

Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity

by

Timothy Scott Wardle

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Joel Marcus, Supervisor

Eric Meyers

Lucas Van Rompay

Christopher Rowe

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
Religion in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2008

ABSTRACT

Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity

by

Timothy Scott Wardle

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved: _____

Joel Marcus, Supervisor

Eric Meyers

Lucas Van Rompay

Christopher Rowe

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Religion in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2008

Copyright by
Timothy Scott Wardle
2008

Abstract

In Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, he asks the readers this question: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's spirit dwells in you?" (1 Cor 3:16). Although Paul is the earliest Christian writer to explicitly identify the Christian community with the temple of God, this correlation is not a Pauline innovation. Indeed, this association between the community and the temple first appears in pre-Pauline Christianity (see Gal 2:9) and is found in many layers of first-century Christian tradition. Some effects of this identification are readily apparent, as the equation of the Christian community with a temple (1) conveyed the belief that the presence of God was now present in this community in a special way, (2) underlined the importance of holy living, and (3) provided for the metaphorical assimilation of Gentiles into the people of God. Though some of the effects of this correlation are clear, its origins are less so.

This study contends that the early Christian idea of the Christian community as a temple should be understood in relation to the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. Moreover, this nascent Christian conception of the community as a temple should be seen in light of the existence of other Jewish temples which were established as alternatives to the one in Jerusalem: namely, the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, the Oniad temple in Leontopolis, and the "temple of men" at Qumran. Though the formation of each temple was a complex affair, in each case the primary motivating factor appears to have been conflict with the Jerusalem religious establishment.

This work concludes that the transference of temple terminology to the Christian community also developed through conflict with the Jerusalem chief priests charged with oversight of the temple, and that the creation of a communal temple idea should be understood as a culturally recognizable way to register dissent against the Jerusalem priesthood. As a result, we are better able to situate the early Christians in their originally Jewish nexus and see the extent to which tension in Jerusalem helped to forge the nascent Christian mindset.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Question.....	1
1.2 The Scope of the Project.....	5
1.3 History of Research.....	6
1.4 Outline.....	11
1.5 Methodological Issues	15
Chapter 2: The Centrality of the Temple and High Priest in Second Temple Judaism.....	18
2.1 The Jerusalem Temple	19
2.1.1 Religious Significance	21
2.1.2 Excursus on the synagogue as a religious institution.....	29
2.1.3 Economic impact	33
2.1.4 Socio-Political significance	39
2.1.5 Summary Observations on the Role of the Temple in Second Temple Judaism	42
2.2 Priests and Politics	44
2.2.1 Persian and Hellenistic Eras.....	48
2.2.2 Hasmonean Era	55
2.2.3 Excursus on the Gerousia and Sanhedrin.....	59
2.2.4 Roman Era	62
2.3 Conclusion	69

Chapter 3: Reactions to the Control and Influence of the Jerusalem Temple and Priesthood	71
3.1 Exilic and Post-Exilic Biblical Literature	73
3.2 The Hellenistic Period prior to Antiochus Epiphanes.....	78
3.2.1 Tobit.....	78
3.2.2 Enochic Literature: the Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers....	81
3.2.3 Aramaic Levi	86
3.2.4 Conclusion to earliest works.....	87
3.3 The Period of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Early Maccabean Years.....	92
3.3.1 Jubilees.....	92
3.3.2 The Animal Visions	95
3.3.3 The Apocalypse of Weeks	97
3.3.4 Testament of Moses	99
3.3.5 The Qumran Scrolls	101
3.3.6 4QMMT	102
3.3.7 Damascus Document	106
3.3.8 The Rise of Jewish Sects.....	108
3.3.9 Conclusions about the Period of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Rise of the Maccabees.....	116
3.4 The Late Second Century B.C.E. to the Destruction of the Temple.....	121
3.4.1 Second Maccabees	122
3.4.2 Greek Testament of Levi	124
3.4.3 Peshar Habakkuk	127
3.4.4 Psalms of Solomon	129

3.4.5 Testament of Moses 6-7	133
3.4.6 Sibylline Oracles 3-5.....	134
3.4.7 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch	137
3.4.8 Conclusion to Literary Evidence from the Second Century B.C.E. to the First Century C.E.....	139
3.5 Concluding Observations.....	141
Chapter 4: The Emergence of Alternative Temples	147
4.1 The Samaritans.....	148
4.1.1 The Relationship Between Samaritans and Jews.....	153
4.1.2 Similarities	156
4.1.3 Role of Temple in Dispute.....	159
4.1.4 Recent Archaeological Evidence	164
4.1.5 Destruction of Temple	170
4.1.6 What gave Gerizim legitimacy, and why was it destroyed?	171
4.2 Leontopolis	180
4.2.1 Sources.....	181
4.2.2 The <i>Jewish War</i>	183
4.2.3 The Jewish Antiquities.....	188
4.2.4 Archaeology.....	193
4.2.5 Description of Temple/Tower.....	196
4.2.6 The prophecy of Isaiah.....	198
4.2.7 Motivations	203
4.3 Qumran	207

4.3.1 Community Origins	208
4.3.2 Priestly Influence at Qumran	213
4.3.3 Qumran and Sacrifice in the Temple?.....	216
4.3.4 Three Responses to Separation from Jerusalem Temple	223
4.3.5 The Eschatological Temple.....	224
4.3.6 Participation in the Heavenly Temple.....	228
4.3.7 The Community as Temple.....	231
4.4 Concluding Thoughts.....	241
Chapter 5: The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity.....	247
5.1 A Note on the Use of the Gospels and Acts as Historical Sources.....	248
5.2 Jesus' View of the Temple and Jerusalem Priesthood.....	252
5.2.1 Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple.....	256
5.2.2 Sayings Regarding the Future Destruction of the Temple.....	270
5.2.3 Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants.....	275
5.2.4 Concluding Observations on Jesus' View of the Temple and Priesthood.....	282
5.3 The First Followers of Jesus, Acts, and the Temple.....	286
5.3.1 Evidence of Early Christian Criticism of the Chief Priests	292
5.3.2 The Use of Psalm 118:22.....	294
5.4 The Community as a Temple in Earliest Christianity.....	299
5.4.1 Galatians 2 and Revelation 3	302
5.4.2 1 Corinthians 3 and 2 Corinthians 6	306
5.4.3 Ephesians 2:19-22 and 1 Peter 2:4-10	313
5.4.4 A Shift in Emphasis: Individual Believers as Temples	318

5.4.5 Jesus as the Temple.....	321
5.4.6 Summary	323
5.5 Conclusions: Jesus and the Christian Community as a Temple	326
Chapter 6: Concluding Reflections and Implications	332
Bibliography	342
Biography.....	384

Acknowledgements

In the final months of writing and revising I have become increasingly cognizant of how indebted I am to a number of individuals, and I am grateful for this opportunity to publicly thank them for their support, guidance, and friendship.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife Cherie, my dearest friend and partner in life for nearly 10 years. She has been a constant source of encouragement and has graciously allowed me to spend more hours in the library than either of us would have liked. Thanks for your love and faithfulness. Thanks also to my daughters Autumn, Aspen, and Brooke, whose smiles, laughter, and hugs are a source of endless delight.

Second, I would like to thank the members of my committee. Joel Marcus's careful attention to detail and uncanny ability to hone in on weaknesses in an argument have greatly improved the prose and argumentation of what follows. As the director of this dissertation, I owe him a special thanks for his perseverance in seeing this project through to its completion in these final months. Additionally, Eric Meyers's expertise in Second Temple period archaeology and material culture, Kavin Rowe's knowledge of all things related to Luke-Acts, and Luk Van Rompay's love of Syriac Christianity have all had an impact on this dissertation. A special thanks to these three for their insightful comments and encouragement in these last months.

Third, I would like to thank the many friends and colleagues at Duke who have helped make these years at Duke University such enjoyable ones. I am especially thankful to Rodrigo Morales, Matt Thiessen and Seth Dowland for their aid in improving

the prose of this dissertation, as well as to Brad Trick, Hans Arneson, Lori Baron and Dave Moffitt for their friendship and encouragement along the way.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 The Question

The Jewish temple in Jerusalem cut a majestic and imposing figure. Situated atop the Temple Mount in the eastern half of the city, the sanctuary towered over all other structures on its side of the Tyropolean Valley. For most Second Temple Jews, however, the metaphorical shadow cast by this institution far exceeded its literal one. Josephus, Philo, and a whole host of other Jewish, Greek, and Roman writers of this period remark on the magnificence of the city and temple and the magnetic pull that the sanctuary exerted upon Jewish hearts and minds in both Palestine and the Diaspora.¹ The temple and its cult created a shared religious and emotional experience that knit together Jews all around the ancient world.² In a very real sense, the temple, and participation in it, fashioned both an individual and a collective Jewish identity.

Not all, however, participated in the worship of the God of Israel in the Jerusalem temple. Most Jews did not dwell in Palestine,³ and even many Palestinian Jews did not live close to the city of Jerusalem. As a result, though many Diaspora Jews traveled to Jerusalem in order to participate in the thrice-yearly pilgrimage festivals, a significant number probably never set eyes upon Jerusalem or the temple. While it is uncertain that all Jews the world over pined to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, many who wished to visit

¹ E.g. Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.67-78; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.392-425; *Ag. Ap.* 2.193; Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 5.70; *b. B Bat* 4a.

² E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 256-57; Richard Bauckham, "The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why," *ST* 47 (1993): 135-51, esp. 139.

³ On the phenomenon of Diaspora Judaism, see John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 B.C.E. to 117 C.E.)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), *passim*.

the city and temple were likely prevented from doing so by geographic and economic constraints.

On the other end of the spectrum, three distinct communities living in and around Judea in the Second Temple period separated themselves from the Jerusalem temple on ideological grounds, deliberately cutting themselves off from the temple and its worship. This physical detachment from the temple, however, did not entail a rejection of the temple *per se*. Rather, these groups formed alternative temples to that in Jerusalem, with some erecting physical sanctuaries (the Samaritan and Oniad Temples) and another establishing a communal temple identity (the Qumran community).

The present study focuses upon a fourth community which toward the end of the Second Temple period established another alternative temple to the one in Jerusalem. The formation of this new temple occurred in Jerusalem amongst the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, who had begun to proclaim and worship him following his death and resurrection. Animating their proclamation was the belief that God, through Jesus, had fulfilled many of the promises originally given to Israel. The application of temple terminology and ideology to their community represents one important manifestation of this new conviction; these early Christians came to believe that a new temple had been founded in their midst, and that they themselves were constituent parts of it.

This idea of the Christian community as a new, eschatological temple is deeply embedded in early Christian tradition and appears throughout the New Testament. In 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 Paul first refers to the Christian community as a temple, and his reference to Peter, James, and John as those “reputed to be pillars” (Gal 2:9) indicates

that this temple ideology arose very early in the Jerusalem church. Later New Testament documents develop this idea, as depictions of the community as a temple, both explicit and implicit, appear in Ephesians, 1 Peter, Mark, Acts, Revelation, and early non-canonical Christian texts.⁴ This metaphorical temple language appears to have been both descriptive and normative for the early Christian community, serving not only as a way in which early Christians could describe themselves to fellow Jews (or Gentiles, as the case may be), but also as an expression of their real and tangible belief that their community had been transformed into a temple.

The prominence of this idea in the storehouse of early Christian imagery is not difficult to discern.⁵ As early as Paul and continuing into later centuries, the application of temple imagery to the community was closely tied to the belief that God's presence, his Spirit, now inhabited this communal temple in a special way.⁶ Indeed, the persistence of this view of the community as a temple attests to the resonance that this particular image held, especially in a largely pagan society in which many converts had formerly frequented pagan temples. In contrast to their previous way of life, these Christians could now proclaim the powerful conviction, "God dwells in *our* midst, and *we* are his temple."

This understanding of God's presence in the community carried with it several important corollary convictions, including an emphasis on the unity and holiness of the

⁴ E.g. Eph 2:20-22; 1 Pet 2:4-8; Mark 14:58; Acts 15:16; Rev 3:12; *Barn.* 4:11; 6:15-16; Ign. *Eph.* 9:1; 15:3; *Magn.* 7:2; *Trall.* 7:2; *Phld.* 7:2; *Herm. Vis.* 3.3.

⁵ For the continued popularity of this image in later centuries, see Frances M. Young, "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity," *NTS* 19 (1973): 325-38; W. Horbury, "New Wine in Old Wineskins," *ExpTim* 86 (1974): 36-42.

⁶ E.g. 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16-17; Eph 2:22.

Christian community. In addition, this belief opened up a new way to speak of Gentile inclusion into the Christian faith. In contrast to the Jerusalem temple, which restricted Gentiles to the outer courts, in this new, eschatological temple the Gentiles were now seen as equal participants in the worship of God and full members of the people of God.

Although these are all important *effects* of the appropriation of this temple imagery in early Christianity, in this study I will contend that none of these convictions should be understood as the *cause* of the construction of this temple identity. In other words, the appropriation of temple terminology was *not* predicated primarily on the belief that God's presence could now be ultimately found in the Christian community, nor in the related idea that the Christian community was now holy or that Gentiles could now be included in the Christian faith. Rather, I will argue that the transference of temple terminology to the Christian community must be understood in light of the harsh critique that often surfaced in this period against the priestly overseers of the Jerusalem temple. Indeed, I will claim that the decision to proclaim the Christian community as a temple was a bold and calculated move that held particular cultural currency in the first century C.E. It was a culturally recognizable way to register dissent. Moreover, the decision to construct an alternative temple *in Jerusalem*, in the shadow of the sanctuary that dominated the skyline of Jerusalem, held potentially explosive socio-religious consequences. In ascertaining the origins and potency of the idea of the Christian community as a temple, we must look first and foremost to the small Jewish-Christian community located in the shadow of the Jerusalem temple.

1.2 The Scope of the Project

Most recent scholars interested in the transference of cultic and/or temple metaphors to the Christian community often focus on the linguistic and conceptual parallels that exist between the New Testament and Dead Sea Scrolls, and with good reason.⁷ As we shall see in the latter half of the present study, both the covenanters at Qumran and the early Christians chose to imagine their communities in terms of a new and metaphorical temple. Yet the parallels with similar phenomena in Second Temple Judaism do not end here.

In coming to terms with nascent Christianity's appropriation of temple terminology as part of its self-definition, I have chosen to broaden the scope of inquiry to include not only the communal temple ideology found at Qumran, but also two physical temples constructed in the Second Temple period which functioned, to varying degrees, as rivals to the Jerusalem temple. To be sure, the popularity of the Jerusalem temple does not appear to have suffered much loss in this competition. Nevertheless, the very existence of these temples exposes the high level of disagreement and dissatisfaction caused by the Jerusalem temple and its presiding priesthood and the lengths to which some were willing to go in their attempts to worship God freely and rightly.

In point of fact, three important physical temples were constructed or already existed in the Second Temple period: namely, the temple at Elephantine, the Samaritan

⁷ E.g. John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997); Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran* (NovTSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

temple, and the temple at Leontopolis. The archaeological and literary evidence for each of these temples is uneven. As the primary task of this study is to delineate the pattern of dissent from the Jerusalem temple resulting in the construction of these temples, as well as to ascertain its relevance to the construction of the early Christian sense of itself as a temple, I have chosen to exclude from the discussion the temple at Elephantine. The evidence for this temple is so meager, and its destruction so early in the Second Temple period, that its very existence seems inconsequential to first century C.E. Judaism. This is not the case for the other two temples. Even though the Samaritan temple was constructed early in the Second Temple period and was destroyed in the second century B.C.E., the memory of this temple remained a live issue in the first century C.E. As such, it is quite relevant to the discussion at hand. Similarly, the importance of the temple at Leontopolis is seen not only in its existence, but also in the care that the Romans took to have this temple destroyed after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. Roman awareness of the Jerusalem temple's explosive effect on the psyche of the Jewish people made the Romans wary of allowing any Jewish temple to exist, in Jerusalem or elsewhere.

1.3 History of Research

The present study will engage three overlapping yet distinct streams of scholarly inquiry. The first involves discussion of the source of the temple language found in the New Testament. Prior to the discovery of the Scrolls in the late 1940s, it was assumed that the early Christians were *sui generis* in appropriating temple terminology for their

own community. Hans Wenschkewitz exemplified the *Zeitgeist* of his time when he urged that the move to “spiritualize” the temple and apply this terminology both to the individual and the community was the result of Stoic and Philonic influence upon early Christian thought.⁸ The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, however, revealed that the transfer of temple terminology to a community was at home in Palestinian Judaism prior to the rise of the Christian movement.

In 1965, Bertil Gärtner wrote a groundbreaking study arguing just this point. Giving nearly equal attention to the Scrolls and the New Testament, Gärtner argued that the shared temple symbolism in these texts was based on three factors: criticism of the Jerusalem temple and its sacrifices, a belief that the last days had come, and a belief that God had come to dwell within their respective communities.⁹

Four years later, R.J. McKelvey broadened the scope of the question to include a discussion of the literary representations of the new, heavenly, and spiritual temple in Jewish and Greek literature.¹⁰ While his discussion of the Scrolls was minimal, their impact upon his study seems certain from the way in which he assumed a Jewish background to the New Testament’s use of temple language. McKelvey’s stated goal was to come to terms with the early Christian idea of the community as a temple. As a

⁸ Hans Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament* (Angelos-Beiheft 4; Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932), 49-87.

⁹ Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

¹⁰ R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).

result, the majority of this monograph concentrated upon an examination of the pertinent New Testament texts.

Georg Klinzing's comparative study of the Qumran and New Testament materials in 1971 was characterized by the opposite approach, as he placed a heavy emphasis upon the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community itself.¹¹ Similar to Gärtner, Klinzing detailed some of the reasons for Qumran's split from the Jerusalem temple amidst his examination of the temple imagery found in the scrolls. He concluded that the parallel temple conception that arose in both apocalyptic communities resulted from their shared belief that their respective communities were the true community of the last days.

Following the publication of these three monographs, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza challenged Klinzing's argument, asserting that he had not sufficiently dealt with the peculiarities of each community that gave rise to their parallel communal temple conception.¹² Rather than assuming that the development of each community's temple ideology was predicated upon a shared stimulus, as Klinzing had done, she correctly argued that differing theological motivations and concrete occasions gave rise to the transfer of cultic language in each case.

Though they disagree on some of the particulars, these four studies all have in common a desire to understand the totality of the New Testament's witness to the new temple ideology, and to do so through a comparison with parallel Jewish ideas dating to

¹¹ Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

¹² Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159-77.

the Second Temple period. There has been no recent comprehensive study of the transfer of temple terminology and ideology to the Christian community. Rather, there has been a proliferation of studies specific to one or more New Testament passages or authors.¹³

The lack of a comprehensive treatment of the subject, coupled with new insights into the emergence of a parallel temple ideology at Qumran in the last thirty years,¹⁴ necessitates a fresh investigation into the origins of this belief in the Christian community as a temple.

The second stream of scholarly inquiry that bears on the present study is epitomized by the work of James Dunn and Richard Bauckham.¹⁵ Each has examined the ways in which early Christian attitudes toward the temple are not only revelatory of the Christians' emerging self-perception, but also how this idea would have contributed to the eventual parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity. Dunn asserted that

¹³ E.g. Lanci, *New Temple for Corinth*; Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (BZNT 107; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001); Stephen Finlan, *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors* (SBLABib 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004); Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*; Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006); Andrew M. Mbuvi, *Temple, Exile and Identity in 1 Peter* (LNTS 345; London: T & T Clark, 2007).

¹⁴ E.g. Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), passim; Devorah Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à V. Nikiprowetzky* (ed. André Caquot et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 165-89; David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (ed. Brad Young; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 23-74; M. O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103-32; Daniel R. Schwartz, "Temple and Desert: On Religion and State in Second Temple Period Judaea," in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992); 29-43; George J. Brooke, "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* (ed. Beate Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999), 285-301; Richard Bauckham, "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. James Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 63-89.

¹⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 1991); Bauckham, "Parting of the Ways," 135-51.

the temple was one of the four “pillars” of Judaism which was undermined by at least some early Christians (those of a more Hellenistic background), and that the belief that the temple was no longer the center of Israel’s national and religious life was an important component in the eventual parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity. Accepting many of Dunn’s conclusions but somewhat critical of his approach, Richard Bauckham attempted to concretize the idea of the Christian communal temple more firmly in the social realia of the first century C.E. Situating the Christian community between the Qumran community and the Samaritans, Bauckham argued that the Christian perception of itself as a new temple was well within the bounds of common Judaism. But the combination of the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., the growing Pharisaic/rabbinic influence, and the events of the Bar Kokhba rebellion all conspired to plant the Christian community outside of Judaism by 135 C.E.

Though the present study certainly supports the contention that the Jerusalem temple, and early Christian views of it, played an important role in the parting of the ways between the two religions, I am interested principally in the origins of this idea in earliest Christianity and the ways in which Christian appropriation of temple terminology spurred on the emergence and growth of the earliest Christian movement in Jerusalem.

A third important stream of scholarship significant for this study is the voice of the “other” temples that existed in Judaism during the Second Temple period, namely, the Samaritan and the Oniad temples. Though the existence of these alternative temples is readily acknowledged, discussion of these sanctuaries is usually confined to a few pages

or relegated to footnotes.¹⁶ More recently, Jörg Frey has begun to fill this void in his discussion of the Jewish temples at Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis,¹⁷ and recent archaeological excavations on Mt. Gerizim have greatly enhanced our knowledge of the Samaritan temple.¹⁸ Still, a major study of these temples is necessary, for they attest to a felt disconnection with the Jerusalem temple and its presiding priesthood during the Second Temple period. The present study is, in part, an attempt to fill this void. In addition, the results of the present investigation will offer new insight into the early Christian movement's idea that it was establishing a new, metaphorical temple.

1.4 Outline

The purpose of the first major chapter is twofold: to highlight the centrality of the Jerusalem Temple and the influence of the high priesthood in the Second Temple period.¹⁹ While the temple functioned primarily as Judaism's religious center,

¹⁶ E.g. Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)* (ed. Geza Vermes et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973); 2.17-19; 3.47-48, 145-47; Sanders, *Judaism*, 23-24; Michael E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions* (New York: Collins, 1980), 78-82; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic period* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 272-75.

¹⁷ Jörg Frey, "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* (ed. Beate Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1999), 171-203.

¹⁸ Most recently, see Yitzhak Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. Ephraim Stern; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008), 5.1742-48.

¹⁹ See also Sanders, *Judaism*, 47-145; Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai, eds., *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996), passim; Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2002), esp. 87-132; Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. - 70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002), passim; Ingrid Hjelm, *Jerusalem's*

throughout the Second Temple period it grew in stature not only as an institution in which religious rites were performed, but also as a symbol that united all adherents to the God of Israel, both within and outside of the land of Palestine. Indeed, by the second and first centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., there was no question that the temple stood at the center of Jewish religious, political, and economic life and was the paramount symbol of the covenant relationship between the God of Israel and his people. The throngs of pilgrims who assembled at Jerusalem thrice-yearly gave elegant testimony to the centrality and sacredness of this place. As caretaker of this temple, the Jewish high priest was the highest-ranking Jewish political and religious figure in the country and exerted considerable influence and power for most of the Second Temple period.

Not all, however, were comfortable with this consolidation of power and authority in the hands of the high priestly establishment. Chapter Three will focus upon the few negative evaluations of the Jerusalem temple and the more numerous and escalating criticisms of the Jerusalem priestly aristocracy.²⁰ While “critique” of the temple was largely confined to its perceived inferiority when compared with the first temple or a future one, the high priesthood of this period regularly came under scathing review.

Indeed, these priests were routinely branded as illegitimate due to allegations of improper

Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), passim; James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), passim.

²⁰ See also David Flusser, "No Temple in the City," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (ed. Brad Young; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 455-56; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 137-43; Francis Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism* (trans. J. Edward Crowley; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), passim.

descent, charges of halakhic and/or sexual impurity, and accusations of greed and arrogance. In this chapter I will argue that this critique was confined largely to Jerusalem and its environs, was sustained over several centuries, and became increasingly polemical.

In Chapter Three I will concentrate more specifically on three distinct communities whose dispute with the religious leadership in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period resulted in the creation of temples that offered alternatives to that in the capital city. These temples, all outside of Jerusalem, all connected to the Zadokite priestly line, and all devoted to the worship of the one true God of Israel, appear to have been established as rivals of the Jerusalem temple and in contradistinction to the high priestly overseers of that city's sanctuary. The Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim was erected in the fifth century B.C.E., that of Leontopolis in the early second century B.C.E. Alongside the existence of these physical temples is the community at Qumran, a group whose members envisioned themselves as a spiritual temple, eschewed participation in the Jerusalem cult, and heaped scorn upon the current Jerusalem priests. Although none of these alternative temples could compare with the physical presence of the Jerusalem temple, each community deemed it better to worship in an undefiled temple than to participate in what they perceived to be a polluted sanctuary. Though much separates these three communities and temples, in this chapter I will argue that the formation of alternative temples outside of Jerusalem follows a common pattern, as similar motivations contributed to their separation from Jerusalem and establishment of a new temple.

The early Christian appropriation of temple terminology and ideology is the focus of Chapter Four. The contention of this study is that Jesus, along with many of his contemporaries, held both the temple and the office of the high priest in high regard. This does not mean, however, that the particular chief priests of his day were highly esteemed. Indeed, Jesus, along with several of his contemporaries and some of his followers, appears on occasion to have sharply criticized the current Jerusalem priests officiating in the temple.

Moreover, if I am correct that the formation of alternative temples was the result of specific instances of conflict with the Jerusalem religious establishment, then it stands to reason that the early Christian temple idea was borne of similar convictions. Though their rationale may have been different (the early Christians appear to have been unconcerned over the purity of the priests and did not question their lineage), the collaboration of the chief priests with the Romans in bringing about the death of their leader likely provided a clear motivation for distancing themselves from the high priestly leadership of the temple. In this chapter I will argue that the Christian appropriation of temple terminology should be understood not only as a continuation of Jesus' critique of the current chief priests, but also as a reaction to the chief priests' involvement in the crucifixion of Jesus and their continued hostility toward the early Christian leadership in Jerusalem.

Thus, on the one hand, we see in the early Christians certain parallels with other anti-temple and/or anti-priestly groups. In their founding there was a dispute with the priestly overseers of the temple, and one result of this quarrel was the institution of a new

temple. On the other hand, the critique of temple and priesthood developed in a rather different manner than did that of the other alternative temple communities, for disagreement centered on the identity of a specific figure, Jesus, rather than the qualifications of the priests to oversee the temple. Additionally, and in contrast to the founding of the other alternative temples, the Christian transfer of temple terminology to the community occurred in conjunction with continued participation in the Jerusalem temple.

1.5 Methodological Issues

Before proceeding with the inquiry, it is necessary to lay out a few methodological principles. The present work is predicated upon the idea that any study of Jesus and the early Christian movement in Jerusalem must seriously engage the world of Second Temple Judaism. This, of course, is not a new insight. Interest in the Jewish background of Christianity had already intensified in the wake of World War II, and E.P. Sanders' landmark publication of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* in 1977 greatly increased scholarly awareness in the Judaism of Jesus' and Paul's day.²¹ Still, I think it important to state from the outset that this study continues in the line of scholarship that has emphasized the Jewishness of Jesus and the early Christian movement.

Additionally, along with several other recent scholars, I have deliberately avoided the term "spiritualization" in describing both the Qumran and Christian application of

²¹ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), passim.

temple terminology to their respective communities. As the title *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* suggests, Klinzing chose to speak of reinterpretation rather than spiritualization.²² Similarly, Schüssler Fiorenza pointed out that the category “spiritualization” contains so many presuppositions and shades of meaning that “its use tends not to clarify but to confuse.”²³ She proposed instead the term “transference,” indicating that “Jewish and Hellenistic cultic concepts were *shifted* to designate a reality which was not cultic.” More recently, Steven Fine has coined the term “templization” to describe how synagogues began to acquire attributes originally reserved for the Jerusalem temple, and how this *imitatio templi* is also seen in the literature of Qumran, the New Testament, and the Tannaim.²⁴ Common to all three is the desire to communicate the continuing relevance and vitality of the temple and its sacrifices, for the potency of the comparison is lessened if the original symbol is denigrated or relativized. This line of reasoning seems correct to me. In place of the term “spiritualization,” I will use a variety of terms, such as “application,” “templization,” and “transference,” that speak to the continuing significance of the Jerusalem temple in the early Christian mindset.

Furthermore, if the new temple terminology is, at least in part, to be understood as a socio-political or socio-religious reaction to the high priestly circles, then this may help

²² Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 143-47.

²³ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," 161.

²⁴ Steven Fine, *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 32, 55; cf. Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 220, 251.

explain how the early Christians became a recognizable group within the Judaism of their day. Shaye Cohen has noted that the major Jewish sects of the Second Temple period were all designated as such precisely because of their relationship with and attitude towards the Jerusalem temple and its presiding priesthood.²⁵ While he cites the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in this regard, he gives little attention to the early Christians, their relationship to the temple, and the way in which this perception may have made them an identifiable group alongside the above-mentioned sects. Thus, the appropriation of this temple terminology may also help us understand how the early Christians situated themselves vis-à-vis other recognizable groups, as well as shedding light on some of the diversity amidst the early Christian movement.

Finally, unless otherwise noted, I have used several standard translations. For biblical citations, including the Apocrypha, I have followed the NRSV. Translations for the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997-98). For Greek and Latin sources, see the Loeb Classical Library.

²⁵ Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 131-32.

Chapter 2: The Centrality of the Temple and High Priest in Second Temple Judaism

Writing in the early first century C.E., Pliny the Elder lauds Jerusalem as “the most famous city of the East.”¹ To modern readers, this high praise may seem incommensurate with the social reality of a city perched precariously on the edge of the Judean desert. It had little in the way of natural resources and lacked the water supply necessary to support a large population. Moreover, it did not lie near either of the two main trade arteries that ran north-south through Syro-Palestine. The coastal highway, which allowed for trade between Egypt, on the one hand, and Damascus, Tyre, and Sidon, on the other, lay well to the west of Jerusalem. Likewise, the King’s Highway ran well to the east of the city on the other side of the Jordan River and the Dead Sea, and connected Damascus with Egypt, the Red Sea, and the Arabian Peninsula.

And yet, Pliny’s praise was not an anomaly, for Jewish, Greek, and Roman sources all extolled this city.² The only explanation for the persistent respect shown Jerusalem was the existence of the magnificent temple positioned on the eastern edge of

¹ Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 5.70. Cf. Menahem Stern, “Jerusalem, The Most Famous of the Cities of the East” (Pliny, *Natural History* V, 70),” in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume* (ed. A. Oppenheimer et al.; Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980), 257-70.

² Philo, *Embassy*, 281-83; Hecataeus of Abdera, in Diodorus of Sicily, *Bib. Hist.* 40, 3.3; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.1-2; Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*, 65.3-7. For an inscription from 80 C.E. detailing the seeming impregnability of Jerusalem and praising Titus for having conquered it, see Hermannus Dessau, ed., *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (Berolini, apud Weidmannos, 1892), 71 no. 264. Moreover, Bickerman has observed that, due to Jerusalem’s location away from the main trade routes, it was not until after the time of Alexander the Great that Greek writers, excluding Herodotus, even mention the Jews. The growth of Jerusalem’s reputation and status in the Roman period altered this lack of attention. Elias Bickerman, “The Historical Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism,” in *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion* (ed. Louis Finkelstein; New York: Harper & Row, 1949), 88-89.

the city. As Josephus succinctly stated, Jerusalem was home to the “one temple for the one God.”³

2.1 The Jerusalem Temple

During the Second Temple period the perceived magnificence of the temple, as well as the prestige bestowed upon it by the Jewish people, increased dramatically. This elevation in stature was mirrored by a concomitant rise in the authority of the high priest. In a departure from earlier Israelite history when king, priest, and to a lesser extent prophet shared political and religious power, authority in the Second Temple period was concentrated largely in the hands of the high priest and priestly aristocracy in Jerusalem.⁴

This development is not surprising. Under the aegis of Cyrus and Darius, and led by figures such as Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the exiles returned from their captivity in eastern lands and set themselves to the task of rebuilding the temple and the city of Jerusalem.⁵ Furthermore, Cyrus’ original edict allowing the

³ *Ag. Ap.* 2.193; cf. *Ant.* 4.200. Although the temple in Jerusalem was the pre-eminent sanctuary for the worship of the God of Israel, several other temples devoted to the worship of the Jewish deity also existed. Brief histories of the alternative temples are given by Josephus, and the very fact that he could profess “one temple for the one God” while also giving details about other temples suggests that he did not see a contradiction between the Jerusalem temple and the alternatives. These temples will be the subject of Chapter Four.

⁴ Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 1.74-75.

⁵ The debate concerning the date of the return of the exiles from Babylon is succinctly summarized in Grabbe, 1.75-79, 88-93; Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah,” in *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period* (ed. Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 117; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 37-40. Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, and Jeshua were amongst the first wave of returnees and were responsible for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra 1-6; Hag 1). Neh 2:1 recounts that Nehemiah first returned to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes and made a return trip in Artaxerxes’ thirty-second year (Neh 13:6-7). Accordingly, Nehemiah would have traveled to Jerusalem in 445 B.C.E. and again in 433 B.C.E. The date of Ezra’s return is more widely debated. According to the order of

Jews to return to Jerusalem did not entail a re-establishment of the Jewish state, but rather the rebuilding of the temple, and a large number of the returning exiles were priests.⁶ To those who had known the first temple, the appearance of the second temple seems to have left much to be desired (Ezra 3:12). And yet, despite its humble beginnings, this temple grew increasingly central to Jewish identity and nationalism in the years between its restoration in the late sixth century B.C.E. and its destruction in 70 C.E. After its initial reestablishment in Jerusalem, periodic architectural modifications ensued. Sirach 50:2-4, for example, says that in the days of Simon the Just (circa 200 B.C.E), the sanctuary was fortified and a reservoir was built inside the confines of the Temple Mount, and 1 Maccabees 4:43-46 credits Judah Maccabee with demolishing the altar that had been polluted by Antiochus Epiphanes and erecting a new altar in his purification of the temple in 164 B.C.E. These structural modifications, however, pale in comparison to Herod the Great's enlargement and beautification of the temple at the end of the first century B.C.E. Herod spared no expense, and the magnificence of the temple reached its pinnacle during

events in the book of Ezra, Ezra returned in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, or 458 B.C.E. Many have argued, however, that this is a reference to Artaxerxes II, and this would place Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem in 398 B.C.E. Determining the correct chronology is not of great importance for our purposes. In either case, the book of Ezra is one of the oldest documents to discuss the restoration of the cult and temple.

⁶ According to Wilhelm Bousset (*Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter* [HNT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926], 98), one-sixth of the returning exiles could claim priestly ancestry: "In der Exulantenliste Es 2:3-39 = Neh 7:8-42 werden unter einer Bevölkerung von 25000—26000 Männern 4289 Priester (übereinstimmend nach Es 2:36-39, Neh 7:39-42) gezählt, d. h. es kam auf je sechs erwachsene männliche Laien jedesmal ein Priester." While rightfully acknowledging the difficulty in ascertaining concrete data and numbers from these few lists, he maintains that the basic ratio is probably correct. More recently, Martha Himmelfarb (*A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006], 6) has noted that many more priests (4289) were involved in the return than Levites (341), a ratio of 12:1 (Ezra 2:36-42). This disparity between priests and Levites does not appear to be an anomaly amongst the early returnees; a century later Ezra is unable to find any Levites amongst the community in Jerusalem and must search for some in the broader community (Ezra 8:15-20).

his reign.⁷ Even the rabbinic traditions, which are usually hostile to Herod, declare: “Whoever has not seen Herod’s building has not seen a beautiful building in his life.”⁸ Architecturally and aesthetically, Herod’s temple was a wonder to behold. Not long after Herod’s remarkable reconstruction efforts, however, Jerusalem fell to the Romans, and this temple was destroyed.

But from its renewal in the sixth century B.C.E., this temple, and the priesthood that governed daily operations in it, grew in stature religiously, economically, and politically. In this chapter I am concerned specifically with the related issues of temple, priesthood, and power and the central position of the temple and the role of the high priest in the Second Temple period.

2.1.1 Religious Significance

The centrality of the temple during the Second Temple period has been well documented in recent scholarship.⁹ In this place, the core beliefs and fundamental practices of Judaism were on public display. The one God of Israel had chosen to dwell in Jerusalem and to inhabit the temple that had been built for Him. This understanding of God dwelling in one specific place seems to have been widely held, and is borne out by

⁷ Josephus, *Ant.*, 15.380-425; Philo, *Spec. Laws*, 1.71-75; cf. Levine, *Jerusalem*, 219-43.

⁸ *b. B. Bat.* 4a; cf. Mark 13:1; *b. Ta’an.* 23a.

⁹ E.g., Moshe David Herr, "Jerusalem, the Temple, and Its Cult-Reality and Concepts in Second Temple Times," in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume* (ed. A. Oppenheimer et al.; Jerusalem: Yitzhak Ben Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980), 166-77; Sanders, *Judaism*; Poorthuis and Safrai, eds., *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 2002; Skarsaune, *Shadow of the Temple*; Hjelm, *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty*.

the popular designation of the temple in the Hebrew Bible as the “house of God” (e.g., Gen 28:17; Exod 23:19; Deut 23:18; Josh 9:23; Judg 18:31; Isa 2:3; Jer 27:21; Ezek 10:19; Dan 1:2; 5:23; Joel 1; Eccl 5:1; Pss 84:11[10]; 92:14[13]; 122:1; and throughout 1 and 2 Chronicles). The New Testament and Josephus attest to the continued prevalence of this understanding in the first century C.E.¹⁰ In Matthew 23:21, for example, Jesus is reported to have said: “Whoever swears by the temple, swears by it and by the one who dwells in it,” an acknowledgement and affirmation of God’s continual presence in the temple. Similarly, Josephus notes on several occasions that the presence of God resided in the temple. This is perhaps seen most clearly in his assertion that prior to the destruction of the temple, the priests overheard a voice declaring, “We are departing hence,” a portent of the removal of God’s presence and the ensuing vulnerability of the temple (*J.W.* 6.300; *Ant.* 20.166; cf. *J.W.* 5.412; *Ant.* 3.215-18).

Nevertheless, it was also recognized by some that God could not be circumscribed in time and space. In his dedication speech at the completion of the temple, Solomon articulates that the temple that he has built will be a special focal point of God’s presence on the earth, but he reasons: “will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built! Regard your servant’s prayer and his plea, O Lord my God...that your eyes may be open night and day toward this house” (1 Kings 8:27-29). This same awareness appears also in Deuteronomy, where the temple is said to be the place where God will place his Name, not where he will live, as well as in writings throughout the Second Temple period (see

¹⁰ Cf. Sanders, *Judaism*, 70-71.

Isa 66:1-2; 2 Chron 2:5-6; 2 Macc 3:28-39; *J.W.* 6.127). These passages illustrate that not all were comfortable with the idea that God actually dwelt in the confines of the temple. Rather, these texts insist that God is transcendent and cannot be contained in one place.

Even so, reverence for the temple appears to have increased throughout the periods of the Monarchy and the Second Temple, as it was understood that God's presence (or at least his name) resided in Jerusalem and permeated the temple with his holiness.¹¹ Alongside the description of the temple as a "house," many psalms and a significant number of prophetic passages also utilize mountain imagery when speaking of the temple.¹² Isaiah 56:7 states: "Even [the Gentiles] will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar," and the Psalmist, speaking for God, declares: "I have set my king upon Zion my holy hill" (Psalm 2:6). Significantly, as the terminology for the temple begins to multiply, the edifice's sacredness begins to extend beyond its architectural bounds, and the city of Jerusalem attains a similar level of sanctity.¹³

¹¹ Cf. Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 181-82.

¹² Yaron Z. Eliav (*God's Mountain: The Temple Mount in Time, Place, and Memory* [Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2005], 6-8) points out that geography played a role in the development of mountain imagery for the temple in Jerusalem, since Jerusalem was situated on a hill. Cf. Ronald E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 1-17; Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 98-192; Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, "Jerusalem and Zion after the Exile: The Evidence of First Zechariah," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 130.

¹³ Lee I. Levine, "Second Temple Jerusalem: A Jewish City in the Greco-Roman Orbit," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. Lee Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 53-54. Cf. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985), 89-184; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 31-35; Eliav, *God's Mountain*, 6-8.

Several passages in Isaiah assert that the holy mountain of Jerusalem and the house of the God of Jacob will be the focus of pilgrimage by all the nations in the future (2:1-4; 27:13; cf. Micah 4:1-2), and even after the destruction of the first temple, Ezekiel asserts that Jerusalem is the center of the world and that the city's new name will be "the Lord is there" (5:5; 48:35).¹⁴ The theme of the elevation of the city is typified by Isaiah 60:14: "The descendants of those who oppressed you shall come bending low to you, and all who despised you shall bow down at your feet; they shall call you the City of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel" (cf. Isaiah 48:2; 52:1; 62:1-2). In addition, Jerusalem is also depicted as the navel of the world (*I En.* 26.1; *Jub.* 8.19; *Sib. Or.* 5.250; *J.W.* 3.52),¹⁵ and the binding of Isaac is cleverly associated with the site of the temple by the suggestion in 2 Chron 3:1 that the temple was built upon Mount Moriah.¹⁶

Not only was the temple, and by extension the city, the locus of holiness and sanctity for Jews during the Second Temple period, it was also at the heart of religious experience. Here at the center of the Jewish religious universe stood the sacrificial

¹⁴ The city is described as "holy" in several Second Temple sources (see CD 12.1; 11Q19 45.11-12, 16-17; Matt 4:5; 27:53). Several of the Dead Sea Scrolls (4QMMT B 29-31, 58-60; 1QSa 1:25-26; 11QT 45:7-14; 51:1-6; CD 12:1-2; 1QM 7:3-5) also ascribe to Jerusalem the sanctity which had originally been reserved only for the temple itself; see Hannah K. Harrington, "Holiness in the Laws of 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* (ed. Moshe J. Bernstein et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 112-17. For coins from the time of the Jewish revolt engraved with "Jerusalem the holy," see Ya'akov Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage* (Dix Hills, NY: Amphora Books, 1982), 2.96-131.

¹⁵ Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "Jerusalem as the *Omphalos* of the World: On the History of a Geographic Concept," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. Lee Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), *passim*.

¹⁶ Cf. *Jub.* 18:13; *Ant.* 1.224-26, 7.333; *Gen. Rab.* 55; Klaus Seybold, "Jerusalem in the View of the Psalms," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai; Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996), 12-14.

system and its provision for atonement and forgiveness. Daily sacrifices were performed in the temple enclosure, maintaining the relationships between God, people, and individual.¹⁷ The introductory lines of the Mishnaic tractate *ʿAbot* articulate well the significance of the temple and the sacrificial system: “On three things does the world stand: on the Torah, on the temple service, and on deeds of loving kindness.”¹⁸ The maintenance of this temple service was crucial to the continuance of Israel’s relationship with God and his preservation of the world.

Participation in the cultic system required the petitioner to be in a state of purity when entering the temple precincts. Very few people regularly lived in a state of ritual purity, as the necessities of life and daily interaction with neighbors precluded this high level of ritual cleanness.¹⁹ Yet the law of God required ritual purity, and so special care was taken in the days preceding entrance to the temple to purify oneself and to maintain a status of ritual purity throughout the time of one’s visit to the temple.²⁰ Furthermore, the temple, with all its barriers and restrictions, consisted of a series of interlocking circles of holiness.²¹ At the center stood the holy of holies, into which none but the high priest

¹⁷ For descriptions of the daily service, see Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.168-93, 274-277; *Heir* 174, 196. Cf. Robert Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), 118-41.

¹⁸ *m. Abot* 1.2. Translation and text from Joseph H. Hertz, *Sayings of the Fathers* (New York: Behrman House, 1945). Few would claim that this statement goes back to the historical Simon the Just. The passage, however, seems to capture the respect which the temple and its service held in the period.

¹⁹ Sanders, *Judaism*, 71-72, 217-30.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 70-72, 112-16.

²¹ *Ant.* 15.417-20; *J.W.* 5.190-226; J. N. Lightstone, *Society, the Sacred, and Scripture in Ancient Judaism: A Sociology of Knowledge* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988), 36; Sanders, *Judaism*, 54-76; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 237-43; Martin S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism: Religious Worlds of the First Judaic Millennium* (Bethesda: University of Maryland Press, 2006), 174-81.

could enter. Outside of this were courtyards for the priests, Jewish men, Jewish women, and finally a larger space for Gentiles. Its very geography ensured that only Jews could enter the inner courts of the temple, with further distinctions even within the Jewish people. Thus, in this place, and especially in this place, one knew where one stood vis-à-vis Judaism and its God. The barrier between Jew and Gentile was never more sharply delineated than in this spot, for here a warning of death, written in Greek and Latin letters, was given to any Gentile who wished to pass beyond the stone balustrade dividing the court of the Gentiles from the inner courts of the temple (*J.W.* 5.193-94; 6.124-26).²² The religious experience of appearing at the temple and performing sacrifice was intensely intimate, as one had to be not only Jewish, but also in a state of ritual purity to do so.

Due to the biblical injunction to assemble in Jerusalem thrice yearly (Exodus 23:17; 34:23; Deuteronomy 16:16), the city was the destination of Jews worldwide during the pilgrimage feasts.²³ During the early years of the Second Temple, pilgrimage, if it occurred at all, was probably undertaken by those living in nearby towns and hamlets. Presumably, the number of pilgrims rose in the Hasmonean era,²⁴ but it is not

²² The inscription reads: "No foreigner is to enter within the forecourt and the balustrade around the sanctuary. Whoever is caught will have himself to blame for his subsequent death." For text, translation, and a commentary in which it is argued that the priestly authorities were able to carry out the death penalty for transgressors of this warning, see Peretz Segal, "The Penalty of the Warning Inscription from the Temple of Jerusalem," *IEJ* 39, no. 1-2 (1989): 79-84. For substantial bibliography, see Schürer, *HJP*, II.285 n. 57.

²³ Pilgrimage seems to have been viewed as commendable and meritorious rather than mandatory; see Shmuel Safrai, "Relations Between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel," in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern 1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 191-94.

²⁴ Shmuel Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1985), 151-53.

until the reign of Herod at the end of the first century B.C.E. that we hear of mass international pilgrimage.²⁵ The immense numbers of Jews who participated in these annual pilgrimages distinguished Judaism from other Roman cults, for international pilgrimage was not a common feature of Roman religions.²⁶ Other shrines in the Roman Empire held large festivals and gatherings, but for the most part those assembled came from the surrounding regions, very few from international destinations.²⁷ By contrast, many seem to have made pilgrimage to the Jerusalem temple, with visitors arriving from all corners of the Roman and Persian empires.²⁸ These pilgrimage feasts were principally a time of joy and celebration, the occasion for renewing friendships and a break from normal daily activities (*Ant.* 4.203-4). This celebratory atmosphere, capped by the solemn trip to the sacred temple, would presumably have created an intensely moving experience for some pilgrims. Indeed, the Romans, well aware of the political volatility of these pilgrimage feasts, stationed extra soldiers in the city during them in an attempt to ensure that religious and nationalistic fervor did not erupt into anti-Roman

²⁵ Martin Goodman, "The Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. Lee Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 70.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 70-71.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 70-71; cf. Ramsay MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 25-29.

²⁸ Shmuel Safrai, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 44-93; *Ibid.*, "Relations," 184-215; cf. Acts 2:5-12; *Ant.* 17.26; *b. Meg* 26a; *Abot R. Nat.* B, 55. Philo's statement that "countless multitudes from countless cities come, some over land, others over sea, from east and west and north and south at every feast" undoubtedly overstates the case (*Spec. Laws*, 1.69). Nevertheless, the general thrust of his assertion, that Jews from all geographical points of the compass annually converged on Jerusalem, remains valid. The Theodotos inscription also suggests that many diaspora Jews frequently made their way to Jerusalem, as this synagogue provided overnight accommodations for pilgrims from abroad; see Levine, *Jerusalem*, 322, 395-97.

demonstrations.²⁹ With its commemoration of the exodus from Egypt and national liberation from foreign oppressors, Passover was an especially intense time, and Josephus records several incidents from the first century C.E. in which disturbances erupted during these festivals (*J.W.* 2.10-13, 42-44, 224-27; *Ant.* 17.254-55; 20.105-12).

These great pilgrimage feasts united representatives of Jewish communities from all points of the known world and were instrumental in reinforcing communal identity through corporate participation in the central beliefs and practices which formed Judaism (cf. Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.70).³⁰ As Richard Bauckham has observed,

What they concretely and emotively shared was not simply what different forms of Judaism had in common, but what gave them their own ethno-religious identity as Jews. Common Judaism – the temple, the torah, the one God who was worshipped in the temple and obeyed in following the torah, election as his covenant people to whom he had given temple and torah – this common Judaism gave Jews common identity in very concrete ways.³¹

As the dwelling place of the Jewish God, location of the sacrificial system, and destination of Jews worldwide, the temple in Jerusalem was the cornerstone of Jewish religious experience.

²⁹ *Ant.* 20.106-7; cf. E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 157, 161-63, 263-64. Judging from *Ant.* 17.213-17, fear of sedition during the Passover feast was also felt in the Herodian period.

³⁰ Cf. Victor Turner, "The Center Out There: Pilgrim's Goal," *HR* 12 (1973): 191-230, esp. 216-218.

³¹ Bauckham, "Parting of the Ways," 139; cf. Sanders, *Judaism*, 256-57.

2.1.2 Excursus on the synagogue as a religious institution

The only institution that could have rivaled the temple in terms of religious significance is the synagogue, or *proseuche*, as it was known in the Diaspora.³² The earliest attestation of a synagogue is found in Egypt in two third-century B.C.E. inscriptions dating to the reign of Ptolemy III. Evidence for pre-70 synagogues also exists for many of the cities in the Mediterranean basin; in Asia Minor alone over 100 inscriptions have been unearthed, and in Palestine the remains of three pre-70 synagogues have been found (Gamla, Herodion, and Masada), with the existence of a fourth in Jerusalem attested by the Theodotus inscription.³³ In addition, Josephus writes of synagogues and incidents surrounding them in Dor, Caesarea, and Tiberias (*Ant.* 19.300; *J.W.* 2.285-92; *Life* 277-80), while the Gospels and Acts mention synagogues in Jerusalem, throughout Galilee, and in many of the cities which Paul visited (see, e.g., Mark 1:29; 3:1; 6:2; Matt 4:23; 13:54; Luke 4:15-44; 13:10-21; John 6:59; 18:20; Acts 6:9; 13:14-15; 17:10; 18:17).

Until recently, it was commonplace to describe the origins of the synagogue as arising in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E. and the deportation of its inhabitants. According to this understanding, Israelites suddenly sundered from land

³² Shmuel Safrai, "The Synagogue," in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), II.908-13; Don Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS 169; Atlanta: SBL, 1999), 41-341; Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 42-123.

³³ Several other possible first century Palestinian sites have also been suggested, among them Capernaum, Chorazin, and Qiryat Sefer. See Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 42-69.

and temple had to develop ways to cope with this new reality and to maintain the worship of their God. Thus, the institution of the synagogue developed in response to the loss of the temple and the worship of God therein.

More recently, Levine has offered a different interpretation.³⁴ He notes that during the Monarchy most of the leadership functions occurred at the city gate complex, in many respects the heart of the city.³⁵ Judicial proceedings, discussion amongst the elders of the town, political meetings, and religious functions were all performed here. During the Hellenistic era, however, the gates ceased to be the main gathering place and began serving simply as a passageway.³⁶ As a consequence, important functions that had occurred in this area had to be moved to an adjacent building. Levine contends that the origins of the synagogue are to be found in this move, and that although the synagogue did play a religious role in the life of the community, its civil and communal aspects would have remained its primary activities.³⁷ Only after 70 C.E., with the destruction of the temple, did the synagogue assume greater significance religiously. For Levine, the origins of the synagogue are not to be found in any period of crisis, but rather should be seen as resulting from a shift in architecture during the Hellenistic period.

³⁴ See *ibid.*, 26-41.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 26-31.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 31-41.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 124-59.

Although he accepts much of Levine's reconstruction, Binder argues that it is not all that easy to separate religious from non-religious activity in the ancient world.³⁸ Rather, he asserts that all of the activities that could be performed at the temple in Jerusalem could also be performed in the synagogue, with the exception of sacrifice.³⁹ The proximity of a mikveh to the synagogue at Gamla, the mention of public reading and study of the Law in the Theodotus Inscription, and the presence of a genizah at Masada in which to store old Torah scrolls all suggest that the synagogue had become a sacred place. For Binder, this sacrality may also be noted in the various names given to early synagogues (prayer houses, temples, sacred precincts, etc.), the sense that synagogues could be desecrated,⁴⁰ and the very architecture of the synagogue itself. He contends that synagogues were built to imitate the temple, and that visitors who entered a synagogue and sat on benches looking through the pillars toward the front of the building would have felt as if they were in the temple itself, peering around the pillars to see what was happening.⁴¹ For Binder, the religious function was the primary one.

While Levine and Binder present different views on the origin of the synagogue, both highlight its communal importance. The synagogue was a multi-purpose institution, and Jews seem to have been equally at home eating a meal and entertaining visitors in it as they were engaging in prayer or study of Torah there. For local communities the

³⁸ Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 204-26.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 389-450.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 91-154; see the incidents at Dor (*Ant.* 19.300-12) and Caesarea (*J.W.* 2.285-92).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 223-26, 484.

synagogue was much more accessible than the temple and provided a place where Jews could congregate on the Sabbath and corporately worship the God of Israel. Moreover, the synagogue's leadership was much more egalitarian than that of the temple, where the priests were the only ones who could perform the temple rites. In synagogues, both men and women seem to have held important leadership positions, whole communities were able to study and worship, and participation by all was directly encouraged.⁴² Diaspora *proseuchai* may have been seen as sacred institutions at an earlier date than their Palestinian counterparts,⁴³ but the idea of sacred space and/or a sacred institution was also found in Palestine in pre-70 C.E. Judaism.⁴⁴ This is seen above all by the identification of these Diaspora buildings as *proseuchai*, or houses of prayer. Distance from Jerusalem, as well as the need for self-identification in a non-Jewish environment, may have necessitated this development.⁴⁵

While some have speculated about inherent tension that may have existed between synagogue and temple,⁴⁶ several lines of evidence indicate that many people saw the two institutions as mutually compatible, with the synagogue functioning as a

⁴² Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 2-3.

⁴³ Ibid., 158; cf. Martin Goodman, "Sacred Space in Diaspora Judaism," in *Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (ed. B. Isaac and A. Oppenheimer; Te'uda 12; Tel Aviv: Ramot, 1996), 4-6.

⁴⁴ Fine, *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*, 25-33.

⁴⁵ Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 112; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 26-27.

⁴⁶ Paul V. M. Flesher, "Palestinian Synagogues before 70 C.E.: A Review of the Evidence," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (ed. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 6.67-81; Stefan C. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 65-79.

supplement to the temple rather than a substitute.⁴⁷ First, the masses of pilgrims who descended upon Jerusalem, both from Palestine and the Diaspora, reveal that the sanctity of city and temple was still revered in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. Second, the existence of at least one synagogue in Jerusalem during the time of the temple is revealing. At least for those who frequented this synagogue, no apparent contradiction seems to have been felt in passing from the walls of the synagogue into the courts of the temple. Third, the sacrificial cult was reserved for the Jerusalem temple alone.⁴⁸ Synagogues encouraged piety through study of the scriptures and prayer, but without the temple there would have been nothing to offer in terms of atonement and restitution. Alternate sources of atonement only emerged in the wake of the temple's destruction in 70 C.E.

2.1.3 Economic impact

As already stated, Jerusalem was not situated near any of the major trade routes and should not have been an important force economically. Nevertheless, Philo recounts that "countless multitudes" made pilgrimage to Jerusalem each year on account of the temple.⁴⁹ The mass influx of Jews from around the world had a direct and positive effect

⁴⁷ Smallwood, *Jews Under Roman Rule*, 124; Shmuel Safrai, "The Temple and the Synagogue," in *Synagogues in Antiquity* (ed. A. Kasher et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1987), 31-51; Sanders, *Judaism*, 195-208; Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Temple and the Synagogue," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period* (ed. William Horbury et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 298-325; Skarsaune, *Shadow of the Temple*, 125; Klawans, *Purity*, 104.

⁴⁸ Safrai, "The Temple and the Synagogue," 31-32.

⁴⁹ *Spec. Laws* 1.69. Even today it is difficult to obtain accurate numbers for populations and crowds, and it is much more difficult to establish such numbers with regard to the ancient world. After a discussion

on the revenue of the temple and the city, for these pilgrims brought with them the half-shekel temple tax collected from every male Jew between the ages of twenty and fifty, including freed slaves and proselytes, all of which made its way into the temple coffers. The payment of this tax is well-attested in the ancient sources. Philo and Josephus both mention the annual contribution that was sent to Jerusalem, and Roman sources also show an awareness of the practice.⁵⁰ The best evidence for the payment of this temple tax, as Sanders points out, is that after 70 C.E. the Romans ordered that it still be paid, only now for the benefit of the Romans.⁵¹

The annual influx of pilgrims into Jerusalem would have necessitated a mini-industry devoted to providing accommodations and provisions, and the economic impact of this week-long sojourn was tremendous.⁵² These festivals were days of enjoyment and

evaluating the existing evidence and noting the difficulties involved in estimation, Sanders (*Judaism*, 128) suggests that 300,000 to 500,000 people would have participated in the festivals. All three feasts seem to have been well attended, with Passover usually seeing the largest number of pilgrims (*Ant.* 17.214).

⁵⁰ Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.76-8, *Embassy* 156; Josephus, *Ant.* 14.110-12, 185-267; *J.W.* 6.160-78; Cicero, *Flac.* 28.66-9; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5. Josephus (*Ant.* 18.311-13) also notes that there were specific cities in Mesopotamia that acted as storehouses for the annual half-shekel contribution. The contribution of the tax is assumed by Matt 17:24, and *m. Seqal.* 1-2 and *t. Seqal.* 2:3 preserve the memory of it. Contributions on the part of Diaspora Jews also suggest the reverence many of them felt toward the temple, even though most had never seen it; see E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law From Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM, 1990), 283-308. Nevertheless, as Klawans (*Purity*, 231) has pointed out, there is evidence that some opposed the annual collection of this tax; see 4Q159 1 II.6-7; cf. 11QT 39:7-11.

⁵¹ Sanders, *Judaism*, 52, cf. *J.W.* 7.218; Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*, 65.7. Abuses in the collection of the *Fiscus Judaicus* seem to have been stopped during the reign of Nerva. Coins minted in 96-97 C.E. commemorate this event; see Ya'akov Meshorer, *Ancient Means of Exchange, Weights and Coins* (ed. Ronny Reich; Haifa: A. B. Press, 1998), 119.

⁵² While it is unclear where everyone would have stayed during their time in Jerusalem, there is evidence of a synagogue being used to house Diaspora Jews, and other buildings were presumably pressed into similar service. On this question, see John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Dating Theodotos (CIJ II 1404)," *JJS* 51, no. 2 (2000): 243-80. It is likely, however, that most pilgrims and their families rented places to stay either in the city itself or in the surrounding towns and villages (see Mark 11:11). Others may have brought tents and/or camped outside the city walls; see *Ant.* 17.213-217; Sanders, *Judaism*, 129.

revelry, with many pilgrims presumably eating better than they did during the rest of the year.⁵³ The general merriment was certainly aided by the practice of the second tithe, as ten percent of a pilgrim's produce was set aside and earmarked for consumption. Since pilgrims were already in the city it was a natural occasion on which to spend this tithe.⁵⁴

As an urban center, Jerusalem would have been home to all of the normal trades and occupations of cities of that day.⁵⁵ The existence of the temple, however, necessitated the emergence of special businesses. Suppliers of linen for priestly robes, firewood for sacrifices, and traders in incense doubtless found the temple in Jerusalem to be a welcome market for their wares. Local farmers and shepherds, moreover, provided the goats, lambs, pigeons, and doves required by the large number of tourists who flocked to the city during the festivals.⁵⁶ Beginning in the late first century B.C.E. and continuing until the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., a stone vessel industry also flourished in and around Jerusalem. According to rabbinic halakhah, stone vessels cannot convey impurity.⁵⁷ Archaeological excavations have confirmed the halakhah on this point, and evidence for the production of stone vessels has been found in many

⁵³ Sanders, *Judaism*, 128-29.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 128-29. The second tithe is first instituted in Deut 14:26, where it is specified that the Israelite should spend this money in Jerusalem on food and drink. Tobit 1:7; *Jub.* 32:10-14; and Josephus, *Ant.* 4.205 all indicate that this practice was still in effect in the second century B.C.E., and Josephus's familiarity with the custom suggests that it was still practiced in the first century C.E.

⁵⁵ For details on industry and commerce in Jerusalem, see Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (London: SCM, 1969), 3-57; cf. *Let. Aris.* 114; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 346.

⁵⁶ Sanders, *Judaism*, 124; Jostein Ådna, *Jerusalem Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999), 119-39.

⁵⁷ *m. Kel.* 10:1; *m. Oh* 5:5; *m. Par.* 5:5; *m. Miq.* 4:1; *m. Yad.* 1:2

Jewish settlements, with Jerusalem and its environs the hub of this business.⁵⁸ At the destruction of the temple the production of stone vessels was largely abandoned, illustrating that a heightened interest in purity matters, most easily seen in the burgeoning stone vessel industry, was directly tied to the temple.⁵⁹

The buying and selling of all sorts of goods took place in and around the temple. For business transactions specifically related to the temple service, the Royal Portico most likely served as an economic hub, since here Diaspora Jews could exchange their foreign currency for Tyrian coinage, and animals and grain could be purchased for sacrifice.⁶⁰ The lower market, located along the Tyropoeon valley just west of the temple, was the commercial center of the city. Here, local shopkeepers and craftsmen, as well as out-of-town traders, plied their wares to the many people moving in and out of the temple.⁶¹ Some of this business would have been specific to the temple, while other

⁵⁸ Yitzhak Magen, *The Stone Vessel Industry in the Second Temple Period: Excavations at Hizma and the Jerusalem Temple Mount* (ed. Levana Tsfania; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), passim; cf. *ibid.*, "Jerusalem as a Center of the Stone Vessel Industry during the Second Temple Period," in *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed* (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 244-56; Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 165-83.

⁵⁹ Magen, *Stone Vessel Industry*, 147. The production of stone vessels ceased completely after the failed Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 C.E.

⁶⁰ Mark 11:15-17; Matthew 21:12-13; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-16. Cf. E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61-76; Richard Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple," in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (ed. Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1988), 75-79; Ådna, *Jerusalem Tempel*, 96-118; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 235-36.

⁶¹ Levine, *Jerusalem*, 344-46; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 32-33. *Let. Aris.* 114 notes that all types of goods were imported from overseas and that a large quantity of spices, precious stones and gold were brought to Jerusalem by Arabs.

transactions would have been what would be expected in any commercial city center in the Roman world.

As with many other temples in the ancient world, the temple in Jerusalem had a treasury and officials who oversaw it.⁶² The reason for this is not difficult to discern. Since temples were seen as public institutions protected by the gods, they could also function as banks.⁶³ Dio Chrysostom's description of the temple of Artemis in Ephesus illustrates this point well.

You know about the Ephesians, of course, and that large sums of money are in their hands, some of it belonging to private citizens and deposited in the temple of Artemis, not alone money of the Ephesians but also of aliens and of persons from all parts of the world, and in some cases of commonwealths and kings, money which all deposit there in order that it may be safe, since no one has ever yet dared to violate that place, although countless wars have occurred in the past and the city has often been captured.⁶⁴

The temple in Jerusalem was similar. Annual contributions of the temple tax, votive offerings, and general donations to the temple were all stored in the treasury, with contributions coming from rich and poor alike. A golden chain given by Gaius Caligula to Agrippa I was donated to the temple, as was a golden lamp from Queen Helena.⁶⁵ Tiberius Julius Alexander, Philo's brother, also contributed nine elaborate temple gates, each inlaid with gold and silver.⁶⁶ Alongside these lavish donations were gifts from

⁶² Schürer, *HJP*, II.279-81; cf. Matthew 27:6; *Ant.* 15.408; 20.220; *J.W.* 6.390.

⁶³ Levine, "Second Temple Jerusalem," 236.

⁶⁴ Dio Chrysostom 31, 54-55 (Cohoon and Crosby, LCL).

⁶⁵ *Ant.* 19.294-95; *m. Yom.* 3:10.

⁶⁶ Levine, "Second Temple Jerusalem," 236-37.

those with fewer resources, exemplified by the Gospel account of the widow who contributed all of the little she had to the temple (Mark 12:41-44; Luke 21:1-4). In addition, the temple may have functioned as a type of bank for private citizens.⁶⁷ 2 Maccabees 3:6-14 relates that some widows and orphans, as well as one prominent citizen, deposited money in it, trusting in its sanctity and inviolability,⁶⁸ and Josephus also describes individuals depositing valuables in the temple during wartime (*J.W.* 6.282, cf. *Ant.* 14.110-13).⁶⁹ The temple's reputation as a premier financial institution resulted in occasional attempts to plunder its resources. 2 Maccabees 3-4 describes the unsuccessful efforts of Seleucus to confiscate the temple's money, and Josephus depicts the plundering of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes (*Ant.* 12.246-50) as well as by Crassus in 54 B.C.E (*Ant.* 14.105-109; *J.W.* 1.179) and Sabinus fifty years later (*Ant.* 17.264).⁷⁰

As the *raison d'être* for all of this financial activity, the temple exerted an enormous economic influence over Judean and Jewish life, and as caretaker of the temple

⁶⁷ Marty E. Stevens (*Temples, Tithes, and Taxes* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006], 136-44) dislikes the term "bank" because of the many modern connotations associated with the term, preferring instead the term "financial intermediary." Ancient temples did serve as institutions where people could deposit private money, but that money was not lent out to others, but remained on deposit until the depositor withdrew it or gave specific instructions for its use. Temples may have lent their own money (it is disputed whether or not this is true of the Jerusalem temple), but they did not lend private deposits.

⁶⁸ 4 Macc 3 relates the same story with a few variations. For a discussion of whether this money was private or was part of the gifts that certain kings gave to the temple, see Daniel R. Schwartz, *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2004), 105.

⁶⁹ Blenkinsopp ("Temple and Society," 48) has argued that the idea of the temple as a bank may already be inferred from Neh 13:4-13.

⁷⁰ Schürer, *HJP*, II.281.

and supervisor of the treasurers and administrators, the high priest oversaw the enormous amounts of money that daily and yearly flowed into its coffers.⁷¹ In this the priestly aristocracy played an important and sacred role, for the money devoted to God and designated for his worship was entrusted to the leader of the nation and his fellow priests.

2.1.4 Socio-Political significance

The temple was also at the center of Jewish socio-political identity. As Daniel Schwartz has pointed out, this is proven above all by instances in which Judaism was threatened or in which war broke out, for on these occasions many Jews took great risks to defend the sanctity of the temple.⁷² This understanding is portrayed in works of literary fiction and historical accounts alike. In the book of Judith, the attack of Holofernes and the “Assyrians” is principally seen as an attack against the temple, and surrender and/or defeat are not viable options (Jdt 4:2; 8:21-24; 9:8). In attempting to rally her people, Judith states that “if we are captured all Judea will be captured and our sanctuary will be plundered. . . . Now therefore, brethren, let us set an example to our brethren, for their lives depend upon us, and the sanctuary and the temple and the altar rest upon us” (Jdt 8:21, 24). Similarly, the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes resulted in the Maccabean insurgency, which in turn led to political independence (*Ant.* 12.248-71). In the midst of this fighting the Maccabees expressed

⁷¹ Levine, *Jerusalem*, 243.

⁷² Daniel R. Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices: Opposition and Spiritualization in the Late Second Temple Period" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1979), 49-50; cf. Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 170-72.

more concern for the temple than they did for their own welfare and the well-being of their families, for their “greatest and first fear was for the consecrated sanctuary” (2 Macc 15:18; cf. 1 Macc 14:29-31). An analogous situation occurred near the conclusion of Herod’s reign, when several young men pulled down the golden eagle that Herod had installed over the gate of the temple. Knowing that their actions would most likely incur Herod’s wrath, they were still willing to die for the “preservation and observation of the law of their fathers” (*Ant.* 17.149-63).

Josephus also reports several instances in which great commotion and calamity resulted from a Gentile’s attempt to enter the temple itself. Even though Pompey did not plunder the sanctuary after his victory in 63 B.C.E., “there was nothing that affected the nation so much in the calamities they were then under, as that their holy place, which had been hitherto seen by none, should be laid open to the strangers; for Pompey, and those that were about him, went into the temple itself” (*J.W.* 1.152; *Ant.* 14.72). The attempt by Gaius Caligula to erect a statue of himself in the temple in Jerusalem also illustrates this point. Petronius, the new governor of Syria, was entrusted with this task, but “many ten thousands” of the Jews met Petronius in the north of Palestine and protested the proposed action, declaring that they would rather lose their lives than see their laws transgressed.⁷³ In demonstration of their firm resolve they threw themselves on the ground and stretched out their necks, indicating their willingness to die rather than to submit to the placement of a statue of the emperor in the temple. Only the stalling

⁷³ *Ant.* 18.257-309; *J.W.* 2.184-203; cf. Philo, *Embassy*, passim.

techniques of the sympathetic Petronius and the sudden death of Caligula averted a catastrophic confrontation.

Lastly, the uprising against the Romans that began in 66 C.E. centered on Jerusalem and the temple, with the spark for the revolt being the cessation of offerings for the emperor. The direct causes of the revolt remain unclear. Josephus, our only source for this event, offers multiple explanations, with the various options alternately emphasized by modern scholars. Socio-economic issues, such as class tension and internal politicking, are sometimes stressed,⁷⁴ as are the deteriorating relations between Jews and Gentiles in Judea and Galilee, on both the social⁷⁵ and the ideological level.⁷⁶ In addition, the role of zealots, brigands, and eschatology in the events leading up to the war has also been analyzed,⁷⁷ along with a rising sense of nationalism⁷⁸ and the possibility of Roman misgovernment.⁷⁹ Although all of these theories have some truth in them insofar as they are all based upon Josephus' somewhat conflicted account of the

⁷⁴ Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), passim.

⁷⁵ Lee I. Levine, "The Jewish-Greek Conflict in First Century Caesarea," *JJS* 25 (1974): 381-97; Uriel Rappaport, "Jewish-Pagan Relations and the Revolt against Rome in 66-70 C.E.," in *Jerusalem Cathedra* (ed. Lee Levine; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1981) 1.81-95.

⁷⁶ Helmut Schwier, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg (66-74 n. Chr.)* (NTOA 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 55-201.

⁷⁷ David R. Rhoads, *Israel in Revolution* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976); Richard A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 48-259; Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989).

⁷⁸ Doron Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

⁷⁹ Smallwood, *Jews Under Roman Rule*, 155-80, 256-92.

causes of the Jewish war, the web of historical cause and effect is difficult to untangle. It is apparent, however, that all of the sparring factions that contributed to the uprising focused their attention on the temple. Resistance occurred in areas outside of Jerusalem, but the primary opposition to the Romans was located in Jerusalem and in the temple courts.⁸⁰

2.1.5 Summary Observations on the Role of the Temple in Second Temple Judaism

From what we have seen above, it is clear that Jewish religious, economic, and socio-political life revolved around the Jerusalem temple. No other institution rivaled its significance in the Second Temple period. Standing as it did at the ideological and social center of Judaism, the temple also came to be seen as a defining example of Jewish identity and belief.⁸¹ Indeed, the Jewish people *en masse* were portrayed as willing to

⁸⁰ Josephus and Sulpicius Severus disagree as to whether or not Titus planned to destroy the temple. In *J.W.* 6.239, several of his commanders urge him to do so, arguing that the Jews will never stop rebelling while the temple is still standing. Titus, however, is of a different mind, and he states that the temple should not be destroyed and that the Romans should take their revenge upon the Jewish people and not on inanimate objects. The account in Sulpicius Severus (*Chronica* 2.30.7), which some argue is reliant on Tacitus' lost account of the Jewish revolt, is quite different. In this account, it is Titus, along with several others, who insists that the temple be destroyed so as to destroy the religion of both the Jews and the Christians and root out the opposition to the Romans. According to Sulpicius Severus, the Romans knew that the temple had to be destroyed in order finally to bring an end to the Jewish revolts, which were so effective because of the people's total commitment to a single place. In support of the opinion of Sulpicius Severus, see Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1984), 282; Gideon Bohak, "Theopolis: A Single-Temple Policy and Its Singular Ramifications," *JJS* 50 (1999): 3-16, esp. 6-7; cf. Diodorus 34/5.1.1 (=GLAJJ 63). For general agreement with the account in Josephus, see Tessa Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian*, 206-11. Cf. Gerd Theissen (*Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* [NTOA 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989], 275) who notes that the Romans consciously destroyed the Jerusalem temple and ordered the destruction of the temple at Leontopolis, in order to decisively bring to an end Jewish revolutionary sentiment.

⁸¹ Here I am indebted to the thoughtful discussion in Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 167-82.

risk life and limb for the preservation of the sanctuary against any and all aggressors.⁸²

The temple's religious significance, however, was not restricted to its cultic functions. It was also indispensable in creating and sustaining Israelite and Jewish identity. Both Josephus and Philo had proclaimed: "One temple for the one God" (*Ag. Ap.* 2.193; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.67). Essential to this assertion is the belief that God's relationship with his people is most clearly defined in this place. As such, the temple came to be symbolic of God's election of a specific people, the giving of the law, and the establishment of the covenant, for the Jerusalem temple was the locus of God's presence on earth.⁸³ This understanding goes a long way toward explaining not only the attraction of pilgrimage and the contribution of the half-shekel to the temple even by many who had never physically seen the sanctuary,⁸⁴ but also the consistent willingness to give up one's life for the sake of this sacred space.⁸⁵ More than just an institution, the temple embodied the unique relationship between Israel and its God and became a tangible symbol of God's election and covenant with his people.

⁸² Ibid., 172. As Stevenson notes: "In times of national crisis, the temple and national identity were mutually inclusive."

⁸³ Ibid., 168.

⁸⁴ Turner, "Center Out There," 191-230.

⁸⁵ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (trans. William R. Trask; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1959), 27-56; Mircea Eliade, *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism* (trans. Philip Mairet; New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), 36-56.

2.2 Priests and Politics

Since the temple exerted such a powerful influence in the Judaism of the Second Temple period, the priests who oversaw it became the religious and political power-brokers of the nation. As with the monarchial period, in the time of the Second Temple the high priest both mediated the presence of God to the people and brought the intercessions of the people before God. He did this principally through his oversight of the sacrificial system, which provided atonement for sin and maintenance of the individual's relationship with the God of Israel. In this period, however, the political role of the high priest began to increase in the absence of other forms of Jewish leadership.⁸⁶ The later books of the Hebrew Bible describe claimants to the Davidic throne and several prophetic figures,⁸⁷ but, as will be discussed below, individuals filling these roles slowly disappeared from view.

An early attempt to revitalize the Davidic line and monarchy centered on the figure of Zerubbabel, a Davidic descendant of King Jehoiachin who was appointed governor of the province of Yehud by the Persian authorities.⁸⁸ Although Haggai depicts

⁸⁶ The decline of royal and prophetic influence in the post-exilic period may have been due in part to efforts by the Zadokite priesthood to consolidate power; see Paul D. Hanson, "Israelite Religion in the Early Postexilic Period," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. Patrick D. Miller, Jr. et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 499-501.

⁸⁷ See Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987), 194-201, 351-54.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 9-13; Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus*, 1.74-79.

him as a “signet ring,” signifying his royal authority,⁸⁹ Zerubbabel was more commonly portrayed as part of a diarchy in which he shared political influence with Joshua the high priest (Ezra 3-4; Neh 12; Hag 1-2; Zech 4-6). These Davidic aspirations, however, seem to have died with Zerubbabel. Meyers and Meyers have tentatively suggested that the Davidic line may have remained tied to the political office of governor for a few succeeding generations through the marriage of Shelomith, daughter of Zerubbabel, to Elnathan, the new governor, though this speculation depends on the identification of Shelomith, daughter of Zerubbabel, with a seal bearing the name of Shelomith.⁹⁰ Even if the identification is correct, however, the Davidic hope of some segments of Judean society, which is represented, for example, by Haggai, seems to have ended with the death of Zerubbabel. At his demise, the grandiose claims attached to Zerubbabel were not applied to any succeeding governors, as the Persians likely realized that it would be politically expedient to appoint non-Davidide governors who would not incite hopes of a restored monarchy.⁹¹

In a similar manner, there was a decline in prophecy and the prophetic office in the Second Temple period. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi are all post-exilic prophets,

⁸⁹ Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 69-70. As Meyers and Meyers note, the imagery of Zerubbabel as a signet ring dramatically reverses the situation in Jeremiah 22:24-30, where the Lord ironically states that even if Coniah (=Jehoiachin) were God’s signet ring, he would rip the kingdom from Coniah and send the Israelites into exile for the disobedience of the king. In contrast, Zerubbabel will be the Lord’s true signet ring on the day that he brings judgment against the nations.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 12-14; Eric M. Meyers, "The Persian Period and the Judean Restoration," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. Patrick D. Miller, Jr. et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 509-13.

⁹¹ Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 34.

but at the stilling of their voices the authoritative word of the “prophet” largely disappeared from view.⁹² As John Barton notes, there appears to have been a growing belief in the latter Second Temple period (200 B.C.E. onward) that

‘prophecy’ belongs to the past . . . the belief that prophetic inspiration is a characteristic feature of an age that has now passed away is in practice compatible with a recognition of the inspiration of some of one’s contemporaries. The crucial feature is not an absolute dogma that prophecy has decisively ceased, but simply a sense that the prophets of old form a distinctive group which differs in significant ways from contemporary persons who may resemble them, with the result that these earlier figures can be described collectively as ‘the prophets’, ‘the former prophets’, ‘God’s servants the prophets’ and so forth.⁹³

In place of the prophet, a number of apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts from the latter Second Temple period reveal an interest in angels and human figures from the distant past who act as intermediaries between God and humanity.⁹⁴

This did not mean that prophets and prophecy were relics of the past and would never reemerge.⁹⁵ Indeed, several Second Temple period texts couple acknowledgement of the decline of true prophecy with a hope for its return in a future period (1 Macc 4:46; 9:27; 14:41; 2 Bar. 85:1-3), and the first century C.E. witnessed a renewed interest in prophecy. Two cases illustrate this point. In his narrative about the years leading up to

⁹² Benjamin D. Sommers, "Did Prophecy Cease: Evaluating a Reevaluation," *JBL* 115 (1996): 31-47. For a skeptical appraisal of prophecy in the exilic period, see Armin Lange, "Reading the Decline of Prophecy," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 181-84.

⁹³ John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 5-6.

⁹⁴ E.g., Tobit, *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Testament of Levi*, *4 Ezra*. Similarly, the voice of God was often heard through the agency of the Holy Spirit in early Christianity and sometimes through the *קול ה' ב'ה* in rabbinic Judaism; see Sommers, "Did Prophecy Cease: Evaluating a Reevaluation," 39-41.

⁹⁵ Barton, *Oracles of God*, 115-16.

and including the Jewish revolt against Rome in 66 C.E., Josephus describes several figures as prophets (*Ant.* 20.97-99, 167-72, 188; *J.W.* 6.283-87; 7.437-50).⁹⁶ Similarly, the New Testament reveals that prophets and prophetic activities were still present and indeed were major components in the early Christian movement (Matt 11:9; 14:5; 21:11, 26, 46; Mark 6:15; 11:32; Luke 1:76; 7:16, 26; 20:6; 24:19; John 1:21-25; 4:19; 6:14; 7:40; cf. Acts 21:10; 1 Cor 14:37).⁹⁷ This renewed interest in prophets in the first century C.E. reveals the relative dearth of prophetic figures prior to this point. The absence of recognizable prophets during the majority of the Second Temple period suggests that the role of the prophet had largely declined and that communication from God was now largely understood to be mediated through alternative forms.

The high priest and priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem stepped in to fill the void left by the absence of king and prophet, a situation which led to Josephus's assertion that the high priest was the *de facto* ruler of the country. In a famous passage in his treatise *Against Apion*, Josephus proclaims Judea a "theocracy" (*Ag. Ap.* 2.164-65, cf. *Ant.* 11.111). As he later clarifies, however, what he means by "theocracy" is, in reality, a hierocracy. Ostensibly ordained by Moses himself, the high priest was the ruler of the country, and it was he who instructed the priests, who in turn led the greater population. Specifically, Josephus relates that the priests were responsible for general supervision, judgment of cases, and the punishment of condemned persons (*Ag. Ap.* 2.185-87).

⁹⁶ Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 112-63.

⁹⁷ David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 153-290.

The truthfulness of this assertion has been debated for several reasons. First, it is unclear which time period Josephus has in mind. Is he referring to the status of the Jerusalem priesthood as it existed while he lived in Palestine, or is he referring to a different era? Second, and closely related to the first, does Josephus have in mind historical reality at all, or is he presenting an idealized picture of priestly leadership? His general attitude towards the priesthood is indeed positive—a bent doubtless influenced by the fact that he himself was a priest.⁹⁸ But even if Josephus is here describing his personal opinion, it does seem to have a strong element of historical veracity. As I shall detail below, during the Persian, Hellenistic, and Hasmonean periods, a hierocratic governmental structure appears to have prevailed, though the situation in the Roman era is less clear.

2.2.1 Persian and Hellenistic Eras

Our knowledge of fifth- and fourth-century B.C.E. Palestine is admittedly quite deficient, as very little textual evidence has survived. Nevertheless, periodic snapshots of life in Palestine hint at the influence of the high priest. The most important evidence comes from *On the Jews*, a work ascribed by Josephus to Hecataeus of Abdera, circa 300 B.C.E.⁹⁹ In discussing the political arrangement in Judea, he states:

⁹⁸ Sanders, *Judaism*, 187. It is interesting that the first thing Josephus says about himself in Life 1-2 is that he is of priestly descent. Only after this introduction does he add that he is of Hasmonean stock. If this order is any indication, he seems to take special pride in his priestly heritage, reducing his Hasmonean lineage to a secondary status; cf. Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 545; Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 50-51.

⁹⁹ The authenticity of Hecataeus' account has been questioned. Josephus credits Hecataeus with two works which involve Jews and Jewish history. The first one, *On Abraham*, is commonly acknowledged to be the

The colony was headed by a man called Moses, outstanding both for his wisdom and for his courage. On taking possession of the land he founded, besides other cities, one that is now the most renowned of all, called Jerusalem. In addition he established the temple that they hold in chief veneration, instituted their forms of worship and ritual, drew up their laws, and ordered their political institutions. . . . He picked out the men of most refinement and with the greatest ability to head the entire nation, and appointed them priests; and he ordained that they should occupy themselves with the temple and the honours and sacrifices offered to their god. These same men he appointed to be judges in all major disputes, and entrusted to them the guardianship of the laws and customs. For this reason the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call this man the high priest, and believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. It is he, we are told, who in their assemblies and other gatherings announces what is ordained, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightaway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the high priest when he expounds the commandments to them.¹⁰⁰

As many scholars have noted, there are striking similarities between this account and that of Josephus himself.¹⁰¹ Both contend that the priests rule the country, with Hecataeus refining this assertion by relating (unhistorically) that the Jews have never had a king. Moreover, both appeal to Moses as the founder of the current hierocratic system. From the perspective of the non-Jewish author, this form of government in which the high

work of someone other than Hecataeus, but the authenticity of *On the Jews* is the subject of debate. On the one hand, the attribution of this work to Hecataeus was seen as suspicious as early as the second century C.E. In *Contra Celsum*, Origen notes that Herennius Philo had reservations about ascribing it to Hecataeus due to its staunchly pro-Jewish sentiment. More recently, some have also noted alleged anachronisms or details that look suspicious coming from a non-Jew (e.g., C. R. Holladay, "Pseudo-Hecataeus," in *Fragments of Hellenistic Jewish Authors Volume 1: Historians* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 277-97). On the other hand, others (e.g. Schürer, *HJP*, III.1, 671-75; Hayward, *Jewish Temple*, 18-20) have protested that the supposed examples of anachronistic statements are impossible to prove given that there is much that is not known about this period in Jewish history, and that it was not all that unusual for Gentile writers to be enamored with Judaism and to write positively about it.

¹⁰⁰ Diodorus of Sicily, *Bib. Hist.* 40, 3.3-6 (Walton, LCL).

¹⁰¹ In fact, the close similarities have caused several scholars to question whether Josephus is reliant on Hecataeus for his similar statements. For a discussion of the issue and an argument for the independence of the accounts, see David Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 34-36.

priest is the respected and ultimate authority is so well established that he can even claim that the Jews have never had another system.¹⁰²

While Hecataeus is the best confirmation for priestly authority in the Hellenistic period, his is not the only evidence. A second indication of priestly leadership comes from the Elephantine community. In 407 B.C.E., the Jews in Egypt sent a letter to Bigvai, the governor of Yehud, and to Johanon the high priest and his priestly colleagues.¹⁰³ In this letter “Yedoniah and his colleagues, the priests who are in Yeb the fortress” ask for aid in rebuilding the Jewish temple that had been destroyed by the local Egyptian inhabitants. There is no indication that the high priest Johanon ever replied to the letter. Nonetheless, the very existence of this missive suggests that the high priest held a significant and acknowledged position in Yehud, and that petitions were directed to this figure by at least one group of Jews living outside the borders of Israel.

A third hint occurs in the account of the meeting between Alexander the Great and the high priest Jaddua.¹⁰⁴ According to Josephus, Alexander was angrily marching toward Jerusalem, intent on punishing the city for its refusal to provide his army with provisions and tribute. Instead, overcome at the sight of the high priest adorned in his

¹⁰² Stern (*GLAJJ*, I.31) observes that the view of Hecataeus was the norm among Greek writers, as Israel’s kings were rarely mentioned in Hellenistic literature and a hierocracy was the assumed form of Jewish government.

¹⁰³ TAD A4.7=AP 30. Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University 1986-1999) I.68. For further discussion see VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 55-59; Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 7-9. This letter mentions that Yedoniah and his colleagues sent a similar letter to Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. The significance of this will be discussed below in Chapter Four.

¹⁰⁴ See VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 65-85; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.317-39.

resplendent high priestly vestments, Alexander prostrated himself at his feet. At Jaddua's direction, Alexander then offered sacrifices in the temple and agreed that they might observe their own laws and be exempt from tribute. Moreover, he promised to grant similar concessions to the Jews of Babylon and Persia.

The historicity of this encounter between Jaddua and Alexander has been sharply disputed.¹⁰⁵ While admitting that Josephus' account of the meeting between the two leaders bears "the marks of a good story that got better as it was told and retold," VanderKam argues, against the majority of scholars, that certain credible details about the high priest Jaddua can be gleaned from this story.¹⁰⁶ In his view, the following list of items is consonant with what is known from other sources: 1) the position of high priest continued to be passed down in hereditary fashion, 2) aristocratic families in Jerusalem and Samaria intermarried, 3) Alexander requested military and economic assistance from the high priest, indicating that this office held such powers, 4) the high priest was understood as being the figure to whom God spoke, and 5) he was taken to speak for Jews in all countries, not just for those living in Judea. If VanderKam is correct, then this

¹⁰⁵ Those who see the story as fiction include Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1959), 45; Martin Hengel, *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 6-7; Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 10; Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 189-202. Others are more willing to grant that it contains a kernel of historical veracity; see VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 67-85; David Golan, "Josephus, Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem, and Modern Historiography," in *Josephus Flavius: Historian of Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (ed. U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben Zvi, 1982), 29-55. Golan argues that Alexander's actions in the narrative are consonant with what is known of his policies early in his career.

¹⁰⁶ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 75-84.

confirms and extends our picture of the high priest, as he is once again presented as being at the head of the people and taking the lead in important political events.

A last piece of evidence from the Hellenistic era comes from Ben Sira, who praises Simon the high priest¹⁰⁷ and elevates the priesthood at the expense of the monarchy in his retelling of Israelite history.¹⁰⁸ After lauding many of the faithful Israelite ancestors, he ends his panegyric with a lengthy praise of Simon the High Priest.¹⁰⁹

The leader of his brothers and the pride of his people
was the high priest, Simon son of Onias,
who in his life repaired the house, and in his time fortified the temple.
He laid the foundations for the high double walls,
the high retaining walls for the temple enclosure.
In his days a water cistern was dug, a reservoir like the sea in circumference.
He considered how to save his people from ruin,
and fortified the city against siege (50:1-4).

This encomium goes on to describe Simon's cultic functions, narrating the way in which he would ascend to the holy altar, receive the portions from the priests, pour libations at the foot of the altar, and turn and bless the whole congregation of Israel – all actions

¹⁰⁷ The identification of this Simon is a matter of some dispute. Josephus explicitly refers to Simon the Just as Simon I (circa 300 B.C.E), but almost all modern scholars have argued that Simon the Just should be equated with Simon II (circa 200 B.C.E.). For a survey of the debate and an argument for identifying Simon the Just with Simon I, see James C. VanderKam, "Simon the Just: Simon I or Simon II?," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. David P. Wright et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 303-18.

¹⁰⁸ Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 35-38. Praise is lavished upon Aaron, Phineas, and Simon, all exemplars of righteous priests. This praise seems to come at the expense of the Judean and Israelite monarchs, who are largely disparaged. David, Hezekiah, and Josiah all receive accolades, but the reminder that all the rest of the kings were sinful (49:4-5) serves to devalue the covenant that had been given to David (mentioned, but not elaborated upon, in 47:2-11). Solomon receives a lukewarm appraisal. In his day the temple was built, but his kingly prowess was diminished by his many marriages to foreign women.

¹⁰⁹ Hayward (*Jewish Temple*, 38-84) discusses Ben Sira's praise of Simon in its Hebrew and Greek recensions. Both versions indicate that the high priest was highly respected in his day.

expected of a high priest. But he is also praised for non-cultic actions. During his tenure as high priest, the temple was repaired, the foundations of the walls laid, and a cistern dug. Credit is also given to Simon for fortifying the city and saving the people from ruin.¹¹⁰ What is important to see is that these are all actions for which Ben Sira has praised earlier kings and governors,¹¹¹ and this overlap reveals the extent to which the high priest has become the ruler of the country in the interim.¹¹²

In the above-mentioned examples we are given glimpses of the esteem in which the high priest was held and of the political authority he wielded. In each case he is portrayed as the leader of the people and the highest internal political figure. This political clout and emerging influence of the high priest are also reflected in Ben Sira's reverent depiction of Simon's appearance:¹¹³

How glorious he was, surrounded by the people,
As he came out of the house of the curtain.
Like the morning star among the clouds, like the full moon at the festal season
Like the sun shining on the temple of the Most High...
When he put on his glorious robe and clothed himself in perfect splendor,
When he went up to the holy altar,

¹¹⁰ Goodblatt (*Monarchic Principle*, 19) points out that the verbs are all in passive voice in the Hebrew text of 50:1-3. Thus the construction is not explicitly linked to Simon, but was undertaken during his tenure as high priest. But in verse four, fortification of the city and protection of the people is explicitly attributed to Simon.

¹¹¹ Thomas R. Lee, *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44-50* (SBLDS 75; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 18-19.

¹¹² Georg Sauer, *Jesus Sirach / Ben Sira* (ATD Apokryphen 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 338. Sauer cites the examples of Moses-Aaron and David-Solomon, in which political and priestly leadership coincided. He contrasts these pairs with the figure of Simon, in whom political and religious authority coalesced. To the examples that Sauer provides, Zerubbabel-Joshua could also be added (Sir 49:11-12).

¹¹³ Hayward, *Jewish Temple*, 38-84.

He made the court of the sanctuary glorious. . . .¹¹⁴

While Ben Sira reserves his praise for Simon, other texts bestow equal veneration on other high priests. The author of the second century B.C.E. *Letter of Aristeas*, for example, describes the magnificence of the robe of the high priest Eleazar, which was inlaid breastplate of twelve stones, and of his diadem, remarking that the glory of these vestments was commensurate with the grandeur of the high priest, for the “wearer is considered worthy of such vestments at the services” (96-98).

A similar description of the robe, breastplate of stones, and diadem of the high priest is found in a first-century C.E. work, the *Wisdom of Solomon* (18:24). As in Ben Sira, the high priest and his vestments are described in metaphorical language taken from the realm of nature, language that emphasizes his cosmic significance and supernatural aura. Philo, a near contemporary of the author of *Wisdom*, also lavishes praise upon the high priest. For him, though, instead of sacrificing and praying for his people alone,

the high priest of the Jews offers both prayers and thanksgiving not only for the whole race of men, but also for the parts of nature, earth, water, air, and fire, considering that the universe (which is in fact the truth) is his native land, on whose behalf he is accustomed to propitiate the ruler with supplications and entreaties, beseeching him to make what he has created a partaker of his own fair and merciful nature.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Sir 50:5-7, 11; cf. 7:29-31; 45:6-25 for other passages in which Ben Sira is outspoken in his support for the priests and their cultic activities.

¹¹⁵ Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.97; cf. Hayward (*Jewish Temple*, 109-41) for a discussion of Philo’s views on the high priest, temple service, and sacrifices.

No longer the head of the Jewish nation alone, the high priest has now become a mediator for the entire world.¹¹⁶ Even though Philo gives a slightly different nuance to the theme, the thread that connects all of these texts is the adulation bestowed on the current high priest. In the Hellenistic period and later centuries, the glorious language used to describe the high priest attests to the importance of his role in the eyes of the populace.

2.2.2 Hasmonean Era

The idyllic situation described in Ben Sira, however, was about to come to an end. At the death of Simon the high priesthood passed to Onias, and 2 Macc 3:1 portrays his tenure as a time when “the whole city was inhabited in unbroken peace and the laws were strictly observed.” By means of bribery, however, Onias’s brother Jason attained the position of high priest, and Onias was forced to flee.¹¹⁷ This was a remarkable turn of events, as it was the first appointment of a Jewish high priest while his predecessor still lived.¹¹⁸ Jason embarked upon a series of Hellenistic “reforms,” and, according to the author of 2 Maccabees, utterly corrupted the priests serving in the temple (4:11-17). Within a few years, Menelaus in turn deposed Jason through treachery and the payment of bribes. Above and beyond his continuation of these Hellenistic “reforms,” Menelaus is condemned for his involvement in murder, robbery of the temple, and violations of

¹¹⁶ Cf. Jaffee (*Early Judaism*, 174-80) for an account of the cosmic significance of the temple and high priest in the Second Temple period.

¹¹⁷ Contradictory reports are given of Onias’ subsequent fate. This issue will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.

¹¹⁸ Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 117.

cultic purity.¹¹⁹ Moreover, 2 Maccabees chastises Menelaus for accompanying Antiochus Epiphanes into the temple when the latter pillaged the sacred precinct (5:15-16). Menelaus' successor, Alcimus, is similarly evaluated by the author of 1 Maccabees, who remarks that his evils were "more than the Gentiles had done" (7:23), and in 159 B.C.E. he was struck down and died "in great agony." According to Josephus and the author of 1 Maccabees, his painful demise was punishment for his attempt to tear down the wall of the inner court of the sanctuary (1 Macc 9:54-56; *Ant.* 12.413).¹²⁰

Even though they vehemently opposed the activities of the Hellenizing high priests, 1 and 2 Maccabees' fixation with these figures clearly reveals that the high priest was still the most important official in Judea.¹²¹ Foreign officials may have held oversight over the country, but among Jewish officials the high priest was without rival in the political realm. In the years between the ousting of Onias III (175 B.C.E.) and the assumption of the role of high priest by the first Hasmonean, Jonathan (152 B.C.E.), the office was clearly in a state of flux, with no record of a high priest officiating in the

¹¹⁹ 2 Macc 4:32-5:16; Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 85.

¹²⁰ Attempts at precise identification of this wall have yielded little consensus. A majority of scholars prefer to see the wall as one which separated the "holy" areas of the temple courts from the outer courts of the Gentiles. For bibliography, see Schürer, *HJP*, I.175 n. 6; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 230 n. 318. Jonathan A. Goldstein (*I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976], 391-93), however, argues that the *τείχος* of 1 Macc 9.54 refers to the inner wall surrounding the temple building itself, and thus the division between the court of the priests and the court of the Israelites. More recently (Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* [JSOTSup 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 245) understands the demolition of this *τείχος* in terms of the separation between priests and laity. Whichever wall is intended, an attempt to remove the barrier between different courts seems to have been perceived as a threat to the sacrality of some aspect of the temple. Moreover, the author of I Maccabees and Josephus agree that in tearing down this wall, Alcimus was undoing the work of the prophets.

¹²¹ Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 22.

temple at all during the final seven years of this period.¹²² When, however, the Hasmoneans succeeded in their attempts at driving the Seleucids out of Jerusalem and quieting some of the internal dissension that had developed, one of the first things Jonathan did was to assume the title of high priest, which was conferred upon him by Alexander Balas (1 Macc 10:20; *Ant.* 13.45).

The various ways in which Jonathan and his successors used this title suggests that the position still carried a great deal of authority.¹²³ For example, in official correspondence, the Hasmoneans availed themselves of the title “high priest” (1 Macc 12:2, 5; 13:36; 14:20, 23; 15:2, 15, 21), and events were commonly dated to the reign of the high priest (1 Macc 13:41; 14:27). In 104/3 B.C.E., Aristobulus added the title “king” to that of high priest, a move also followed by Alexander Jannaeus. The appropriation of this title, however, was largely a formality, since John Hyrcanus had been a *de facto* king for the better part of twenty years. Even after assuming the title “king,” however, the Hasmoneans still held strongly to the high priestly mantle. Goodman has argued that their retention of the title “high priest” led to a devaluation of the office during this period.¹²⁴ If anything, however, the office seems to have maintained its former esteem

¹²² Whereas 1 Maccabees simply glosses over this period (9:56; 10:18-21), Josephus explicitly states that there was a seven year period in which there was no high priest (*Ant.* 20.237). This seems unlikely, as the high priest alone was responsible for such activities as officiating over the ceremony and sacrifices on the Day of Atonement and entering the Holy of Holies on this sacred day. As Hartmut Stegemann (*Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* [Bonn: 1971], 214) notes: “Soll man sich wirklich vorstellen, in den Jahren zwischen dem Tod des Alkimos und dem Amtsantritt Jonathans sei das Versöhnungsfest nicht begangen worden, der gerade durch die Makkabäer wieder ermöglichte Kult nach traditionellem Ritus in seinem wesentlichsten Bestandteil zum Erliegen gekommen?” For a discussion of various views of the intersacerdotium, see VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 244-250.

¹²³ Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 22.

¹²⁴ Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 31.

and influence. This is seen not only in the Roman appointment of figures such as Hyrcanus II to the high priesthood in the latter days of Hasmonean rule, but also in Herod's uneasiness over the Hasmoneans' continued hold on this office.¹²⁵ Coins from this period also help establish that the high priesthood was still the principal office that conveyed authority, since the Hasmoneans Alexander Jannaeus and Antigonus, the last Hasmonean ruler, minted a sizable number of coins bearing the appellation of both "king" and "high priest," while Aristobolus II and Hyrcanus II minted coins only bearing the title "high priest."¹²⁶

One sees a final indication of the continuing prestige of the office of the high priest at the conclusion of Hasmonean rule. Civil war had broken out in Judea between two rival claimants of the Hasmonean priest/king position, Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, and each side sent emissaries to Pompey in Syria requesting arbitration. But a third embassy was also sent, this one from "the nation." According to Josephus, the spokesman for this third delegation argued that the nation "asked not to be ruled by a king, saying that it was the custom of their country to obey the priests of God" (*Ant.* 14.41). While this position presumably reflects Josephus' own penchant for hierocratic rule, the embassy's request likely also reflects some disdain for the Hasmonean rulers and a nostalgic desire for the former ways of governance (cf. Diodorus xl 2).

¹²⁵ *Ant.* 14.487-91; *J.W.* 1.433-37; cf. Schürer, *HJP*, 1.296-98; Sanders, *Judaism*, 32.

¹²⁶ Meshorer, *Jewish Coinage*, 1.77-90, 118-59. Sanders (*Judaism*, 319) notes that the coins struck by the Hasmonean rulers often had a similar inscription... "X the high priest and the *heber* of the Jews." The meaning of the term *heber* is disputed, although it most likely refers to a gerousia. In his depiction of the rivalry between Hyrcanus II and Aristobolus II, Cassius Dio notes that the Jews call their kingship a priesthood (*Hist. Rom.*, 37, 15.2).

In some ways the Hasmonean era changed the institution of high priestly rule. Although the Hasmoneans were priests, they replaced the established line of Zadok as the family from which most in this period believed the high priest was to come, and their combination of priestly and kingly roles led to a redefinition of the political contours of the country.¹²⁷ Nonetheless, there was a striking degree of continuity in the role and responsibility of the high priest between the Hasmonean era and what had preceded it. As David Goodblatt notes: “When the Hasmoneans replaced the descendants of Sadoq, the Judean constitution did not change. Only the incumbents of the highest office did.”¹²⁸

2.2.3 Excursus on the Gerousia and Sanhedrin

Before moving on to the Roman period, the issue of a Judean national council that appears to have played a role in Judean and Jewish politics needs to be addressed. In the late Hellenistic and early Hasmonean periods, a *gerousia*, or council of elders which functioned alongside the high priest and seems to have had some political clout, appears in the sources for the first time. Much has been written about the origins, evolution, and authority of this group.¹²⁹ The first mention of it is found in a letter preserved by

¹²⁷ Mendels (*Rise and Fall*, 151) argues that the temple and Jerusalem were religio-political symbols in the Hasmonean era, and that the only real criticism of the Hasmonean high priests was over the question of separation between secular and religious authority. For Mendels, in the Roman era the temple and priesthood became strictly religious symbols devoid of political significance. This assertion, however, does not adequately take into account the continued political significance of the high priesthood in the period between Herod’s death and the revolt in 66 C.E. Though the political landscape was different during the Roman period, the office of the high priest still retained an important political role.

¹²⁸ Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 22.

¹²⁹ Schürer, *HJP*, II.199-226; Hugo Mantel, *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 54-101; Shmuel Safrai, "Jewish Self-Government," in *The Jewish People*

Josephus and purportedly penned by Antiochus the Great (223-187 B.C.E). In his correspondence with Ptolemy, Antiochus refers to a body of elders who aided the Seleucids in removing a garrison of Egyptians from the citadel in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 12.138). As a reward for this assistance, Antiochus grants several concessions, including tax exemptions, for “the gerousia, the priests, the scribes of the temple. . . . (*Ant.* 12.142).” In addition, this institution is explicitly mentioned in official communications in several sources which record the events of the first half of the second century B.C.E. (1 Macc 12:6; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:44; 11:27; *Ant.* 13.166). In each instance, the gerousia appears prominently alongside the high priest as an official and important Jewish governing body, especially in regard to foreign affairs. Though the sources are silent on the actual functioning of this assembly, it is clear that it represented the populace at large, had some authority on the Jewish political landscape, and operated only within the purview and influence of the high priest.

Josephus and the New Testament also provide evidence for the existence of a governing body in the Roman period, which they call the Sanhedrin, and in this case more details are given regarding the group’s political functions and authority.¹³⁰ The Sanhedrin appears to have acted largely as a tribunal, with its first recorded action being the trial of Herod when, as governor of Galilee, he was accused of murder (*Ant.* 14.168-84). Similarly, this group is also said to have presided over the trials of Jesus (Mark

in the First Century (ed. Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), I.380-400; James S. McLaren, *Power and Politics in Palestine* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 188-225; Sanders, *Judaism*, 472-88; Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*, 77-130.

¹³⁰ For bibliography, see previous footnote.

14:53 and parallels), the apostles (Acts 5:21), Stephen (Acts 6:21) and Paul (Acts 22:30; 23:20), and Josephus records the death of James at the hands of a Sanhedrin (*Ant.* 20.200). The authority of this body, however, was not restricted to the adjudication of cases. Josephus relates that, as commander of the Jewish forces in Galilee at the outset of the Revolt, he sought advice from and followed the directions of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem (*Life*, 62). Though we are not given all the details, the Sanhedrin, like the gerousia, appears to have had some degree of authority, as it was allowed to try cases and give direction in time of national emergency. Moreover, as with the gerousia, the high priest is usually portrayed as being at the head of the Sanhedrin and heavily involved in its leadership and decision-making.

Precise details regarding the constitution and continuity of these institutions remains unclear, as does the number of different Sanhedrins that may have existed in the latter Second Temple period.¹³¹ The hypothesis that the “gerousia” and “Sanhedrin” are different names for the same institution seems reasonable, but not certain. Regardless, what is of interest here is whether or not this institution presented an alternative internal Jewish power structure that rivaled that of the high priest. The seemingly close relationship between the high priest and this assembly suggests that these were complementary sources of authority. The high priest lent his weight and stature to this

¹³¹ Due to discrepancies in the presentation of the Sanhedrin in Josephus and the New Testament on the one hand, and the rabbinic literature on the other, it has sometimes been argued that more than one assembly was in operation and that each had different functions. Josephus and the New Testament, however, understand the Sanhedrin as a tribunal and political body, whereas the rabbinic traditions identify it as the supreme authority in halakhic matters. For a review of the different possibilities, see Mantel, *Studies*, 54-101.

assembly and sat at its head, while he, in concert with the council, represented the interests of the people to the surrounding Greek and Roman cultures and rulers.

2.2.4 Roman Era

In the periods surveyed above, Josephus's statements regarding Jewish hierocratic rule seems largely correct. Though foreign rulers may have held ultimate authority during much of this time, the highest internal position in the country was that of the high priest in Jerusalem.¹³² This venerable practice of "priestly monarchy,"¹³³ however, changed with the ascension of Herod the Great, who ushered in one of the most disruptive periods in the Second Temple era for the high priesthood.¹³⁴ Personally ineligible for the office of high priest due to his Idumean background, Herod was wary of the potential power of a strong high priest, particularly one of Hasmonean lineage. Consequently, Herod's first appointment was Ananel, an obscure Babylonian priest with proper lineage but lacking a political following or agenda (*Ant.* 15.22, 39-41). In the ensuing years, Herod maintained a revolving door policy vis-à-vis the high priesthood, deposing and installing seven high priests in his thirty-three year reign and deliberately

¹³² The only exception to this rule is the reign of Salome Alexander (76-67 B.C.E.), who appointed one of her sons as high priest.

¹³³ Goodblatt (*Monarchic Principle*, 6-56) has argued that this term summarily describes the ethos of the Second Temple period in both practice and ideology. Apart from the relatively brief period of Herodian rule mentioned below, the remainder of the Second Temple period could appropriately be described as one in which the high priest was *the* authoritative figure in Jewish national life. The caveat is that the high priest was the highest ranking figure *internal* to Judean politics. As mentioned above, for much of this period a foreign ruler also held power and influenced, to varying degrees, Judean political life.

¹³⁴ Isaiah Gafni, "The Historical Background," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 19.

choosing for the job weak men who lacked any political connections in Judea and who had no qualification other than their lineage.¹³⁵ As Goodman observes, none of these priests and priestly families endeared themselves to the local population during the years in which they presided over the temple.¹³⁶ Yet it was these priestly families that the Romans left in control after the deposition of Archelaus in 6 C.E.

Following the dismissal of Archelaus, Roman prefects assumed the authority to appoint the high priests during the first period of direct Roman rule in Judea (6-41 C.E.). The power of appointment reverted back to Jewish control during the reign of Agrippa I, and after a successful petition following his death, remained in Jewish hands until the revolt against the Romans in 66 C.E. The responsibility was first granted to Herod of Chalcis (44-48 C.E.), and thereafter was under the jurisdiction of Agrippa II.¹³⁷

From the time of Herod until the revolt in 66, several priestly families dominated the scene in Jerusalem. Herod had already chosen high priests from two of these families, Jesus son of Phiabi and Simon son of Boethus, and in the ensuing years high priests were also chosen from the families of Ananus and Qimhit. The emergence of these families created a readily available pool of potential high priests, as well as a good number of former high priests who had seen their tenure in office cut short. This large number of potential and former high priests may explain the use of the term “chief priests” in Josephus and the New Testament, a designation especially prominent in the

¹³⁵ Abraham Schalit, *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk* (SJ 4; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969), 312.

¹³⁶ Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 41-44.

¹³⁷ Sanders, *Judaism*, 321; Schürer, *HJP*, II.229-32.

trial scenes in the gospels and Acts and in narratives related to governance and political oversight in Josephus.¹³⁸ Whereas modern English usage draws a distinction between the terms “high priest” and “chief priest(s),” no such distinction exists in Greek, where the serving high priest is called ἀρχιερεύς, while the collective body of chief priests is called ἀρχιερείς. Josephus, however, also retains the title ἀρχιερεύς for former high priests who now belong to the larger body known as ἀρχιερείς.¹³⁹ The rise to prominence of these chief priests dates to the death of Herod, and they are often leading figures in the internal politics of Jerusalem. They are usually, though not always, mentioned in conjunction with the high priest, who still held the highest religious and political office in Judaism, but after the reign of Herod became “first among equals.”¹⁴⁰

The high priests during the Roman era served as mediators between the Romans and the Jewish populace; they represented the interests of the Roman ruler to the people and vice versa.¹⁴¹ The ability to navigate between these two extremes, coupled with a firm resolve to keep the peace, was an obligatory character trait of anyone assuming the position of high priest. Caiphas, who held the office for eighteen years, seems to have been the most adept at fulfilling this mediatory role. Similar success stories were scarce. In *Antiquities* 20, Josephus relates a series of episodes in which the high priest was involved in instances of strife between himself and other priests or prominent citizens of

¹³⁸ See Mark 14-15; Matthew 21, 26-27; Luke 22-23; John 19; Acts 4-5; *Ant.* 20.6, 181, 207; *J.W.* 2.243, 301, 318-336; 4.315; 6.114.

¹³⁹ Schürer, *HJP*, II.232-36; Sanders, *Judaism*, 327-29.

¹⁴⁰ Sanders, *Judaism*, 327; cf. McLaren, *Power and Politics*, 188-225.

¹⁴¹ Sanders, *Judaism*, 319-27.

Jerusalem.¹⁴² In one instance, Ishmael son of Phabi and other chief priests sent their servants into the threshing floors in order to take away the tithes due to the regular priests, and Josephus laments that some of the poorer priests died on account of this disgraceful action.¹⁴³

Most scholars agree that the office of the high priest underwent change during the Roman period, but the degree of the change has been the subject of some debate. Sanders has cautioned that leadership in Palestine was not fixed and thus one must be cautious in attributing too much power to the high priest.¹⁴⁴ In his appraisal of the situation, high priestly leadership was the norm, but the extent of the high priests' influence varied. Despite the corruption of some priests during this time, he asserts that the prestige of the office remained fairly constant, with high priestly influence and authority actually improving after the tenure of Herod. The few immoral or incompetent priests did not undermine the honor of the office, and the populace was a fairly discerning lot; Ananias was killed whereas Ananus was followed.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, the fact that the Romans concerned themselves with control of the high priestly vestments reveals their apprehensiveness at letting the high priest have too much influence; when the high priest

¹⁴² These anecdotes stem from the years 59-65 C.E. and are found principally in *Ant.* 20.180-214; cf. Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 300-305; Sanders, *Judaism*, 323-24.

¹⁴³ *Ant.* 20.180-81. Sanders (*Judaism*, 324) has argued that this incident represents internal strife among the priestly classes, and that this strife did not spread into the wider populace. He theorizes that the men did not go to the farmers' houses and demand food but rather went to priestly residences that had already received the tithes. This may be so, but at the very least the image of the high priest would have suffered from such incidents.

¹⁴⁴ Sanders, *Judaism*, 490.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 326.

wore the vestments he spoke for God, which could have devastating effects for the Romans if he incited anti-Roman sentiment.¹⁴⁶ From this, Sanders concludes that during the Roman era the high priesthood was still accorded respect, and that the person who filled it continued to have real authority. The Romans ruled from Caesarea, while Jerusalem was governed by the high priest.

A different opinion is voiced by Mendels. He argues that the institution of the high priesthood went into serious decline during the Roman era, specifically from the accession of Herod to the revolt in 66 C.E.¹⁴⁷ The deterioration of the office is principally seen in the temple's loss of political symbolism and the high priests' loss of actual political power. From the evidence in Josephus regarding the dissension caused by many of the chief priests, Mendels draws a conclusion opposite to that of Sanders, namely that the priestly elites' extensive abuse of the temple resulted in the temple and priesthood gradually losing all spiritual and religious significance.¹⁴⁸ Mendels carries this argument to its logical conclusion, asserting: "For many Jews, the Temple was in effect destroyed long before its physical destruction in 70 C.E."¹⁴⁹ It was only in the late sixties, when Jerusalem was on the edge of revolt, that any real political power returned to the high priestly families.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 326-27. Whether the high priest was worthy of the vestments was largely immaterial. What mattered most was the office and the assumption that it's incumbent was divinely ordained. In retaining control over these vestments, the Romans were simply continuing a Herodian practice, see *Ant.* 15.403-4.

¹⁴⁷ Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 277-320.

¹⁴⁸ Both draw upon the same passages in Josephus while coming to radically different conclusions.

¹⁴⁹ Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 301, 304.

A more moderate position is urged by Goodman, who argues that the Romans allowed the high priestly circles to maintain their position of power because it was Roman practice to trust the existing leadership and to maintain as much continuity as possible.¹⁵⁰ Since no ruling class existed, the Romans were forced to create one. Unfortunately for them, their pool of potential leaders was a shallow one, since it had been Herod's policy to choose as high priests weak-willed men who would not be serious rivals. Under direct Roman rule, these "puppet rulers" were doomed from the start, since they possessed neither the prestige to govern effectively on behalf of the Romans nor the support of the local populace.¹⁵¹ Moreover, the Romans significantly weakened the authority of the high priest by disallowing the convocation of popular assemblies, the traditional bodies which made important national decisions and held the respect of the general population.¹⁵² According to Goodman, although the high priest remained a part of the ruling class and essential for the continuance of worship in the temple, the office declined in influence. Lineage was no longer heeded and the Romans had no compunction about shuffling high priests. Beset by faction and strife, the ruling class stumbled on until the beginning of the revolt, in which they played a considerable role.

Of these three positions, that of Mendels seems to have the least to commend it. While he is certainly correct that the meddling of Herod and the Roman prefects and procurators dealt a blow to the political influence of the high priest, it most certainly did

¹⁵⁰ Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 29-50.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 43; cf. 111-13.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 109-12.

not divest the office of the high priest of all political and religious significance. As they did in all corners of the empire, the Romans in Palestine held ultimate political control. But when the Romans wished to discuss certain issues with the Jewish people or wanted certain demands met, they turned to the high priest. Moreover, as Sanders argues, there would be no need to maintain control over the high priestly vestments if the office was devoid of political significance. Similarly, if the temple and temple service were really as devoid of meaning as Mendels suggests, one would have expected the people to be disinterested in the temple. In fact, however, many of them were still deeply involved in pilgrimage and continued to view the temple as God's abode.

Goodman and Sanders hold more tenable positions, in that they agree that the office of the high priest still held some political power. They disagree, though, as to the extent of its continuing influence. Deciding between the two positions seems more a matter of emphasis than substance. Goodman is attempting to analyze the way in which the events of 66-70 C.E. came about, and consequently puts more emphasis on internal conflict amongst the leading families in Jerusalem; this conflict probably diminished the political and moral clout of the high priestly families. Sanders, on the other hand, is more concerned to establish a broad review of Judaism and its leadership than to analyze the causes of the Jewish revolt. He sees clearly that there had to be some form of recognizable Jewish leadership, and that outside of the sectarian groups that developed in the second century B.C.E., there were no candidates other than priestly ones available.¹⁵³

¹⁵³ The three main sects in the Second Temple period, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

To balance the emphases of these two scholars: the high priest and the leading priestly families in the first century C.E. seem to have been the leading political and religious figures of their generation, but in the decades leading up to the Jewish revolt their internal dissension may well have weakened them in the eyes of the populace.

2.3 Conclusion

In this survey of the role of the temple and priesthood in the Second Temple period, I have detailed how central the temple was in the religious, economic, and political life of Judaism. As the pre-eminent religious institution in the country, it inspired great devotion, and in times of grave conflict, great solidarity. This great concern and reverence for the temple reveals that the temple was also a symbol, a physical embodiment of the relationship between Israel and its God and a tangible reminder of the peoples' election and covenant. Similarly, as caretakers of this sanctuary and officiates of the temple sacrifices, most Second Temple Jews held the high priests in high regard, and to a certain extent these priests embodied the religious, economic, and political authority of the temple. This priestly privilege and power, however, developed over the course of many centuries, and then declined a bit in the latter years of the Second Temple. As Sanders has noted: "Influence and control varied from time to time, from region to region, and from issue to issue. . . .The chief priests were the leading actors The priests, however, did not always run everything everywhere."¹⁵⁴ It may be that the

¹⁵⁴ Sanders, *Judaism*, 490.

damage that occurred during Hasmonean times, coupled with Herodian and Roman meddling, served to devalue the high priesthood, at least in the political sphere. But the importance of the high priest should not be underestimated. Religiously, he was still of supreme importance for Judaism, and economically he retained his powerful position. Although the Roman era saw a return to foreign rule and a concomitant reduction in the high priest's role as head of the state, he remained the highest ranking official in Judaism and the official liaison between his people and the Romans. No Jewish figure in the Second Temple period exerted as much influence in the religious, economic, and political spheres.

Having established the centrality of the temple and high priest, I will now focus attention on the discontent that was frequently expressed against both.

Chapter 3: Reactions to the Control and Influence of the Jerusalem Temple and Priesthood

In the previous chapter it was argued that the temple stood at the ideological and social epicenter of Jewish national life. Moreover, as overseers of the temple, the Jerusalem priests shared in much of its prestige, with their religious and political influence growing exponentially over the course of the Second Temple period. The aim of the present chapter is to survey the negative reactions spawned by this consolidation of religion, wealth, and political power in the hands of a select few. Such responses, as shall be seen, were sharpened during times of national crisis when Jerusalem and the temple were threatened. The events surrounding Antiochus Epiphanes's involvement with the temple and priesthood and the subsequent Hasmonean revolt is a prime example of such an occasion, for it was during this period that the religio-political landscape of Palestine was reshaped through the confluence of "illegitimate" priests buying their position, the desecration of the temple itself by Antiochus, and the establishment of a new Hasmonean high-priestly line. Reactions to these incidents reverberated for many years, with certain groups becoming overtly hostile and antagonistic toward the priestly elite in Jerusalem. Critique of the Jerusalem priesthood, however, developed prior to the early-to-mid second century B.C.E. and continued through the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. when the high priest and the priestly governing elite were removed from positions of power, thus eliminating the very grounds of complaint.¹

¹ Priestly influence continued in the following centuries, but did so without the presence of the temple. See David Goodblatt, "The Title *Nasi* and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt," in *The Bar-Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach* (ed. A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi,

In an intriguing article, Gideon Bohak has suggested that the temple in Jerusalem served as both a centripetal and a centrifugal force.² So much power was concentrated in the temple (and in the hands of the priests that controlled it) that any reaction or opposition to the ruling high priest flung the dissenters away from the center. That is to say, the harshness of the critique was, in some quarters, due largely to the magnetism and power of the temple as a central symbol.³ This terminology from the world of physics perhaps overstates the case, as the extant evidence suggests that criticism of the sanctuary and its priests could coincide with participation in the temple cult and service.⁴ Even so, the image of centripetal and centrifugal forces highlights the magnetism of the temple as well as the power and position that it and its priestly overseers held in Jewish society. As Michael Knibb has observed, it is hardly a surprise that the temple should “very often appear as an object of rivalry and contention” in Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature.⁵

1984), 113-32; Jodi Magness, "Heaven on Earth: Helios and the Zodiac Cycle in Ancient Palestinian Synagogues," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 59 (2005): 1-52, esp. 22-29.

² Bohak, "Theopolis," 4; cf. Benjamin G. Wright, "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (ed. P.C. Beentjes; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 189-90; Flusser, "No Temple in the City," 455-56.

³ Schwartz ("Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 68-103) and Sanders (*Judaism*, 317-40, 481-90) would probably reject this strong image, as they prefer to see a more irenic situation. The persistence of the critique leveled against the priestly elite in Jerusalem suggests, however, that Schwartz and Sanders are a bit too dismissive of the criticism directed against priests and the temple.

⁴ The documents from Qumran are an exception, as it is clear that this sectarian community did separate from the temple. For the other texts surveyed in this chapter, however, there is no firm evidence to suggest that the author or community behind the texts had broken from the temple.

⁵ Michael A. Knibb, "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 401.

The remainder of this chapter will detail the steady stream of dissatisfaction with the Second Temple, as well as the implicit and explicit critique leveled against the circle of priests who presided over it. As will be seen, the evidence is limited. Nonetheless, the force of the complaint, in its many different manifestations, is a testament to the disapproval with which many seem to have viewed the temple and its priestly aristocracy. In this survey I will divide the surviving evidence into three periods. First, I will investigate views of the temple and Jerusalem priesthood from the founding of the Second Temple down to the tumultuous events in Judea in the 170's and 160's B.C.E., just prior to the threatening of the Zadokite claim to the high priesthood and the institution of Antiochus Epiphanes' infamous reforms. Second, I will survey the literature which arose in direct response to these events, the subsequent criticism directed toward the Hasmoneans upon the usurpation of the office of high priest, and the formation of Jewish sects. Third, I will examine the continuance of the critique of temple and priesthood from the mid second century B.C.E. down to the destruction of the temple and its immediate aftermath.

3.1 Exilic and Post-Exilic Biblical Literature

Disappointment with the present sanctuary and criticism of the priestly elite who governed it stems from the earliest days of the Second Temple. Ezra 3:10-13, which states that the laying of the foundations of temple was accompanied by great acclamation on the part of the priests, Levites, and Israelite people, also reveals that this momentous occasion was not universally acclaimed. Those standing in the midst of the crowd who

had lived long enough to see the first temple “wept with a loud voice when they saw this house,” evidence that at least some of the elders were not impressed with the new temple under construction and pined for the days of the glorious temple they remembered.⁶ The historical nature of this account is at least partially confirmed by the similar sentiment expressed in Haggai 2:3: “Who is left among you that saw this house in its former glory? How does it look to you now? Is it not in your sight as nothing?” In both texts the humbleness of the present temple is emphasized and its inferiority confirmed by witnesses who had seen the glory of the first temple.⁷ Even at its founding, the second temple was the cause of consternation and discontent in the eyes of some of the returning exiles.

Though not all were impressed with the newly minted Second Temple, displeasure over the glory of the sanctuary pales in comparison to the criticism directed against the Jerusalem priesthood responsible for its oversight. Evidence for this critique is found throughout the corpus of biblical books concerned with post-exilic events.⁸ Since the sharpest appraisal of the Jerusalem priests is found in Ezra and Malachi, and

⁶ Josephus (*Ant.* 11.80-83) gives a slightly different interpretation of this event. In his eyes, the priests and Levites, along with a few of the older men, were the ones who remembered the grandeur of the former temple, and bemoaned its inferiority to the previous one. Their wailing on account of the deficiency of the latter drowned out the sound of the trumpets and the rejoicing of the people.

⁷ Similarly, the dedication of the second temple was not accompanied by a sign of God’s presence. By way of contrast, the sanctity of Solomon’s temple was signified through the presence of God, for the glory of the Lord filled the temple through cloud (1 Kings 8:10-11) or consuming fire (2 Chr 7:1). See Cohen, “The Temple and the Synagogue,” 308.

⁸ For a concise description of the priests in the prophetic literature, see Lester L. Grabbe, “A Priest is Without Honor in His Own Prophet: Priests and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets,” in *The Priests in the Prophets* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 79-97.

because some of the issues raised in Ezra and Malachi continually arose in subsequent Jewish literature of the period, I will restrict discussion to these two books.

At issue in Ezra is the complicity of many of the exiles in marrying foreign women. Ezra 9-10 reveals that many in Israel had taken foreign wives, and in so doing “the holy seed had mixed itself with the peoples of the lands, and in this faithlessness the officials and leaders have led the way.” The magnitude of this sin, at least in the eyes of the author of Ezra,⁹ compelled Ezra to tear his clothes and offer up an intercessory prayer on behalf of the people. Though it is not clear that the people held these intermarriages to be as egregious as did Ezra, they did agree that the situation should be remedied. Of interest to us is the distinct possibility that the priests and Levites were directly involved in this issue of intermarriage. In the initial report given to Ezra, the “leaders and officials of the people” are said to have been at the forefront of this problem. The likelihood that the priests should be considered in this number is borne out by the ensuing lists of people who are to send away their foreign wives; in each case the priests and Levites are singled out as groups guilty of intermarriage (Ezra 9:1; 10:5, 18-25). According to Ezra “all” Israel is guilty, but the priests are the ones who lead the way in this sin.

⁹ Many questions have been raised with respect to the authorship of the book of Ezra. Due to the frequent use of the first person in the narrative of Ezra 7-10, many have argued that these chapters are part of an “Ezra memoir” that was written by the historical Ezra. Others doubt the existence of such a memoir. For arguments for these respective positions, see H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker; WBC 16; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985) xxix-xxxii; Lester L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and James H. Charlesworth; Library of Second Temple Studies 47; London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 76, 324-31. If these chapters are from the historical Ezra, this discussion of intermarriage stems from the fifth century B.C.E.; if not, it belongs to the fourth century. In either case, it is very early evidence of the emergence of this particular critique of the Jerusalem priesthood.

Different issues are at stake in Malachi. In his opening chapter, Malachi excoriates the priests for the impure sacrifices that are being offered on the altar and contrasts the pure offerings and incense that are presented to the Lord by other nations with the profanation of the Lord's name occurring in the Jerusalem temple. In fact, the Lord of Hosts implores that the temple doors be shut, since the hypocrisy of the priests is too much to bear. This condemnation continues in chapter two, as Malachi upbraids the priests for their failures in maintaining proper worship of the God of Israel. Not only have they turned away from the Lord themselves and corrupted the covenant that God made with Levi, but they have also caused others to stumble. For all of this, the Lord says, he will curse the priests, spread dung on their faces, and cast them away from his presence.

The impurity and impiety of these priests is then highlighted through a comparison with Levi, the consummate priest (2:4-7), and a vision of a purified temple in the day the Lord returns to his temple (3:3-4). In contrast to the priests of Malachi's day, Levi is described as "the messenger of the Lord of Hosts" and is praised as one who reveres the Lord, walking with integrity and uprightness, and turning many from their sins. This description of Levi harkens back to the days in which, according to our author, the priests were righteous and the sacrifices pure.¹⁰ In comparison, Malachi views his contemporary priests with great scorn.

¹⁰ Since there is no biblical precedent for a covenant with Levi, some have argued that the reference should be understood as referring more broadly to the descendants of Levi. Robert A. Kugler (*From Patriarch To Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 18-21) argues, however, that the more reasonable reading of 2:4-5 is that the covenant is with the individual

Moreover, Malachi continues his disparagement of the priests by implying that their sins will require purification on a grand scale. When the Lord returns to his temple he will “purify the descendants of Levi and refine them like gold and silver, until they present offerings to the Lord in righteousness. Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord as in the days of old and as in former years” (3:3-4). The actions of the priests have polluted the sanctuary to such a degree that it will take an eschatological act of God, a divine scrubbing, to purify the sanctuary and reestablish acceptable offerings to the Lord.

Malachi 2 and 3 highlight the felt disconnection between the present situation and a proper priesthood. Both contain a vision of a glorious high priest and future temple contrasted with the present situation. Dissatisfaction with the present provokes nostalgia for the priests of old, and the vision of an ideal priesthood is then projected into the future. This vision of the glorious future of the temple and its renewed priesthood is restorative in nature; the Lord will bring back Levi and restore the worship in the temple to what it was in the days of old.¹¹

named Levi. Belief in a covenant with Levi most likely arose through reading Gen 34, Exod 32:25-29, Num 25:6-13, and Deut 33:8-11 together. See Kugler for discussion and bibliography.

¹¹ In an analysis of messianism and the messianic idea, Gershom Scholem ("Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism," in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* [New York: Schocken Books, 1971], 1-36, esp. 3-4) argues that Jewish messianic expectations took two different forms, one deriving from a restorative impulse, a desire to return to the memory of a past golden age, and the other deriving from a utopian vision of the future. While I am not here discussing messianism *per se*, the distinction between these sorts of expectations seems also to hold for speculation concerning a future temple and priesthood. The invocation of Levi and the hope for a return to the days of old places the vision of Malachi on the restorative end of the spectrum.

From the outset of the Second Temple, then, there is evidence of dissatisfaction with the present temple, as well as disparagement of the priestly class who had jurisdiction over it.

3.2 The Hellenistic Period prior to Antiochus Epiphanes

The Judaism of the Hellenistic period was interested in matters quite removed from the books of Ezra-Nehemiah and the minor prophets. In this earliest stratum of surviving literature there is an intense interest in angels, demons, astronomy, heavenly ascents, metallurgy, calendar issues, and the like. Interest in the temple and its governance, however, remained a constant, and as Wright has suggested, the “conduct of the priesthood that served in the temple . . . became a lightning rod for criticism.”¹²

3.2.1 Tobit

The book of Tobit, like the book of Job, highlights the suffering of a righteous person. Though the setting of the book is the city of Nineveh and the events purportedly take place prior to any return to Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the temple, most date the composition of Tobit not long before the rise of the Hasmoneans.¹³ The conclusion of

¹² Wright, "Fear the Lord," 189.

¹³ For a discussion of the dating of Tobit, see Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 40-42. Most agree that Tobit was composed during the third or early second century B.C.E. The integrity of the book, however, has often been questioned, with the last two chapters being especially debatable. Moore (*Tobit*, 21-22, 280-84), among many others, argues for the essential unity of the book. John J. Collins ("The Judaism of the Book of Tobit," in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology* [ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 23-25, 39-40) suggests that chapters 1, 13, and 14 are the product of a later editor who

the book contains a psalm of praise, a prayer of Tobit, and final words of instruction for his progeny. Of special interest are two passages in these latter chapters, both of which specifically discuss Jerusalem and the temple.

In chapter thirteen, Tobit asserts that Jerusalem is the city in which the majesty of God is acknowledged by all people, and that the affliction of the holy city will pass due to the mercy of God. In a future day Jerusalem will be rebuilt in glorious fashion: sapphire and emerald will grace the gates, ruby and stones of Ophir will pave the streets, precious stones will adorn the walls, and gold will cover the towers and battlements.¹⁴ In this future city the tent (σκηνή) of God will also be rebuilt (οικοδομηθήσεται), a clear reference to the temple (13.10). Tobit 13, then envisions a glorious Jerusalem and temple, distinct from any present city, which will arise only through the direct intervention of God in history.

In the final chapter of Tobit, an eschatological Jerusalem and temple is again depicted in a way that is similar to that described above. In this instance, however, there is an implied contrast between the glory of these future days and the present reality of the temple:

is interested in strengthening the connection with, and centrality of, Jerusalem. Since several fragments from Qumran include portions of chapters 13 and 14, the *terminus ad quem* for these additions is the mid first century B.C.E. A variation of the theory of a later addition is found in David Flusser ("Psalms, Hymns and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* [ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984], 555-57) who agrees that chapter 13 is not particularly relevant to the rest of the book of Tobit. He suggests, however, that the eschatological psalm of chapter 13 was originally penned in the fifth or fourth centuries B.C.E. and is the earliest example of this genre of psalm. The other alternative to Collins' position is that chapters 13-14 were originally independent documents that were later appended to the book of Tobit.

¹⁴ Tob 13:16-17, cf. 8-10. This description of the glory of Jerusalem is likely dependent upon Isaiah 54:11-12, and is reminiscent of the depiction of the heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation 21:18-21.

God will again have mercy on them, and God will bring them back into the land of Israel; and they will rebuild (οἰκοδομήσουσιν) the house of God (τὸν οἶκον), but not like the first one until the period when the times of fulfillment shall come. After this they all (πάντες) will return from their exile and will rebuild Jerusalem in splendor; and in it the house of God (ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ) will be rebuilt (οἰκοδομηθήσεται), just as the prophets of Israel have said concerning it (14:5).

The above quotation is indicative of a certain strand of thought that is first found in Ezra 3:10-13/Hag 2:3 and reappears in subsequent second temple literature.¹⁵ At issue is the felt disconnection between the prophetic literature's glorious promises of a restored temple, on the one hand, and the present reality of the temple, on the other. Isaiah 54, 56, and 60, along with Ezekiel 40-48, had all suggested that a glorious temple would stand at the center of a future rebuilt Jerusalem. The temple that was rebuilt under the direction of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel, however, paled in comparison to the Solomonic sanctuary.¹⁶ Consequently, in books such as Tobit, the prophetic promises were thrust into the future, a time in which it was believed that a new and glorious temple would rise to replace the present one.¹⁷

¹⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg and Michael E. Stone, *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 73.

¹⁶ Meyers and Meyers (*Haggai, Zechariah, 49-50, 71-75*) suggest that the physical appearance of the temple was not the real cause of discouragement. The temple may have looked similar to its predecessor, but in terms of political and economic significance it was a shadow of its former self.

¹⁷ Moore (*Tobit, 291*) seems to suggest that Herod's temple is the more glorious temple described in Tobit 14. This, however, cannot be the case. First, the depiction in chapter 14 of the new city and temple seems to parallel what is found in chapter 13, where the city and temple are understood to belong to a future time. Second, there is a clear demarcation between the present time, in which some had returned from exile, and a future moment when all Israel will return. While Herod certainly beautified the city and temple, these restorations were not accompanied by a mass return of exiles.

3.2.2 Enochic Literature: the Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers

One of the earliest post-biblical Jewish writings of the Second Temple period is *I Enoch*, a composite text whose parts date from several different periods. Two of the earliest pieces, the Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers, provide continuing evidence for an early critique of the temple and priesthood.

The Astronomical Book (*I Enoch* 72-82) likely dates to the third century B.C.E. As the title suggests, these chapters are solely concerned with astronomical information, especially with the orbit of the sun and moon through the heavens and the respective calendars that are based on these two different heavenly bodies (72-75, 78-79). The setting of these chapters is a type of guided tour through the heavenly realm, with the angel Uriel revealing to Enoch the “secrets” of the heavenlies (72, 80-81).¹⁸ Of primary importance in the Astronomical Book is the revelation of a 364-day solar calendar and the laws that govern it.¹⁹ The choice of calendar was of great consequence, for whoever controlled the calendar held jurisdiction over the dates of religious festivals and other observances.²⁰

¹⁸ This tour is reminiscent of Ezekiel’s guided tour of the new temple in Ezekiel 40-48; see James C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 25.

¹⁹ Paolo Sacchi, "The Two Calendars of the *Book of Astronomy*," in *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. William J. Short; JSPP 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 128-39.

²⁰ Several other documents discussed below also advocate or make use of a solar calendar, and further discussion of calendrical issues will be reserved until I have surveyed these texts.

Also dating to the late third century B.C.E., The Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1-36) likely contains a polemic against the contemporary priestly elite.²¹ On the surface, this document appears to have little interest in the temple and its priesthood. Rather, it is a discussion of the fall of the Watchers, a loose rendering of Genesis 6 in which the “sons of God” come down to earth and marry the daughters of men. Nonetheless, in the description of Enoch’s ascent to heaven, the latter is described in language befitting a temple (*1 Enoch* 14:9-20).²² As Enoch moves upward and inward, he encounters a type of courtyard, passes into a large house, reaches the “larger house,” or holy of holies, and arrives in the throne room of the Great Glory.²³ In chapter 15, Enoch is commanded to go to the Watchers of heaven, who have asked him to intercede for them, and to announce that “you [the watchers] should petition in behalf of men, and not men in behalf of you” (*1 Enoch* 15:2).²⁴ The Lord then accuses the Watchers of forsaking the eternal sanctuary and defiling themselves with women and blood (cf. *1 Enoch* 7:1; 9:8; 10:11;

²¹ The Book of Watchers arguably belongs to the earliest stratum of literature contained in *1 Enoch* (third century B.C.E.) and is itself composed of several smaller units. Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 25) maintains that these smaller sections were already a composite text that existed essentially in its present form by the middle of the second century B.C.E.

²² Himmelfarb (*Kingdom of Priests*, 20) observes that the Book of the Watchers pictures heaven as a temple, but this portrayal of a heavenly temple does not necessarily denigrate the earthly temple in the way that other apocalypses, including the Enochic Animal Visions and Apocalypse of Weeks, do. For the author of the Book of Watchers, the Second Temple is not irreversibly defiled or institutionally invalid.

²³ This account of three areas of increasing holiness in the heavenly temple is consistent with biblical descriptions of the arrangement of the earthly temple (Lev. 16; 1 Kings 6-7; 2 Chr 3-4; Ezekiel 40-42); see Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 20. A description of the increasing holiness of the temple is also seen in *m. Kel.* 1.6-9.

²⁴ Unless otherwise noted, all translations of *1 Enoch* are from George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

12:4; 15:4).²⁵ These allegations of defilement, abandonment of the heavenly sanctuary, and failure to intercede for human beings, have led several scholars to suggest that this story is a veiled critique of the Jerusalem priesthood in charge of the temple at the time of writing.²⁶ If this correlation is correct, then the Jerusalem priesthood is charged with a failure to intercede on behalf of the people, a lack of proper respect for the temple, and defilement through marriage with women prohibited to them.

What, however, constitutes a prohibited marriage, for the author of the Book of Watchers? This question has been debated. Suter and Nickelsburg are of the opinion that these illegitimate marriages refer to intermarriage with non-Jews, an activity clearly forbidden for priests.²⁷ Himmelfarb, however, has argued that the issue is not intermarriage with foreigners, but rather marriage to women inappropriate in any way.²⁸

²⁵ The offspring of this union produced “bastards” (μαζήρσοι in Greek, a transliteration of the Aramaic ܡܙܗܪܝܢ) and “children of fornication” (Greek πορνεία, probably based upon an Aramaic ܩܢܝܐ, cf. *1 Enoch* 10:9). See Knibb, “Temple and Cult,” 405.

²⁶ David Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16,” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-35; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600; Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 20-23; cf. David Suter, “Revisiting “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,”” *Hen* 24 (2002): 137-42; Martha Himmelfarb, “The Book of The Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem,” *Hen* 24 (2002): 131-35.

²⁷ Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 119-31; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” 584-86. Menahem Stern (“Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and other Classes,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century* [ed. Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976], 582-84) sees no evidence that the priests were required to marry the daughters of priests, and argues that a priest could freely marry any Israelite woman provided that her family tree was unblemished. He admits, though, that the inclination toward endogamous marriages was stronger for the high priest and the priestly circles from which he might be chosen. For rabbinic evidence of priestly concern for pure marriage, see Adolph Büchler, “Family Purity and Family Impurity in Jerusalem Before the Year 70 C.E.,” in *Studies in Jewish History: The Adolph Büchler Memorial Volume* (ed. Israel Brodie and Joseph Rabbinowitz; London: Oxford University Press, 1956), 64-98.

²⁸ This understanding is based upon a “rigorist” reading of Leviticus 21.7, in which a priest is forbidden to marry a זנה. Since זנה in this case cannot mean a prostitute, since she would already have been ruled out of

Hence not only foreign women, but also Jewish women who cannot claim proper priestly ancestry, are out of bounds. The merit of this interpretation is that it provides a context in which the polemic may address a live issue. Intermarriage with Gentiles had already been condemned in the time of Ezra, and there is no record of priests intermarrying with Gentiles in the third- and second- centuries B.C.E.²⁹ Accordingly, the illegitimate marriages at issue must refer to the necessity of endogamous marriages on the part of the priests, and not Jew/Gentile matrimony.³⁰ The related emphasis on the defilement of the Watchers through blood is likely a reference to menstrual blood, a bodily flux that would render a priest impure if contact was made.³¹ This charge of priestly defilement through contact with blood will appear again in subsequent Second Temple literature (e.g. CD 4.12-5.11; *Ps. Sol.* 8.13).

A further accusation directed against these Watchers may serve to strengthen the connection between them and certain priestly circles operating in Jerusalem.³² The chief

bounds for a priest, Martha Himmelfarb ("Levi, Phineas, and the Problem of Intermarriage," *JSQ* 6 [1999]: 1-24) postulates that a woman inappropriate in any way is meant. Thus a Jewish woman who lacks a priestly pedigree may also be improper for a priest to marry; cf. eadem, "Book of the Watchers," 132-34.

²⁹ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phineas," 17-24.

³⁰ Philo (*Spec. Leg.* 1.110) has a similar understanding, though for him this injunction applies only to the high priest.

³¹ The basis of this charge is Lev 15:25, where it is stated that a man who engages in sexual activity with a menstruating woman contracts the woman's impurity. For the origins and history of the relationship between menstruants, impurity, and the sacred, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity," in *Women's History and Ancient History* (ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 273-99.

³² Michael E. Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.," in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth and Third Centuries B.C.E.* (ed. Michael E. Stone and David Satran; Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress Press, 1989), 73.

Watchers, Semyaza and Azaz'el, are indicted for forbidden marriage and the procreation of giants, on the one hand, and revelation of secret knowledge (medicine, magic, and astrology) to humanity, on the other.³³ Above I have argued that a strong parallel exists between Semyaza's sin of illegitimate marriage and the apparent transgressions of certain Jerusalem priests; a similar line may also be drawn between Azaz'el's sin of revealing clandestine information to humankind and these same priestly circles. In Malachi 2:6-9, for example, the priests are charged with avoiding their responsibility to teach knowledge and instruction, and consequently with leading many people astray (cf. Ezek 22:26). Moreover, several studies have connected the elevation of the study of Torah in the Second Temple period with the role of the priest as a purveyor of this knowledge.³⁴ It is plausible, therefore, to link the charge against Azaz'el with a similar allegation against the priesthood in Jerusalem. The Watchers have revealed knowledge to humans, but it is of a forbidden variety. Similarly, the Jerusalem priesthood has disclosed knowledge and instruction to the people, but this knowledge is untrustworthy and has caused the people to stumble.

³³ John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 38.

³⁴ This is certainly true for the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. At a certain point there arose a group of lay Torah scholars who were independent of the priests. Following the Maccabean uprising, the growth of this class seems to have accelerated. In the late third century B.C.E, however, the task of instructing and disseminating knowledge would have largely remained with the priests; see Schürer, *HJP*, 238-39; Elias Bickerman, "The Historical Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism," in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth and Third Centuries B.C.E.* (ed. Michael E. Stone and David Satran; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989 [orig. 1949]), 42-44; James L. Kugel, "The World of Ancient Biblical Interpreters," in *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 1-14.

3.2.3 Aramaic Levi

Part of a work composed in the late third or early second century B.C.E.,³⁵ the fragments of *Aramaic Levi* found at Qumran (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q213b, 4Q214, 4Q214a, 4Q214b) and the Cairo Genizah reveal that the critique of the contemporary priesthood in Jerusalem in this period was not confined to the circles which composed the Book of Watchers.³⁶ First, a solar calendar similar to that seen in the Astronomical Book, *Jubilees*, and other Qumran writings appears in *Aramaic Levi*, although in contradistinction to these other works the merits of the solar calendar are simply assumed and not promoted. Second, exogamous marriages are condemned in 4Q 213a 2, where a virgin is portrayed as ruining her and her father's name and causing shame to rest upon her brothers. The close proximity of the phrases "holy tithe" and "an offering to God," coupled with the fact that this vision is given to Levi, suggests that what is principally in mind here is an improper priestly marriage.³⁷ If this is correct, then *Aramaic Levi* appears to chastise the priests on the same grounds as does the Book of the Watchers. Third, Levi is portrayed as an ideal priest, invoking the name of the Lord in penitential

³⁵ Jonas D. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 19-20. For a survey of recent opinions on the dating of *Aramaic Levi*, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 131-35.

³⁶ Extracts of a Greek translation of *Aramaic Levi*, dating to the eleventh century C.E., were also found in Athos Koutloumous 39.

³⁷ Cf. Geniza Bodleian b in the Athos Greek Manuscript, in which Levi is warned to stay away from fornication, impurity and harlotry. He is instead to marry a woman from his own family and not to defile his seed, because he is holy seed (text found in Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 74-75). On the connection between priests and illegitimate priesthood in *Aramaic Levi*, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 36-37, 85-87; Wright, "Fear the Lord," 200; Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phineas," 3-6. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel (*Aramaic Levi Document*, 219-21) note that this fragment bears some similarities to the story of Dinah which opens *Aramaic Levi*. Since the connection is quite oblique, they suggest that this material contains a description of a "wayward priestly daughter."

prayer, scrupulously following all of the cultic instructions that he had received, and admonishing his children to live uprightly and to teach wisdom.³⁸ In what follows, however, Levi predicts that the coming generations of priests will abandon the way of truth and “walk in the darkness.”³⁹ The fragmentary state of the text, unfortunately, does not allow for more precise details of Levi’s address. Even so, the description of the apostasy of later generations may be the author’s way of polemicizing against the contemporary priests serving in the temple by contrasting them with the ideal, namely Levi himself.⁴⁰ In this, *Aramaic Levi* bears a close affinity to Malachi 2.

3.2.4 Conclusion to earliest works

The above documents all stem from the period prior to Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabean revolt. When these documents are viewed as a whole, several interrelated critiques of the temple and the Jerusalem priesthood come into focus.

The earliest criticism leveled against the temple is its perceived lack of glory. In comparison to the first temple, or the vision of a renewed third temple, the second temple leaves much to be desired. In the literature surveyed thus far, this disapproval is found in Ezra, Malachi, and Tobit. The book of Ezra highlights the failings of this temple in the eyes of a certain segment of the population. For those who have beheld the first temple,

³⁸ See *Aramaic Levi Document* 3, 6-10, in Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 60-63, 74-93.

³⁹ See the text in Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, 217; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-98), I.449.

⁴⁰ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 130, 136-37; cf. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 216-19.

the second is a cause for mourning and weeping. Malachi and Tobit also mention the temple's lack of stature in relation to the first one, and set up similar comparisons between the present temple and a future rebuilt temple which will be firmly planted in the middle of a renewed and glorious Jerusalem.

Second, the contemporary priesthood is criticized for its impiety. Traces of this criticism are seen in the Book of the Watchers, where the Watchers are rebuked for their lack of intercession on behalf of humanity. The book of Malachi, however, contains the strongest censure of the priests. Here the Lord castigates the priests for their offerings of blemished animals on the altar, contemplates closing the temple doors to stop the temple's defilement, and threatens to remove the priests from his presence for their obstinacy.

Priestly exogamy and ritual purity in the temple are also at issue. Intermarriage is condemned, sometimes as practiced by Israelites in general (Ezra), and sometimes as practiced specifically by the Jerusalem priests (Book of the Watchers and perhaps *Aramaic Levi*). In the passages that clearly refer to the sacerdotal leadership in Jerusalem, the exact meaning of the ban on exogamous marriages is debated: is it a ban on priests marrying Gentiles, or is it meant to limit their marriages to Israelite women from certain families that can document their priestly descent? Since it is already clear from Ezra 9-10 that intermarriage with Gentiles is forbidden to all Israelites, the blanket prohibition against illegitimate marriage for priests seems to imply a more rigorous requirement—that priests should only marry within certain families.⁴¹ Central to the

⁴¹ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phineas," 1-24; Himmelfarb, "Book of the Watchers," 132-135.

question of illegitimate marriages is the issue of ritual purity. If one of the priests overseeing the temple service is impure, the whole ritual will be tainted. This is why the issue of intermarriage is so important for Ezra, the Book of the Watchers and *Aramaic Levi*.

A corollary to the argument over the identity of the proper wife is also the question of proper sexual relations between a priest and his wife. In the Book of the Watchers, the accusations leveled against the priests have to do both with improper marriage and with defilement through the blood of women. This blood most likely refers to menstrual blood, and the indictment against the priests in Jerusalem is that they have engaged in improper sexual relations with their wives during the latter's time of impurity. The result of this would have been the impurity of the priest in question.

The fourth issue involves the calendar. The Astronomical Book and *Aramaic Levi*, as well as *Jubilees* and some of the Qumran writings (which will be discussed below), all agree on the importance of following the solar calendar. Comment on the importance of the calendar will be postponed until I have surveyed some of these pertinent texts.

The general impression given thus far has been that certain individuals or groups outside priestly circles were critical of specific aspects of the Jerusalem priesthood and expressed these concerns in the above-mentioned texts. While this may be the case, it is also possible that some of the literature described above was itself of priestly origin.⁴²

⁴² The overlap between the priestly circles and the literati of the Persian period is discussed in Ehud Ben Zvi, "Observations on Prophetic Characters, Prophetic Texts, Priests of Old, Persian Period Priests and

Wright has drawn attention to the contrast between the implied criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood in the Book of Watchers and the staunch support given to these same priests in the roughly contemporaneous Ben Sira.⁴³ He suggests that the positive view of the priesthood in Ben Sira reflects the views of someone who is keenly aware of, and opposed to, certain circles who are criticizing the Jerusalem priesthood.⁴⁴ Accordingly, it is likely that Ben Sira composed his work in order to contravene attitudes that he found untenable as well as to draw attention to the glory and legitimacy of the high priest. This suggestion is made all the more probable by the figure of Ben Sira himself, as the author's education and literary acumen suggest that he was a professional scribe and sage,⁴⁵ and perhaps even of priestly lineage.⁴⁶

Several shared features in the Book of the Watchers, *Aramaic Levi*, and the Astronomical Book may also point toward a priestly provenance for these works.⁴⁷ First,

Literati," in *The Priests in the Prophets* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 26-27.

⁴³ As stated in Chapter Two, Ben Sira ascribes a lofty, almost divine status to Simon, the high priest. Intriguingly, this praise of Simon is a tribute to the high priest of Ben Sira's youth, not to the current high priest, whom he fails to mention. Noting this, Himmelfarb (*Kingdom of Priests*, 44) wonders if Ben Sira is displaying a reticence to embrace the claims of the present high priest.

⁴⁴ Wright, "Fear the Lord," 189-191; cf. *ibid.*, "Sirach and 1 Enoch: Some Further Considerations," *Hen 24* (2002): 179-87

⁴⁵ Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 30-34; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 55.

⁴⁶ Wright, "Fear the Lord," 192-96; Saul M. Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," *HTR* 80, no. 3 (1987): 261-86; Helge Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter* (WUNT 2/6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980), 13-26. While this is a plausible suggestion, Himmelfarb (*Kingdom of Priests*, 30) observes that holding priests in high regard is not enough to indicate that one comes from priestly stock. She is willing to concede, however, that the scribe Ben Sira would certainly have been on intimate terms with at least some of the Jerusalem priests, for both would have been members of the educated elite.

⁴⁷ Wright, "Sirach and 1 Enoch: Some Further Considerations," 179-87.

Aramaic Levi and the Astronomical Book share an acute concern for the calendar, a matter controlled by priests in the temple. Second, the Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers reveal an intense interest in “scientific” speculations, topics which presumably would have been of interest to an educated elite.⁴⁸ Third, the awareness of and interest in priestly marriages in the Book of the Watchers raises the possibility that priests themselves are involved in the discussion, for the issue of proper priestly marriages would presumably have been of greater interest to the priestly caste than to others in Jerusalem society. These observations, coupled with the possibility of Ben Sira’s priestly status, makes it probable that, in this early period, the priesthood may have been subject to intramural critique. What is not clear, however, is whether or not the criticism was confined to these circles.

Kugler claims that the polemic in the early years of the Second Temple period “seems to come from a time when there was a dispute regarding the proper character of the priestly office, but when the discussion was still tame, and there was room for difference of opinion.” Though Kugler refers specifically to *Aramaic Levi*, his statement summarizes the general sentiment of the literature surveyed thus far. The tenor of this critique, however, quickly sharpened in the ensuing years.

⁴⁸ Stone, "Book of Enoch," 70-75.

3.3 The Period of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Early Maccabean Years

The 160s and 150s B.C.E., a period of profound turmoil and transition for Jerusalem and the Jewish religion, produced not only dissenting literature but also dissenting groups.⁴⁹ The overthrow of the Zadokite high priesthood by certain Hellenizing high priests, the desecration of the temple and the imposition of a draconian hellenization campaign under the auspices of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the Hasmonean reclamation of the temple through force and subsequent usurpation of the high priesthood were all innovations in Second Temple Jewish society. Below I will survey the literary and communal reactions to these tumultuous events.

3.3.1 Jubilees

The book of *Jubilees* was most likely penned in the 160's B.C.E., although there is a dispute as to whether it should be dated to the hellenization campaign of Antiochus Epiphanes or rather just prior to this period.⁵⁰ Of principal interest in *Jubilees* is the division of history into weeks and jubilees of years, culminating in the jubilee of jubilees. This whole system is governed by the use of a solar calendar, which, according to *Jubilees*, God ordained at Sinai. Control of the calendar was of tremendous importance

⁴⁹ These are, of course, not mutually exclusive spheres. The sectarians at Qumran are the clearest example of a community which not only coalesced around opposition to specific events involving the Jerusalem temple and changes in the Jerusalem priestly hierarchy, but who also were responsible for a great deal of literary output.

⁵⁰ George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 101-3; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 17-21.

to Jews in the Second Temple period, for it had a profound impact on the temple service and the entire system of rituals and festivals; if the wrong calendar was followed, festivals would be observed and sacrifices offered on the wrong days. The author's strong insistence on the primacy of the solar calendar implies that he is engaged in an extended argument over the legitimacy of this calendrical system. As such, *Jubilees* appears to be the first piece of Jewish literature to present an explicit polemic against a lunar calendar.⁵¹

Similar to the Book of the Watchers and *Aramaic Levi*, *Jubilees* is also concerned with the issue of illegitimate marriages. Chapter 30 recounts the rape of Dinah at Shechem and the retribution exacted upon the men of Shechem by Levi and Simeon. The author of *Jubilees* uses this passage to expound upon the evils of intermarriage with foreign women and asserts that anyone found guilty of such a heinous act should be put to death. Indeed, the entire nation will be condemned for the transgression of even one Israelite, for any Israelite man or woman who violates this divine sanction "defiles his [the Lord's] sanctuary."⁵² In *Jubilees* 30, this injunction against intermarriage is binding for Israel as a whole as well as for the priests.

⁵¹ Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 96.

⁵² *Jubilees* 30:16. From 30:15, it is evident that "his" refers to the Lord. For text and translation, see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (Louvain: Aedibus E. Peeters, 1989). Himmelfarb ("Levi, Phineas," 23-24) has questioned whether intermarriage with foreigners was really a live issue in this period and has suggested that the real concern was priests marrying Israelite women who did not come from priestly families. She reasons that the author of *Jubilees* has taken over material from *Aramaic Levi* that originally concerned priests and marriage and has generalized the precept to the point where intermarriage with foreigners has become the real issue. Her survey of contemporary texts suggests that intermarriage with foreigners was practiced to such a negligible degree that it warranted little attention. One possible exception is found in 1 Maccabees 1:15, where the Hellenizers are described as having been joined with Gentiles (ἐζευγίσθησαν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). Taking his cue from Numbers 25:3, Goldstein (*I*

In *Jubilees* 23, however, the actions of the high priest are specifically condemned. After describing the death and burial of Abraham, the author prophesies that an “evil generation” will arise which will “make the earth commit sin through sexual impurity, contamination, and their detestable actions” (23:14).⁵³ This condemnation is continued in verse 21, which states: “They will mention the great name but neither truly nor rightly. They will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination.” As the high priest is the only one allowed to enter the holy of holies, *Jubilees* 23:21 focuses the attention on one specific member of this evil generation—the high priest. Here the high priest is condemned not only for unrighteousness but also for immoral sexual behavior. The use of the plural in this passage, however, suggests that more than just the high priest is in mind. Either the author is referring to a specific line of high priests, or the indictment extends to the Jerusalem priesthood as a whole.⁵⁴

Maccabees, 201) has suggested that sexual associations are probably intended here. Himmelfarb (*Kingdom of Priests*, 72) and Eberhard Schwarz (*Identität durch Abgrenzung* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982], 108) however, rightly note the ambiguity of the text and argue that non-sexual interactions are more likely in view.

⁵³ Cf. 23:17. The two phrases, “sexual impurity” (Hebrew זנות probably lies behind this phrase) and “contamination” clearly identify the nature of the transgression and suggest that the issue of exogamy may be in mind; see Knibb, “Temple and Cult,” 410.

⁵⁴ See VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 58, and Knibb, “Temple and Cult,” 410.

3.3.2 The Animal Visions

Also written in the 160's B.C.E., the Animal Visions (*I Enoch* 85-90) recount the history of the world up to and including the time of the Maccabean revolt.⁵⁵ In these visions the tabernacle built during the wilderness period is referred to as a "house" (*I Enoch* 89:36, 40).⁵⁶ Beginning with Solomon's construction of the temple in *I Enoch* 89.50, however, the words "house" and "tower" refer respectively to Jerusalem and the temple. After describing the construction of the Solomonic temple in approving terms, the author provides the grim details of Israel's subsequent apostasy and progressive rejection of the temple and cult. Moreover, God's subsequent rejection of his people is also described, with Israel's apostasy resulting in the tower being burned and the house demolished (89:66).

The exilic return prompts the rebuilding of the tower (*I Enoch* 89:73-76), an event which is met with unmitigated disappointment. This differs markedly from the description of the construction of the first temple, about which the author writes in *I Enoch* 89:50:

And that house became large and broad. And a *large and high tower* was built upon that house for the Lord of the sheep. That house was low, but *the tower was*

⁵⁵ As Nickelsburg (*I Enoch*, 361) observes, the description of Maccabean events in 90:9b-16 is followed by the anticipation of imminent divine intervention, thus signaling a date of composition in 163 B.C.E. or shortly thereafter. Coinciding with this evidence is the fact that Jewish apocalypses began to be written with the onset of the Hellenistic reforms in Jerusalem and the Maccabean revolt. See James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 161-63.

⁵⁶ Nickelsburg (*I Enoch*, 381-82) thinks that here the term "house" refers to the tabernacle as well as the entire Israelite camp; cf. the similar argument of Devorah Dimant ("Jerusalem and the Temple according to the Animal Apocalypse [1 Enoch 85-90] in the Light of the Ideology of the Dead Sea Sect," *Shnaton* 5-6 [1982]: 177-93, esp. 178-83) who argues that the house is not a cultic building, but rather a place where the Israelites dwell.

raised up and was high. And the Lord of the sheep stood upon that tower, and they spread a full table before him (emphasis mine).

By contrast, the reconstruction of the city and the founding of the second temple are described in 89:73 in these terms:

And they began to build as before and they raised up that tower and it was called the high tower. And they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure (emphasis mine).

Two details stand out.⁵⁷ The first is that the initial tower is described as being large and elevated, and is twice referred to as being high, while the second tower is depicted in much humbler terms. This tower is not actually described as *having been* high; the author merely tells us that the tower was *called* the “high tower.” This wording suggests disappointment with the second tower, especially when it is compared with the temple of Solomon (cf. Ezra 3:12-13; 1 Esdras 5:63-64). Second, the Lord of the sheep stands upon the earlier tower and a full table is spread before him. In the account of the second temple, however, not only is the Lord not present, but the table that is placed before the tower is filled with polluted and impure foods. The condemnatory description of impure and polluted foods being offered at the temple is reminiscent of the situation described in Malachi 1:7-12, and reveals the author’s negative attitude toward the second temple, which has been impure from its inception.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 394-95.

⁵⁸ Loren Stuckenbruck (“Reading the Present” in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85-90),” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* [ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005], 95-96) has noted that the author of the Animal Visions has little affinity for the present, Second Temple. Even though the author presumably had been a witness to the desecration and subsequent restoration of the temple carried out by Judah Maccabeus, these events are passed over in silence. This is strikingly different from the portrayal of these events in 1 Macc 1:41-64; 4:36-61 and 2 Macc 6:1-6; 10:1-8.

A third, magnificent city is also in view in the Animal Visions (90:28-29). After the leaders of the people are condemned to the abyss, the Lord is depicted as the architect of a new house, which is greater in every way than the first. This new house, erected on the site of the first one, is portrayed as being larger and higher than the first house and adorned with new pillars, columns, and ornaments. A new tower is not described in the Animal Visions, but since the new house is described in terms which previously described the tower (“larger and higher”), it may well be that this new house possesses characteristics of both house and tower.⁵⁹ If so, the contrast between the future temple and the second temple is exponentially magnified, as the ideal future temple is as superior to the first temple as the first temple was to the second.⁶⁰

3.3.3 The Apocalypse of Weeks

Immediately following the Animal Visions and roughly contemporaneous to it is the Apocalypse of Weeks, which also reviews the history of the world from its inception

⁵⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 404-5; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 189-91. Patrick A. Tiller (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* [SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993], 40-51) has argued that the dearth of references to a tower in this passage is intentional, and that the ideal situation envisioned in the Animal Visions is a return to the Israelite camp in the wilderness. He cites Revelation 21:10-14 as a parallel; here the new Jerusalem is explicitly depicted as excluding a temple. But this explicit negation of a temple in the new city is not evident in the Animal Visions, and it is likely that the author, along with later readers of his work, would have assumed that a new temple and city were coterminous, even if this connection is not explicitly stated.

⁶⁰ Cf. John Kampen, "The Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJSup; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 27-28.

to the eschaton and which divides it into ten “weeks.”⁶¹ Several of these weeks refer to events surrounding the temple. The fifth and sixth weeks are the period of the Israelite monarchy, with the former including the building of the first temple under Solomon and the latter the destruction of the temple and subsequent exile of the people. The author’s present circumstances are contained in week seven, a period in which an elect people will emerge from an apostate generation and be given special wisdom and revelation.⁶² Following this, in the eighth week the temple of the kingdom of the Great One will be built for all generations forever. Afterwards righteousness will rule, judgment will take place, and a new heaven will appear.

In this sequence of events in the Apocalypse of Weeks there is a striking omission: no mention of the return of the exiles and the second temple. In fact, the whole period of post-exilic Israel is characterized as a time of apostasy, for it is only in the events of his own day that the author sees the dawning of a period of renewal.⁶³ Accordingly, the Apocalypse of Weeks may represent a furtherance of the critique of the Jerusalem temple, cult, and priesthood that is found in the Animal Visions. By not even naming the second temple in its historical review, it has potentially devalued this temple

⁶¹ The Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Epistle of Enoch, of which the Apocalypse is a part, are usually considered to have been written sometime in the late 160s B.C.E. See Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 49; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 141-49, 161-63.

⁶² Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 247) has argued that the Ethiopic transmission of the first few chapters was accidentally garbled at some stage and the Apocalypse was unnaturally divided. The discovery of the Enochic fragments at Qumran has demonstrated what scholars have suspected all along, that the original text was 93:1-10 + 91:11-17, and the entire Apocalypse belonged in chapter 93. This reading puts the ten weeks in their correct chronological order.

⁶³ Knibb, "Temple and Cult," 408.

and implied the continued apostasy of the post-exilic community in Israel. For the author of the Apocalypse of Weeks, a true restoration of the temple will only occur in a future age.

3.3.4 Testament of Moses

Accusations of moral impropriety and impurity resurface in the *Testament of Moses*, especially with respect to the Hasmonean kings/high priests. Though the *Testament of Moses* can clearly be dated to the late first century B.C.E., as chapters 6 and 7 refer specifically both to Herod and a partial destruction of the temple by Varus in 4 B.C.E.,⁶⁴ it is unlikely that the entire work stems from this period.⁶⁵ Since chapters 1-5 are a review of history from Moses to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and chapters 8-10 contain an apocalypse centered on an individual named Taxo, who is comparable to Mattathias, it has been argued that the document originated in the 160s B.C.E. during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.⁶⁶ Schwartz has given a plausible reading of the situation:

⁶⁴ John J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 344-49.

⁶⁵ See John J. Collins, "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 15-32; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "An Antiochan Date For the Testament of Moses," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 33-37; John J. Collins, "Some Remaining Traditio-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses," in *Studies in the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 38-43; Jonathan A. Goldstein, "The Testament of Moses: Its Contents, Its Origin, and Its Attestation in Josephus," in *Studies in the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 44-52.

⁶⁶ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 80-83; Collins, "Testaments," 347-49. For a discussion of the integrity and date of *Testament of Moses* that reaches different conclusions than Nickelsburg and Collins, see

whoever inserted chapters 6-7 into the larger narrative wanted to bring the document up to date and thus inserted his own material after chapter 5 in order to draw a close parallel between the corrupt priests of the Antiochene era and the priests of his own day.⁶⁷

Though the indictment of the Jerusalem priests is similar in both sections, here I will restrict my comments to the parts of the document that originated in the Antiochene era, and leave a discussion of chapters 6 and 7 for later.

In the *Testament of Moses*, charges are leveled against specific kings (the Hasmoneans) who will “avoid justice and turn to iniquity . . . defile the house of their worship with pollutions . . . and go whoring after foreign gods (5:3).” Following this, the author calls into question contemporary priestly practices, asserting that these leaders “will not follow the truth of God, but some people will defile the altar with the offerings they will bring to the Lord, [*sc.* people] who are not priests, but slaves born of slaves.” Two accusations should be noted. First, the Hasmoneans are indicted for the sacrifices that they bring. In the eyes of the author of *Testament of Moses*, these offerings are polluted due to the moral transgressions of the priests. Second, alongside the accusation that these priest-kings have defiled the sanctuary is the biting polemic against them that they are not really priests at all, but rather, slaves. While this charge cannot literally reflect historical reality (slaves could not, in any circumstance, be high priests), it does seem to mirror Pharisaic discomfort over the lineage of the Hasmoneans. According to

Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 106-28. Below I follow his text and translation, though not his conclusions.

⁶⁷ Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 26-27.

Josephus, some Pharisees suggested to Hyrcanus that he resign from the office of high priest, for it was believed that his mother was a war captive, and thus most likely a slave (*Ant.* 13.291-92).⁶⁸ According to this author, not only did the moral turpitude of these priests render them unfit to perform their cultic duties, but they were descendants of slaves and ineligible to hold this office.⁶⁹

3.3.5 The Qumran Scrolls

The first Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered in 1948, opening up a new window into the Judaism of the Second Temple period. How members of this community viewed themselves vis-à-vis the temple and priesthood in Jerusalem will occupy a significant portion of the following chapter, and I will leave a detailed discussion until then. Here, though, through a representative sample of texts from Qumran, it will be shown that the critique of the temple and priesthood at Qumran is very much in line with other criticisms current in their day. In this section I will discuss 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document*, and in the latter section *Pesher Habakkuk*.

⁶⁸ In the Greek and Roman empires, most slaves were either war captives or their descendants. See Thomas Wiedemann, *Greek and Roman Slavery* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981), 6-7; cf. Joseph Zias and Azriel Gorski, "Capturing a Beautiful Woman at Masada," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 69 (2006): 45-48.

⁶⁹ Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 191-94.

3.3.6 4QMMT

4QMMT is a halakhic work which recounts some of the continuing disputes between those living at Qumran and the priestly establishment in Jerusalem.⁷⁰ Most agree that it was originally composed during the days of the sect's inception, with the earliest of the six manuscripts found at Qumran dating to the second half of the second century B.C.E.⁷¹ Even though the dissent from temple practices is serious, the tone of the letter is conciliatory. At the end of the document, the author of 4QMMT urges his recipient to cast aside the error of his way and embrace the author's halakhic understanding on various matters, stating: "We have written to you some of the works of the Torah which we think are good for you and for your people, for we s[a]w that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law. Reflect on all these matters...so that at the end of time you may rejoice in finding that some of our words are true."⁷²

Of central importance to the author of 4QMMT is the purity, or lack thereof, of those officiating at the temple. Once again the issue of illegitimate marriage is a divisive one. This discussion of marriage begins in line 75, where it states: "concerning the

⁷⁰ Yaacov Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran Cave 4. V. Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (ed. Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell; Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 185-200; Bohak, "Theopolis," 13-16.

⁷¹ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 89. Cf. 4QpPs^a, which may refer to 4QMMT. 4Q171 4:8-9 refers to "the law which he [the Teacher of Righteousness] sent to him [the Wicked Priest]." Although not very weighty evidence, if the identification is correct it may further support the identification of the "Wicked Priest" with Jonathan and that the letter was composed around the year 152 B.C.E.; see Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 53-66.

⁷² 4Q398, frag. 14-17, col. 2.

practice of illegal marriage that exists among the people” (ועל הזנות הנעשה בתוך העם).⁷³ The ensuing halakhot (lines 77-78) are concerned with the biblical injunction against the mixing of differing kinds, and the examples given are mating animals, sewing clothes, and sowing seeds in a field. Line 79 then concludes with: “Because they (Israel) are holy (קודשים), and the sons of Aaron are [most holy] (קודש קודשים).” This contrast between Israel and the priests sets up the controversial reconstruction in lines 80-82. Qimron and Strugnell read the last lines as follows:

But you know that some of the priests and [the laity mingle with each other] (העם מתערבים). [And they] unite with each other and pollute the [holy] seed [as well as] their own [seed] with women whom they are forbidden to marry (הזנות).⁷⁴

According to the reconstruction of Qimron and Strugnell, the condemned practice is marriage between priests and fellow, non-priestly Israelites. By filling the lacuna with the phrase *העם מתערבים*, they have insisted that the issue is one of priests marrying unsuitable Israelite women.

The view of Qimron and Strugnell has not gone unchallenged, with many preferring to see intermarriage with Gentiles as the main issue.⁷⁵ However, since the immediate context appears to be a discussion of gradations of holiness within Israel, it seems likely that Qimron and Strugnell are correct that the issue is that of priestly

⁷³ In this particular discussion I follow the text and translation of Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V. Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 54-57, 171-75. At Qumran, the term *זנות* sometimes carried the more restricted meaning of “illicit marriage” rather than the more general “prostitution” or “fornication.” See David J. Clines, ed., *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-), 3.97, 123.

⁷⁵ For a fuller discussion of this issue, see Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phineas,” 6-12; cf. Harrington, “Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT,” 117.

marriage to Israelite women of non-priestly descent. Divisions within Israel also appear in other documents from Qumran, and the stringent understanding of halakha found in 4QMMT suggests that a differentiation within Israel would seem quite likely here as well.

Discussions of ritual purity are certainly not limited to the matter of marriage. Alongside an argument for the observance of a solar calendar are nearly twenty matters of halakhic disagreement, many of which focus on the maintenance of temple purity,⁷⁶ and Baumgarten has noted that in every case of halakhic dispute, the position that is attacked appears to be the one later espoused in the writings of the rabbis.⁷⁷ As Schiffman observes, the differing halakhic understandings seen in 4QMMT may represent some of our earliest evidence for beliefs which were later advocated by the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, and thus provide some of our earliest evidence for sectarianism in the second century B.C.E.⁷⁸

Additionally, 4QMMT may also accuse the temple overseers of financial irregularities. In 4QMMT C 4-9, the author claims that “we” have segregated ourselves from the majority of the people because of violence (חַמַּס), crimes of fornication (זִנוּיָה), and

⁷⁶ Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997)75; Florentino García Martínez, "The Men of the Dead Sea," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera; trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 32-33.

⁷⁷ Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 75-80; cf. Lester L. Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," 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* (ed. Moshe J. Bernstein et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 90-98.

⁷⁸ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of Tevul Yom," *DSD* 1 (1994): 285-99; cf. Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," 89-108.

מעל. Qimron and Strugnell translated the latter term as “treachery,” but as Eshel and Schwartz have pointed out, a better construal of מעל in Lev 5:15 is “misappropriation of temple funds,” which is also what the term מעילה means in the Mishnah. Discussion of מעילה provides the impetus for the tractate of the same name in the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Babylonian Talmud.⁷⁹ If so, then, it would appear that alongside the halakhic disagreements that resulted in the community’s separation from the multitude of Israel were also very concrete allegations of financial misappropriation of temple funds. In 4QMMT, the accusation is quite general in nature, referring to the entire nation of Israel. In later Qumran literature, however, this charge, as well as a condemnation of the hoarding of wealth, is picked up and applied more specifically to the Jerusalem priesthood.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Eshel, “4QMMT and the History,” 60 n. 24; Daniel R. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 76. Cf. Jacob Milgrom (*Leviticus 1-16* [AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991], 320) who remarks that “all cases of *ma’al* fall under two major categories: sacrilege against sancta and sacrilege involving oaths.”

⁸⁰ See CD 6:15-16; 1QHab 1:6; 8:11; 9:3-9; 11:17-12:10; 2 Macc 7-9, 32, 39; *PsSol* 8:11.

3.3.7 Damascus Document⁸¹

A harsh appraisal of the Jerusalem priests is also seen in the *Damascus Document*.⁸² Though Israel at large is said to be living in sin, ensnared and deceived by the “three nets of Belial” (4.15), a whole litany of charges is leveled against the Jerusalem priesthood in columns four to six. Beginning in CD 4.20, Belial is said to have been set loose against Israel, as predicted by the prophet Isaiah. In the same context the opponents of the Qumran covenanters, the “builders of the wall,” are said to be

caught twice in fornication: by taking two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation is male and female he created them, and the ones who went into the ark went in two by two into the ark. . . . And they also defiled the temple, for they did not keep apart in accordance with the law, but instead lay with her

⁸¹ It is difficult to ascertain a date for the composition of the *Damascus Document*. 4Q266, which has been dated on paleographic grounds to the early first century B.C.E., provides the earliest manuscript evidence for this document. The work, then, must have been complete by at least the end of the second century B.C.E. Since, however, CD supplies important information of the early history of the sect, it seems correct to place the composition of this document in the mid second century B.C.E. For a review of the fragments, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (ed. Emanuel Tov; DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), passim. For an earlier date of composition, see Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 490-97, 542-45; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 119-29; for a later date, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Damascus Document," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1.169-70; Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Document to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 141-232.

⁸² There is some question as to how CD fits alongside the rest of the Qumran documents, especially 1QS. For a brief discussion, see Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995), 6-7. Baumgarten and Schwartz note the complex relationship that exists between the majority of the Dead Sea Scrolls and CD. In contrast to the understanding of most of the scrolls, the text implies that the community has established itself in Damascus (6.5; 8.21), and that it includes women (14.15-16; 16.10-12) and children (7.7; 15.5). It also assumes that members of the community have private income from which they contribute to the communal good (14.12-13). In addition, alongside some of the bitter polemic directed at the temple and the Jerusalem priests is the possibility that the temple is pure, that this purity should be maintained, and that the members of the community participate in the cult (11.19-12.2; 16.13ff). Baumgarten and Schwartz do not seem to appreciate all of the harmonization attempts that have been made, but they assert that it is best to consider CD a “product of the same general movement” as the rest of Qumran, but one, at least in comparison to a scroll such as 1QS, that was “less completely separated from the outside world and its norms.”

who sees the blood of her menstrual flow. And each man takes as a wife the daughter of his brother and the daughter of his sister. But Moses said: Do not approach your mother's sister, she is a blood relation of your mother (CD 4.20-5.9).

Once again the issue of improper marriage is seen to be a principal reason for the perceived corruption of those in charge of the temple. Here, however, the priests in Jerusalem are castigated for marrying their nieces, a practice which was not prohibited in the Torah but deemed a serious transgression by those at Qumran (cf. 11QT 66:16-17=4Q524 15-20 4; 4Q251 12 2-3). A charge of improper sexual relations between priest and wife is also seen in the assertion that priests were having sexual contact with their wives while the latter were having an issue of blood.⁸³ This charge of menstrual impurity against the priests was already evident in our discussion of the Book of the Watchers, and it will appear below in the *Psalms of Solomon*. For the author of CD, the priests that presided over the temple were not only impure due to perceived incestuous marriages, but also for performing rituals while in a state of ritual defilement through contact with the menstrual blood of their wives. Directly following these accusations is a fierce polemic against the misinterpretation of the covenant and law on the part of these priests. On account of their continued insistence on prophesying deceit and rebellion against God's precepts, the land has become desolate (5.12-21).

While other scrolls are more explicit in their insistence on the solar calendar, traces of this understanding are also seen in the *Damascus Document*. Those in

⁸³ *M. Nid.* 4:1-3 accuses the Sadducees of a similarly lenient interpretation of this biblical injunction. See Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting* (ed. John J. Collins; JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67-68.

Jerusalem are warned that they should take care to keep the Sabbath day “according to its exact interpretation,” and observe the festivals and the day of fasting “according to what was discovered by those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus” (6.18-19). This instruction to observe the Sabbath and holy days correctly presumes that there were some who did not do so. While it is conceivable that this charge is specifically related to praxis on these special days, the sect’s continual insistence upon calendrical issues renders it quite likely that the issue is directly related not only to *how* the holidays were to be observed, but also to *when*.

In addition, the Jerusalem priests are denounced for their love of money and economic exploitation of the downtrodden. Following a reference to Malachi 1:10 and its excoriation of the priests, the author of CD warns these priests to abstain from “wicked wealth which defiles,” from the wealth of the temple, and from stealing from the poor, namely, orphans and widows (6:15-7:1). According to CD, this priestly avarice was made even more reprehensible by the fact that these priests had scorned the Torah’s mandate to look after those less fortunate, choosing instead to oppress those most directly in need of their help.

3.3.8 The Rise of Jewish Sects

The major ruptures in the fabric of Judean culture and religion in the 160s B.C.E. also ushered in an age of Jewish sectarianism.⁸⁴ The extant sources do not allow for a

⁸⁴ Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 124-73; Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus*, 463-499, 545-554; Sanders, *Judaism*, 13-29; Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 18-33; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 119-33.

comprehensive account of the emergence of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, although it seems likely that the events of the 160s B.C.E. served to crystallize prior disagreements and distinctions between various groups of people.⁸⁵ While the interests of these three groups were multifaceted, it seems clear that disagreement over the legitimacy of the incumbent Hasmonean high priest, as well as the halakhah that governed the temple rituals, played an important role in the early history of all three sects.⁸⁶ As Baumgarten has noted: “In effect, much of sectarian strife is a fight for control of the temple.”⁸⁷ To properly understand this strife, I will briefly rehearse the genealogy of the high priests prior to this period.

Many ancient sources attest to the importance of Zadokite lineage for the presiding high priest. In Ezekiel’s vision of a new temple, all of the priests were expected to be of the line of Zadok (44.15), and the lineage of high priests in 1 Chronicles 6 is traced back to Zadok, Phineas, and Aaron. In addition, Josephus reports that the high priests during the Persian and Hellenistic periods were of the line of

⁸⁵ For a discussion of the pre-history of these Jewish sects, see Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 137-43; Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 18-28; cf. Kampen (“Books of the Maccabees,” 11-13) for bibliography on divisive tendencies in the third and early second centuries B.C.E. prior to Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmoneans. For a discussion of how the Hasidim may have splintered into several parties, including the Essenes and Pharisees, see Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 175-218.

⁸⁶ Shaye J. D. Cohen, “The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism,” *HUCA* 55 (1984): 27-53, esp. 43-48; Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 137-51; Bohak, “Theopolis,” 12.

⁸⁷ Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 69; cf. Kampen, “Books of the Maccabees,” 21, who observes: “Reactions to the temple, its laws, its hierarchy and the attached definitions of the sacred, of what is pure and what is impure, are pivotal in the definition and rise of Jewish sectarianism.”

Zadok.⁸⁸ This all changed when Menelaus replaced Jason as high priest in 172 B.C.E. Though Antiochus' replacement of Onias with Jason caused some consternation, Jason could still claim Zadokite pedigree.⁸⁹ Menelaus, however, may not have been from the tribe of Levi, let alone of the line of Zadok, and his term as high priest ended the monopoly of the high priesthood by the house of Zadok.⁹⁰ In subsequent literature there is no mention of Zadokite lineage; the Hasmoneans were of the line of Jehoiarib and there is no evidence that any of the high priests during the Roman period claimed Zadokite descent.⁹¹ This usurpation of proper priestly lineage did not go unnoticed. As Bohak has observed, "a nation with only one Temple could afford no mistakes in its priests' performance of that Temple's rituals, and every tiny detail assumed enormous significance on the national scale."⁹² In the years during which the respected Zadokite

⁸⁸ Ralph Marcus, *Josephus* (LCL VII; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 733f. Joachim Schaper ("Numismatik, Epigraphik, alttestamentliche Exegese und die Frage nach der politischen Verfassung des achämenidischen Juda," *ZDPV* 118 [2002]: 150-68) agrees with Josephus on this point, arguing that the priests in Malachi's day were Zadokites who, under the aegis of the high priest, ran the temple in the Persian and Hellenistic periods and already held some political power alongside their religious responsibilities.

⁸⁹ Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 253.

⁹⁰ 2 Macc. 4:23 states that Menelaus was the brother of Simon, and 2 Macc 3:4 relates that Simon was of the tribe of Benjamin. In addition, 1 Macc. 7:14 notes that the Hasidim were willing to accept Alcimus as high priest because he was an Aaronite, which implies that the former priest was not; see Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 21-22.

⁹¹ Following LeMoyne and Jeremias, Sanders (*Judaism*, 25-26) suggests that two later appointees, Hananel and Pinhas of Habta, were of Zadokite lineage. More recently, Alison Schofield and James C. VanderKam, ("Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites?," *JBL* 124 [2005]: 73-87) have suggested that the Hasmoneans were of the line of Zadok. Though intriguing, the final line of the article ("We have considerable evidence to believe that the Hasmoneans were a Zadokite family and no evidence to the contrary") is much stronger than the evidence suggests. Any attempted link between the Hasmoneans and Zadokite ancestry founders at the same spot: the Hasmoneans never claimed Zadokite ancestry, nor did any of the priests in the Roman era. This legitimization would certainly have aided their claim to the office of high priest.

line held the position of high priest, conflicts over proper ritual observance in the temple seem to have been kept to a minimum. But with the usurpation of the high priesthood by a series of Hellenizing high priests, followed by a family of obscure priests from Modiin, the situation was to change profoundly.⁹³ Questions of legitimate authority and proper temple protocol now became pressing.

Having lost their hold on the office of high priest, those of Zadokite ancestry appear to have splintered into several groups, each with a different response to the new social reality in which they found themselves. Onias, the last Zadokite high priest, fled to Egypt and founded a rival temple there.⁹⁴ Other Zadokites, such as the Essenes, continued to live in Jerusalem and the surrounding area.⁹⁵ The views of the larger Essene movement are for the most part unknown, with our information about this sect deriving almost exclusively from a small, dissident branch of Essenes who viewed Jerusalem and the temple as defiled and removed themselves from it, settling near the Dead Sea at modern day Khirbet Qumran.⁹⁶

⁹² Bohak, "Theopolis," 15. The existence of other temples than that in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period will be the subject of Chapter Four.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 12-13.

⁹⁴ See Chapter Four for further details.

⁹⁵ Evidence for this is found in *J.W.* 5.145, where Josephus refers to a gate of the Essenes in the southwestern corner of the city. Excavations in the last several decades have confirmed that a gate did indeed exist in this section of the wall, most likely stemming from the early Herodian era. Presumably, numerous Essenes lived in this section of the city or in nearby villages southwest of the city; see Levine, *Jerusalem*, 130.

⁹⁶ For the identification of those living at Qumran as Essenes, see James C. VanderKam, "Identity and History of the Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 488-99. Although the Essenes appear to have become a recognizable movement in the middle of the second century B.C.E., Qumran does not

The scrolls found in and around the caves at Qumran reveal the strong connections which existed between the Zadokite priests and the community, as the “sons of Zadok” are said to have dwelt within the community (1QS 5.2, 9; 9.14; 1QSa 1.2; 1QSB 3.22; CD 3.21; 4QFlor 1.17).⁹⁷ In light of the importance attributed to the Zadokites at Qumran, it seems likely that the leader of this sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, was himself a prominent member of a Zadokite family.⁹⁸ The scrolls themselves reveal a high degree of animosity between the Teacher of Righteousness and a figure known as the “Wicked Priest” now in residence in Jerusalem. As a result, it is clear that the community at Qumran removed themselves from the temple and city, preferring life in the wilderness to participation in a temple they perceived to be corrupt. Not all Essenes, though, seem to have felt as strongly about the corruption of temple and priesthood as did the members at Qumran. Some appear to have remained in Jerusalem, with others content to conduct business in the city.⁹⁹

appear to have been inhabited until the end of the second century B.C.E. On this, see Eric M. Meyers, “An Evaluation of Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁹⁷ Pace Dimant (“Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 545 n. 292) who argues that the community at Qumran had appropriated this title, and that it was a “conceptual rather than genealogical designation.”

⁹⁸ On the various theories surrounding the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, see Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*, 212-20; G. J. Bunge, “Zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Untergangs der Oniaden und des Aufstiegs der Hasmonäer,” *JSJ* 6 (1975): 1-46, esp. 27-46; P. A. Rainbow, “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness,” *JJS* 48 (1997): 30-52; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 245-51; Maria Brutti, *The Development of the High Priesthood During the Pre-Hasmonean Period: History, Ideology, Theology* (JSJSup 108; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 101-107.

⁹⁹ On this point, see footnote 96 above. On the Essenes more generally, see Chapter Four, sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.3.

A second sect whose origins seem to be bound up in the removal of the Zadokites from the high priestly position and who most likely reflect a similar opposition to the Hasmonean assumption of the high priesthood is the Sadducees. Very little is known of the Sadducees in general, and even less of their beginnings.¹⁰⁰ Two pieces of evidence, however, lend support to the idea that they were originally founded in opposition to the Hasmoneans. First, their very name has often been seen as providing a clue, for “Sadducee” may be derived from the proper name Zadok.¹⁰¹ Second, our first substantial information about the Sadducean party is found in Josephus’ description of the reign of John Hyrcanus, five or six decades removed from the Maccabean rebellion. In this vignette, at least some Sadducees are depicted as fomenting conflict between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, with whom he had formerly been friendly (*Ant.* 13.288-300). Having fallen out with the Pharisees, Hyrcanus now allied himself more closely with the Sadducean party, whose members seem to have renounced their former opposition to the Hasmonean hold on sacerdotal leadership and to have reconciled themselves to Hasmonean rule by Hyrcanus’ time, fifty to sixty years after the original dispute. In the

¹⁰⁰ This is largely a consequence of the fact that, in contrast to the situation with regard to the Essenes and Pharisees, no Sadducean writings have been preserved. What is known stems almost wholly from Josephus and the New Testament.

¹⁰¹ Jean Le Moyne, *Les Sadducéens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972), 155-63; Sanders, *Judaism*, 25; Günter Stemberger, "The Sadducees: Their History and Doctrines," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period* (ed. William Horbury et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 429-35.

beginning, though, the Sadducees, along with the Essenes, seem to have been opposed to the Hasmonean hold on the position of high priest.¹⁰²

The origins of the Pharisaic party are also often traced to the rise of the Hasmoneans. Opposition to the Hasmonean usurpation of the high priesthood seems to have played a lesser function in the formation of this sect than was the case with the Essenes and Sadducees, but two issues relating to the temple and high priest played important roles in their formative years: high priestly lineage and the observance of the law at the temple.

The first real mention of the Pharisees occurs during the reign of John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13.288-98). Josephus describes them as having a “great . . . power over the multitude” and claims that they “delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers” (*Ant.* 13.288, 297). They were on excellent terms with the ruler Hyrcanus, whom Josephus describes as their friend and disciple, although it is unclear whether their great influence attracted Hyrcanus to them or whether their connection with Hyrcanus was what imbued them with their authority. Whatever the case, the relationship soured when Eleazar asked Hyrcanus to lay down the priesthood due to his illegitimate lineage (the accusation was that his mother had been a captive).¹⁰³ Angered, Hyrcanus “abolish[ed] the decrees they [the Pharisees] had imposed on the

¹⁰² Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 25; Sanders, *Judaism*, 25-26. For an argument identifying those at Qumran with the Sadducees, see Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 73-76.

¹⁰³ A similar story of a Pharisee rebuking a king is recounted in BT *Kiddushin* 66a, except in this case the name of the king is Yannai, or Alexander Jannaeus. Since Josephus is so much closer in time to the events of the second century B.C.E., it seems reasonable to follow Josephus' account rather than that of the Talmud. As discussed above, the *Testament of Moses* may have been drawing from a similar tradition in its denunciation of the priests as slaves.

people” and subsequently joined the Sadducean party at the behest of his Sadducean friend Jonathan (*Ant* 13.293-6). At least in the account provided by Josephus, the decisive issue between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees seems not to have been that of Zadokite descent, or lack thereof; rather, due to a supposedly illegitimate marriage, the Hasmonean high priest lacked the proper pedigree. This presumed marital infraction, descent from a captive, was considered by at least some of the Pharisees to be enough to disqualify Hyrcanus from the priesthood.

The second instance of early Pharisaic disagreement with Hasmonean governance of the temple and hold on the priesthood concerned the interpretation of the law and proper halakhic protocol in the temple service and maintenance of the cult.¹⁰⁴ At its root, ancient Jewish sectarianism was an issue of correct worship at the temple. Evidence for the battle over proper interpretation and practice of the law is found in 4QMMT, which appears to provide several instances of disagreement between the positions later known to be espoused by the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. For our purposes now, it is enough to say that correct performance of the temple cult depended largely on how the laws governing the temple ritual were interpreted. Differences in interpretation led to sharp disagreements over the very efficacy of the rituals undertaken in the temple.

The end of the Zadokite monopoly on the high priesthood, and the subsequent emergence of the Hasmoneans, were doubtlessly viewed with exhilaration and

¹⁰⁴ Joachim Schaper, "The Pharisees," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period* (ed. William Horbury et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 405-8.

dissatisfaction by different parties.¹⁰⁵ Those who were dissatisfied distanced themselves, to various degrees and during different periods, from the temple and its service, with the city of Jerusalem often central to much of this sectarian activity. The struggles between the Pharisees and Sadducees in Josephus and the New Testament, the disputes between all three groups in 4QMMT, and their common opposition to proceedings at the temple all suggest that they lived in close proximity to each other. All seem to have agreed that the current high priestly situation at the temple was less than ideal, but sharp disagreement over the correct halakhic practice at the temple, as well as questions over the legitimacy of the current high priest, generated opposition to the temple and to each other. At least in some quarters, high priests who could not trace their descent through the proper channels were not viewed as being suitable for the position of high priest, regardless of their personal piety.

3.3.9 Conclusions about the Period of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Rise of the Maccabees

The mid-second century B.C.E. was a time of great transition and upheaval, as the draconian policies of Antiochus Epiphanes and concomitant rise of the Hasmonean family combined to dramatically affect Jewish religious and political life. These divisive developments contributed greatly to a growing disillusionment with the temple and scorn for its presiding priesthood.

¹⁰⁵ Levine, *Jerusalem*, 120.

In a manner similar to Malachi and Tobit, two texts express unease at the state of the present temple. The Animal Visions denigrate the second temple by setting up a pair of comparisons between it and the first and (future) third temples, asserting that the present temple is impure even from its inception and greatly inferior to the city-temple to come. A different tactic is employed in the Apocalypse of Weeks. In its review of history it omits any mention of the return of the exiles and the rebuilding of the temple. By not even deigning to mention the existence of the Second Temple, the author of the Apocalypse of Weeks has seemingly devalued it. Instead, and in concert with the Animal Visions, the focus is on a future and glorious temple.

As happened in the earlier period, harsher appraisal is reserved for the Jerusalem priesthood. Alongside accusations of general moral misconduct in the Animal Visions, *Testament of Moses* and *Damascus Document*, specific allegations surface regarding the fitness and legitimacy of these priests. Improper sexual relations are once again contentious issues, with specific indictments on this count found in *Jubilees*, 4QMMT, and CD. Possessing a highly developed sense of communal holiness, the author of *Jubilees* understands the actions and attitudes of even one member as having consequences for all, with the high priest (along with his fellow priests) singled out for his defilement of the holy of holies through sexual transgressions.

In addition, the priests are continually indicted for choosing the wrong marriage partners. Though *Jubilees* admonishes the nation as a whole to avoid intermarriage with foreign women, a stricter marital injunction seems to be applied to the priesthood. This is made overtly clear in 4QMMT, where the discussion of priestly marriage arises in the

context of gradations of holiness within Israel. Accordingly, the priests, who stand at the center of the concentric circles of holiness, could only be partnered with those of equal holiness. In the language of 4QMMT, the “most holy” priests were to be separate from “holy” Israel. But even these endogamous relationships were not always met with approval, as the *Damascus Document* indicts some of the Jerusalem priests for marrying their nieces. Though here it is certain that the priests chose wives of the proper pedigree, marriage to nieces appears to have been a bit too close genealogically for those at Qumran. In the eyes of the accusers, these sexual transgressions had the effect of polluting the sacrifices, rendering them inefficacious.

Moreover, both texts from Qumran vehemently denounce the greed, arrogance, and financial misconduct of the temple priests. While 4QMMT views the general charge of misappropriation of temple funds (גזל) to be the responsibility of the whole people, implicit in this censure is that the overseers of the temple have allowed these financial irregularities to occur. The *Damascus Document*, in contrast, is much more specific in its finger-pointing. While the wealth of the priests seems to be particularly irksome to the author of this work, the means by which this wealth is attained appears to be what motivates his denunciation. Not only are the priests warned to abstain from the wealth of the temple, which implies that they are helping themselves to the money from the temple coffers, but their economic prosperity is also said to have come at the expense of the poor, with the widows and orphans explicitly singled out. In the eyes of those at Qumran, the moral bankruptcy of the priests in Jerusalem extended to misuse of the temple funds and the exploitation of the poor.

Disputes over proper priestly lineage also played a role in the emergence of the various sectarian groups in the period. Though not scripturally mandated, the Zadokite line had been firmly ensconced in the office of high priest for centuries. However, Menelaus' disruption of this venerable tradition, along with the usurpation of the office by the Hasmoneans, confirmed the removal of the Zadokites from this office. Finding themselves on the outside looking in, at least some of the priests who could claim Zadokite lineage protested their removal. Those involved in the founding of the temple at Leontopolis and the establishment of the Qumran community are two examples of Zadokite groups whose dissent resulted in a physical removal from the temple in Jerusalem, whereas the Sadducees retained stronger ties to the temple. In a slightly different manner, the Pharisees, and perhaps the author of the *Testament of Moses*, also opposed the Hasmoneans on the grounds of priestly pedigree, for the *Testament of Moses* excoriates the priests of its day for being slaves, and at least some of the Pharisees are said to have opposed Hyrcanus due to his possible descent from a captive, since under no circumstances could the high priest be a slave or a descendant of one (e.g. *Ant.* 3.276; *Ag. Ap.* 1.35)

The issue of the calendar also began to take on greater importance.¹⁰⁶ The issue is twofold: which calendrical system should be observed and who had the authority to

¹⁰⁶ The importance of the calendar in the late third and second centuries B.C.E. has been forcefully stated by Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaeian Desert," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 163-64; "No barrier appears to be more substantial and fraught with heavier consequences than differences in calendar calculation. An alteration of any one of the dates that regulate the course of the year inevitably produces a breakup of communal life, impairing the coordination between the behaviour of man and his fellow, and abolishes that synchronization of habits and activities which is the foundation of a properly functioning social order. Whosoever celebrates his own Sabbath, and does not observe the festivals of the year at the

decide this matter? Prior to the Antiochene era, the merits of a solar calendar had been either assumed (*Aramaic Levi*) or promoted (*Astronomical Book*). Disagreement over the calendar, however, became much more acute in the Antiochene and early Maccabean years, with *Jubilees*, 4QMMT, and the *Damascus Document* all polemicizing against a calendrical system which differed from a 364-day year and insisting that the solar calendar had been ordained by God from ancient times. The issue of the calendar and its observance is complex and cannot be fully engaged here.¹⁰⁷ It is intriguing, however, that many of the texts surveyed above which are critical of the Jerusalem priesthood also argue strongly against a particular type of non-solar calendar. Indeed, specific references in some of the documents from Qumran make it clear that a different calendar, one that was luni-solar, was now in use at the temple, and that this calendar was governing general religious observance and controlling the dates and times for major festivals and days.¹⁰⁸ The intensity of the opposition to this system of calendrical reckoning suggests

same time as the community in which he lives, removes himself from his fellows and ceases to be a member of the social body to which he hitherto belonged." Cf. Michael E. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19, no. 2 (1988): 159-70; Wright, "Fear the Lord," 204.

¹⁰⁷ On the importance of the calendar, see Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques," *VT* 3 (1953): 250-64; eadem, "La date de la dernière cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 140-73; eadem, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine," *VT* 7 (1957): 35-61; eadem, *The Date of the Last Supper* (trans. Isaac Rafferty; Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965); James C. VanderKam, "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364 Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 380-411; *ibid.*, "2 Maccabees 6, 7a and the Calendrical Change in Jerusalem," *JSJ* 12, no. 1 (1981): 52-74; *ibid.*, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998); Philip R. Davies, "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory," *CBQ* 45, no. 1 (1983): 80-89; Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period*, 477-84; Hanan Eshel, "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 102-10.

¹⁰⁸ E.g., 4Q394 3-7 col. 1; CD 6.18-19; 1QpHab 11.4-8. The discussion in *m. Roš Hoš* 2:8-9 similarly revolves around the issue of calendrical control. In this case Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua are in

that this was a recent development, and that adherence to the luni-solar calendar in the temple precincts differed from the understanding and wishes of many dissenters in this period.

As we have seen, disappointment with the temple and a deepening critique of the Jerusalem priesthood continued in some circles in the mid-second century B.C.E. While many of the same concerns and criticisms of the previous period reappear, fresh accusations now surface as well, such as the issue of Zadokite descent and accusations of financial impropriety. The tone has also shifted, as the general disparagement of the priests and their oversight of the temple is sketched in starker terms. The depth of the discontent is well illustrated by the rise of Jewish sectarian groups, each deeply concerned with the present state of affairs in the temple.

3.4 The Late Second Century B.C.E. to the Destruction of the Temple

Though the Hasmonean victory over the Seleucids and their assumption of the high priesthood provided a modicum of stability to Jewish national life, it did nothing to bring to an end the critique of the religious center by those unsatisfied with the current state of affairs. We have already seen some of the early criticisms of the Hasmonean high priests and their control over the affairs of the temple. In what follows, I will discuss the continuing negative appraisals of the high priest and Jerusalem priesthood up through the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. and its immediate aftermath.

disagreement over the appearance of a new moon, and the consequence is that Joshua reckons the Day of Atonement to be on a different day than did Gamaliel. Cf. *m. 'Ed. 7:7*.

3.4.1 Second Maccabees

Second Maccabees, dated to the end of the second century B.C.E., documents the history of the Jews in Jerusalem and its environs amidst the stormy events of the early second century B.C.E., from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to the death of Nicanor.¹⁰⁹ Though highlighting the role of the Maccabean family in the battle against those who would transform Judaism into an overtly Hellenistic religion, 2 Maccabees is primarily interested in the temple and its holiness, even after it has been desecrated.¹¹⁰

The major events involving the activities of the Hasmoneans recorded in 2 Maccabees are not of great concern here. Rather, I am interested in the ways in which this book continues some of the previous polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood. In particular, there is an emphasis on the arrogance of certain priests and their pilfering of temple funds. 2 Maccabees 4:7-9 recounts Jason's bribery of Antiochus Epiphanes in order to unseat Onias and receive the office of high priest. In turn, Menelaus offered a higher bribe and was granted the high priestly role. The state of affairs was such in this

¹⁰⁹ The author of 2 Maccabees explicitly states that his account is an abridgement of a five-volume work by Jason of Cyrene (2:19-32). For dating and relevant bibliography, see Kampen, "Books of the Maccabees," 19.

¹¹⁰ Cohen ("The Temple and the Synagogue," 309) has suggested that 2 Macc 1:10-2:18; *Ant.* 13.282-3; and *t. Sota* 13.5 are similar in that all seem to be propaganda intended to convince fellow Jews that the temple really was sacred even after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes. On the temple in 2 Maccabees, see József Zsengellér, "Maccabees and Temple Propaganda," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJSup; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 183-87; Kampen, "Books of the Maccabees," 16-19; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 13-17, 24-26; Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 47-76.

period that “the priests were no longer intent upon their service at the altar. Despising the sanctuary and neglecting the sacrifices, they hurried to take part in the unlawful proceedings in the wrestling arena” (4:14). We are not told whether these incidents of bribery led to any public outcry, although it is probable that significant parties within the Jewish population of Palestine would have been unhappy with the course of events. Onias himself did not publicly oppose the two usurpers until it was discovered that Menelaus had been pilfering gold vessels from the temple and selling them in Tyre. This exposure of Menelaus’ actions proved fatal for him.¹¹¹ In a similar incident, Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus, was found to be stealing treasures from the temple, and in the ensuing opposition by “the populace,” Lysimachus lost his life (4:39-42). Lysimachus’s epitaph in 2 Maccabees 4:42, “the temple robber (τὸν ἱερόσυλον),” left little room for debate as to his chief offense.

The above anecdotes reveal two items of importance in our documentation of opposition to the high priest and priestly elite in Jerusalem. First, the accusations in 2 Maccabees revolve around monetary issues. The temptation to pocket some of the temple’s vast treasures proved too much for Menelaus and his brother Lysimachus, and for this dishonesty they were roundly condemned. Second, the accusation of misappropriation of funds was specifically tied to two individuals. Though some later documents display a tendency to either recycle earlier charges and apply them anew to the current priestly leadership, or to generalize specific accusations and apply them to all

¹¹¹ So 2 Macc 4.32-34. For a discussion of discrepancies in the sources as to the exact details of Onias’s death, see Chapter Four.

of the contemporary priestly leadership, the initial charges in 2 Maccabees center on a few select personalities.

3.4.2 Greek Testament of Levi¹¹²

In an earlier discussion I noted the anti-priestly polemic found in *Aramaic Levi*. This critique is deepened and expanded in the Greek *Testament of Levi*, as this document decidedly attacks the contemporary priesthood in Jerusalem. First, the second half of the *Testament of Levi* (9:9; 10:2-4; 14:5-8; 16:1-5; 17:8-11) catalogues the failure of the priesthood in a similar fashion to that seen above. Though 9:9-10 broadcasts very general warnings about defilement, in 14:5-15:1 the author enumerates the specific transgressions of these priests and excoriates them for their unseemly sexual mores:

¹¹² The dating of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is notoriously difficult, mostly due to the question of whether or not these texts are of a Jewish or Christian provenance. As the documents now stand, they are clearly Christian. Examples are numerous enough: *T. Levi* 14:2 mentions those who will lay their hands on “the Saviour of the world,” and *T. Benjamin* 9:3 states that the Lord “will be lifted upon a tree.” Even so, many have viewed the *T. 12 Patr.* as originally Jewish compositions into which Christian interpolations have been inserted. For the original argument for this position, see R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), XXIII-XXXIX; a position followed by, among others, Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen Zur Entstehungsgeschichte Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Otto Michel and Martin Hengel; AGJU 8; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 69-158; David Flusser, “Patriarchs, Testament of the Twelve,” in *EJ* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1972), 184-86; Howard C. Kee, “Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 2.777-78. Others, however, see these documents as Christian writings which are dependent upon, or at least draw from, Jewish sources. The main proponents of this view have been Marinus de Jonge and his students; see Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition, and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), passim. Though many now lean toward DeJonge’s position, the existence of small portions of the Testaments (*Aramaic Levi* and 4Q215 [4QTNaph], a Hebrew fragment of the Testament of Naphtali) found at Qumran reveals that testamentary writing connected to the twelve patriarchs was taking place in the second and first century B.C.E. As a result, I will discuss the *T. Levi* in the context of late second or first century B.C.E. texts, though it is possible that it stems from a slightly later period. For discussion of 4QTNaph, see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 26. For further discussion on date and provenance of *T. 12 Patr.*, see Collins, “Testaments,” 331-44. For history of scholarship, see H. Dixon Slingerhand, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), passim.

You will rob the offerings of the Lord and steal from his portions and before sacrificing to the Lord take the choice things, eating contemptuously with harlots; you will teach the commandments of the Lord out of covetousness, pollute married women, defile virgins of Jerusalem, be joined with harlots and adulteresses, take to wives daughters of the Gentiles, purifying them with an unlawful purification, and your union will be like Sodom and Gomorrah in ungodliness.¹¹³

Because of their actions, Levi warns, the “temple which the Lord will choose, will be desolate in uncleanness.”¹¹⁴ Similarly, 16:1-5 and 17:8-11 conclude with a description of the future priests as “idolators, contentious, lovers of money, arrogant, lawless, lascivious, abusers of children and beasts.” In short, the author of the *Testament of Levi* portrays the priests as thieves, sexually and ritually impure, prideful and arrogant.

Similar to the situation with regard to 2 Maccabees, in the case of the *Testament of Levi* the actions of one particular high priest, the Hasmonean Alexander Jannaeus, likely lie behind the vitriol extended toward the Jerusalem priests more generally. From Josephus it is clear that Jannaeus had concubines (*Ant.* 13.380), and, as Sanders has speculated, it is within the realm of possibility that from time to time Jannaeus shared some of the first fruit offerings, which were his by right, with these women.¹¹⁵ Since there is no evidence that Jannaeus (or any priest, for that matter) ever married a Gentile, the specificity of the charges precludes an exact correlation, nor is it known if others in

¹¹³ All translation for *Testament of Levi* from H. W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985). For Greek text see Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).

¹¹⁴ Hollander and de Jonge (*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 157) note that *T. Levi* follows a tradition which regards destruction and exile as a consequence of the sins of the priests. Cf. 1 Esdras 1:47; 2 Chr 36:14 (LXX), (καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς...ἐμίαναν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου τὸν ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ); Zeph 3:4; Ezek 22:26 (LXX), (οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς ἠθέτησαν νόμον μου καὶ ἐβεβήλουν τὰ ἄγια μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἁγίου).

¹¹⁵ Sanders, *Judaism*, 183-84.

the priestly class also participated in this type of activity. Nonetheless, it is likely that allegations against one member of the priestly caste, in this case the high priest Alexander Jannaeus, filtered down and were applied to all members of the Jerusalem guild. As a result, the detailed accusations against Jannaeus may have brought in their wake a more general and exaggerated condemnation of the Jerusalem priests as a whole, especially if they were seen as complicit in these actions. If so, then the *Testament of Levi* is another example of a document which exaggerated the misdeeds of the Jerusalem priests, accusing them of reprehensible conduct.

Testament of Levi 3:4-10 also denigrates the present priesthood by calling attention to the pure, heavenly temple in which the Great Glory dwells in the “holy of holies far beyond all holiness.” In addition, *T. Levi* 5.1 articulates a vision in which Levi sees the gates of heaven and “the holy temple and the Most High upon a throne of glory” (cf. 18:6), with the angels of the presence of the Lord serving as ministering attendants—offering sacrifices and making propitiation to the Lord for the sins of the righteous. These visions of the heavenly temple and angelic ministrants accentuate the defilement of the earthly temple, for the current pollution of the earthly sanctuary through the actions of the corrupt priesthood is contrasted with the worship of God in the uncontaminated heavenly temple.¹¹⁶ Likewise, the tarnished sacrifices that are persistently offered in the earthly temple are contrasted with the unsullied sacrifices, offered by pure ministering

¹¹⁶ See also *T. Levi* 18, where the current high priest and Jerusalem priesthood are contrasted with a glorious eschatological priest.

angels, which continue unabated.¹¹⁷ For the author of the *T. Levi*, the profaned earthly temple is but a shadow of the pure celestial temple.

3.4.3 Peshar Habakkuk

A third text which explains Qumran's separation from the temple and the priesthood therein is *Peshar Habakkuk*, which is generally thought to have been composed in the second half of the first century B.C.E.¹¹⁸ In this text the leader of the Qumran community, the Teacher of Righteousness, has two named adversaries: the Man of Lies and the Wicked Priest. The precise identity of these three figures is difficult to ascertain. The Man of Lies (2.1-2; 5.11) is probably to be identified as the Spouter of Lies (10.9-13), and seems to be the leader of a group that is in direct conflict with the Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran community.¹¹⁹ The identity of the Wicked Priest (הכהן הרשע), though, has been the subject of much conjecture, with Jonathan emerging as the most likely candidate.¹²⁰ In this peshar the term הכהן הרשע is used in its titular sense, and appears to be a play on the title high priest (הכהן הראש).¹²¹ The

¹¹⁷ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 22.

¹¹⁸ Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 508-10; Moshe J. Bernstein, "Peshar Habbakkuk," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 647-50.

¹¹⁹ Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 509; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 228.

¹²⁰ For this identification, see Geza Vermes, *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1954)90-100; VanderKam, "Identity and History," 2.508-14.

¹²¹ Timothy H. Lim, "Wicked Priest," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam Oxford University Press, 2000), 973. Though הכהן הראש appears less often in biblical and Second Temple literature than הכהן or הכהן הגדול to describe the high priest, the term does

adversarial relationship between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness is illustrated in 11.4-8, where the Wicked Priest is castigated for pursuing “the Teacher of Righteousness to consume him with the heat of his anger in the place of his banishment. In festival time, during the rest of the day of Atonement, he appeared to them, to consume them and make them fall on the day of fasting, the Sabbath of their rest.” The above example reveals the continuing importance placed upon the calendar, for the memory of the Wicked Priest’s attempt to “consume” the Teacher of Righteousness on the Day of Atonement (according to the Teacher’s reckoning) has not faded from memory.

Two similar, yet distinct, charges are directed towards the wicked priest and the related priestly circles in Jerusalem in *Pesher Habakkuk*. First, they are accused of being greedy, self-serving, and arrogant. In the earlier discussion of 4QMMT I noted that the Jewish people in general, and most likely the priests more specifically, were accused of misappropriation of temple funds (גזיל). This term reappears at the outset of our pesher, with the Wicked Priest mentioned soon thereafter (1:6, 13). But in contrast to the situation in 4QMMT, here the Jerusalem priests are also accused of being out-and-out thieves. *Pesher Habakkuk* 8.9-9.3 recounts the initial loyalty of the Wicked Priest, but then details how he became proud and “robbed and hoarded wealth . . . seized public money . . . and pillaged many people.” Lines 4-7 of column 9 broaden this critique to

appear at Qumran (1QM 2.1; 15.4; 16.13; 18.5; 19.11; cf. 1QSa 2.12) as well as occasionally in the biblical corpus (2 Kgs 25:18; Jer 52:24; Ezra 7:5; 2 Chr 19:11; 24:11; 26:20; 31:10).

include the “last priests of Jerusalem,” remarking that they have become rich through plundering foreign nations as well as the poor of Judah (12.9-10).

A second indictment against the Wicked Priest involves allegations of defilement of the temple. Although specific details are not given, the charge appears twice. In 8.13 it is said that “he performed re[pul]sive acts by every type of defiling impurity,” and 12.8-9 echoes this accusation: “the [Wicked] Priest performed repulsive acts and defiled the sanctuary of God.” In the discussion of 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document*, I noted several critiques leveled against the Jerusalem priesthood, and it is likely that these same issues—illegitimate marriage, calendrical issues, and misinterpretation of the Law—are in mind here. From *Pesher Habakkuk* itself, we may now add arrogance and greed to this list. In the eyes of the author, the actions of the Wicked Priest, along with those of the “last priests of Jerusalem,” led to the defilement of the temple.

3.4.4 Psalms of Solomon

Similar allegations against the Jerusalem priests surface in the *Psalms of Solomon*, which depict the traumatic events accompanying the Roman intervention in first century B.C.E. Palestine.¹²² At fault are the “sinners.” Though at times this term refers to Gentiles, and specifically to Pompey,¹²³ more often than not these “sinners” are Jewish.

¹²² *Pss. Sol.* 2, 8, and 17 are the readily datable Psalms in this collection. References to Pompey in these three Psalms allow the corpus to be dated around the year 63 B.C.E.

¹²³ Josephus (*Ant.* 14:4) reports that in 63 B.C.E. Pompey marched toward Jerusalem and took the city with the aid of some of the inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem who had welcomed him in. Those resisting took refuge in the temple precincts, which Pompey eventually captured as well. He then proceeded to enter the Holy of Holies, leaving the valuables undisturbed. Josephus’ description of what occurred during

Though precise identification of these “sinners” is sometimes difficult, *Psalms of Solomon* 2 and 8 contain clear references to sins committed by the priests in Jerusalem and reveal the deep-seated anger and resentment the psalmist harbors against these “sinners.”

Ps. Sol. 2 opens with Jerusalem under siege and describes its eventual capitulation to the Romans under Pompey. The root cause of this Roman incursion into the city, the sins of the priests, is made manifestly clear by the author of this psalm. He writes: “The sons of Jerusalem defiled the sanctuary of the Lord, they were profaning the offerings of God with lawless acts.”¹²⁴ Condemnatory statements again appear in 2:11-13, where the daughters of Jerusalem are depicted as having “defiled themselves with sexual promiscuity/mingled intermixing” (ἐμαίωσαν αὐτὰς ἐν φουρμῶ ἀναμείξεως). The aorist here implies that this defilement was their own doing, and that these improprieties were intended and not a matter of happenstance. Since it is unlikely that this “mingled intermixing” refers to intermarriage or intermingling with Gentiles (in a text concerned

Pompey’s invasion lines up very well with what the *Pss. Sol.* report as the sins of the Gentile sinners and the opening of the city gates by some inhabitants of Jerusalem (8:16-17). In addition, the death of the leader of the Gentile sinners is recorded in *Ps. Sol.* 2:26-27: “God showed me his insolence pierced on the mountains of Egypt...His body was carried about on the waves in much shame, and there was no one to bury (him), for he (God) had despised him with contempt.” A similar manner of death for Pompey is recorded in Dio, *Rom. Hist.* 42.4-5 and Plutarch, *Pomp.*, 79-80. In both of these accounts, Pompey is murdered in Egypt, and Plutarch concludes his life of Pompey by noting that his head and body floated in the waves, and, in place of a proper burial, an old fishing boat eventually served as his funeral pyre.

¹²⁴ Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, 20-21) notes that the nomenclature “sons of Jerusalem” in *Ps. Sol.* 2:3 must refer to the priests, since they were in charge of the temple cult. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of the *Psalms of Solomon* are from R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985). The Greek text of the *Psalms of Solomon* may be found in R. B. Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

with the sins of Jews and Gentiles, why not highlight this if it were so?),¹²⁵ the implication is that these women had sexual relations with Jews who were not appropriate for them. If so, the *Pss. Sol.* provide further evidence for the belief that the Jerusalem priests, who were supposed to marry within their own priestly circles, were violating this rule.

More specific allegations against the Jerusalem priestly establishment appear in *Ps. Sol.* 8. Here the priests are explicitly accused of reprehensible sexual practices, theft, and defilement of the sacrifices, a litany of charges closely resembling other contemporary critiques of the Jerusalem priesthood.¹²⁶ *Ps. Sol.* 8:9-10, for example, insists that both incestuous and adulterous liaisons characterize the Jerusalem priesthood. Alongside this assessment is the claim that the officiating priests have defiled the sacrifices due to contact with menstrual blood (8:12), as well as an assertion that the offspring of the priests are a defiled lot (8:21-22). The implication, once again, seems to be that their illegitimacy stems not from contact with gentiles, but rather from Jewish marriages that the author deems to be improper for priestly families.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Cf. Wright ("Psalms of Solomon," 2.652 note n), who observes that improper sexual relations are most likely in view, and not fears of racial mixing. As evidence, he points to *Pss. Sol.* 8:9, where a cognate to $\phi\upsilon\rho\mu\tilde{\omega}$ ($\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\phi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$) is used to describe incestuous behavior.

¹²⁶ 4Q171 (4QpPsa) catalogues similar vices, and CD 4.15-18 specifically disparages the priests for fornication, wealth, and defilement of the temple, the same critique found in *Ps. Sol.* 8. These two scrolls are also connected by the description of "the nets of Belial" in which Israel is ensnared. This phrase, however, is not found in *Ps. Sol.* 8 (cf. *Sib. Or.* 1.172; 2:65-75, 255-60; 4:30-35; *T. Moses* 5:4-6). For more on this connection, see Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 66-67.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 68-73.

In *Psalms of Solomon* 8.11, the priests are also rebuked for “[stealing] from the sanctuary (τὰ ἄγια) of God.” Since Josephus does not mention any Hasmonean stealing from the temple treasury, it is unlikely that outright theft was the problem. Rather, it is likely that one or more of the Hasmoneans, wearing the dual hat of king and priest, had used some of the temple surplus to help finance costly military operations.¹²⁸ Whatever the specifics, the financial dealings of the officials at the temple are deemed to be egregious enough by the author of the *Pss. Sol.* to warrant inclusion in a list of behaviors which were responsible for the siege and surrender of the city. In the end, the psalmist is so distressed by the conduct of the priests presiding over the temple that he laments: “There was no sin left undone in which they did not surpass the gentiles (8:13; cf. 2:9; 17:15”). In this *Psalms*, the priests are clearly culpable for their transgressions, which directly impact the efficacy of the temple service.

Clear parallels exist between the accusations leveled against the priests in the *Psalms of Solomon* and some Dead Sea manuscripts. This close correlation is all the more intriguing as none of the *Pss. Sol.* were found at Qumran, illustrating that harsh critique of the Hasmonean high priesthood and other officiating priests was not confined to the Dead Sea community. Rather, the condemnation directed against the Jerusalem establishment may have been part of a more general critique which circulated in and around Jerusalem and which was appropriated independently by these two groups.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Sanders, *Judaism*, 160, 185. Though Sanders’ suggestion seems more plausible, Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, 75) has proposed that this charge may have stemmed from priestly involvement in commercial enterprises in which they held a distinctly unfair advantage.

¹²⁹ Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 67.

3.4.5 Testament of Moses 6-7

Severe censure of the Jerusalem priests continues in the *Testament of Moses*. As stated above, *T. Mos.* is a composite work, with most of the document emanating from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.¹³⁰ However, chapters 6-7 specifically refer to the reign of Herod and the partial destruction of the temple by Varus in 4 B.C.E.¹³¹ Immediately following the denunciation of the Jerusalem priesthood in *T. Mos.* 5, the author relates that the priests are

pestilent and impious men . . . who proclaim themselves to be righteous. . . . They will be deceitful men, self-complacent, hypocrites in all their dealings, and who love to debauch each hour of the day . . . murderers, complainers, liars, hiding themselves lest they be recognized as impious, full of crime and iniquity. . . . Their hands and minds will deal with impurities, and their mouth will speak enormities, saying in addition to all this: 'Keep off, do not touch me, lest you pollute me (7.3-10).

This invective is cutting, with the perceived arrogance and impurity of these priests likely inspiring the vitriolic language. Specific instances of sin are not given, and in this case, there do not seem to be explicit allusions to certain priests. Rather, in the view of our author, the entirety of the priesthood at the end of the first century B.C.E. and beginning of the first century C.E. was corrupt.

¹³⁰ See Collins, "Testaments," 347-49; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 80-83.

¹³¹ Collins, "Testaments," 344-49. As I noted in our earlier discussion of the *T. Mos.*, Schwartz ("Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 26-27) has plausibly suggested that the person responsible for inserting chapters 6-7 into the *T. Mos.* apparently held similar sentiments toward the cultic officers of his day as did the author of the rest of the *T. Mos.*

3.4.6 Sibylline Oracles 3-5

Contrary to much of the literature contemporary with them, the *Sibylline Oracles* have little to say about the Jerusalem priesthood. Rather, several of these oracles debate the relevance of the Jerusalem temple itself. Though the *Sibylline Oracles* all have complicated histories,¹³² most scholars believe *Sib. Or.* 3-5 stem from a Jewish hand and achieved their final form prior to the Bar Kokhba Revolt.¹³³ Below I will discuss *Sib. Or.* 3 and 5 before turning attention to *Sib. Or.* 4.

It is generally agreed that *Sibylline Oracles* 3 and 5 originated in Egyptian Judaism.¹³⁴ Most of *Sib. Or.* 3, including all of the references to the temple, has been dated to the middle of the second century B.C.E.,¹³⁵ while specific allusions to the destruction of the temple in two of its four central oracles suggest that the fifth *Sibylline Oracle* was composed in the years following the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.¹³⁶ Both books share a favorable view of the Jewish temple; the divine origins of the temple

¹³² The classic evaluation of the *Sibylline Oracles*, which sees a complicated history of composition, may be found in Johannes Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902), 1-30. Valentin Nikiprowetzky (*La Troisième Sibylle* [Paris: Mouton, 1970], 195-225) represents the strongest dissenting voice to Geffcken's position, presenting an argument for the integrity of *Sib. Or.* 3. For a discussion critical of Nikiprowetzky and supportive of Geffcken, see John J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974); *ibid.*, "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina," *JJS* 25 (1974): 365-80; *ibid.*, "The Sibylline Oracles," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 357-81.

¹³³ Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," 357.

¹³⁴ E.g. see the special interest in the seventh king of Egypt in *Sib. Or.* 3.193, 318, 608, and the belief that a temple to the true God would be built in Egypt in *Sib. Or.* 5.493-511.

¹³⁵ The original corpus of the book is found in 97-349 and 489-the end; see Collins, *Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*, 21-33, 57-71; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 162-65.

¹³⁶ Collins, *Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*, 73-76.

are referred to twice in *Sib. Or. 5* (105, 397-408), and the sanctuary in Jerusalem is discussed repeatedly throughout *Sib. Or. 3* (286-94, 564-85, 657-65, 702-4, 715-718, 772-76).¹³⁷ The respective views of the temple in *Sibylline Oracles 3* and *5* are conditioned by the time of their composition, as the confident portrayal of the sanctity and inviolability of the temple, as well as the expectation of the temple's future glory in *Sib. Or. 3*, are tempered by the bitter emotion expressed at its demise in *Sib. Or. 5*.

A very different view of the temple, however, appears in *Sib. Or. 4*. As with the previous two oracles, this book went through a lengthy editorial process, and an original core of material appears to have been elaborated late in the first century C.E.¹³⁸ Since *Sibylline Oracles 4* and *5* both assumed their definitive shape in the aftermath of the destruction of the temple, the contrasting viewpoints of each oracle are illuminating. Whereas *Sib. Or. 5* holds the temple in high regard, *Sib. Or. 4* has a very different understanding.

Although the destruction of the temple is twice mentioned in *Sib. Or. 4* (116, 125-26), nowhere do we find the outrage attached to these events as in *Sib. Or. 5*. 397-408, nor any hope for a future restoration. Rather, *Sib. Or. 4* narrates its demolition impassively. Moreover, the opening lines of the fourth *Sibylline Oracle* argue against the very existence of temples. In 4.8-11 the sybil declares that God "does not have a house, a

¹³⁷ Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," 367.

¹³⁸ David Flusser ("The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988], 317-44) has argued that the author of *Sib. Or. 4* has incorporated into his account a Hellenistic oracle discussing four world empires. In his opinion, the original oracle is contained in lines 47-101. Collins ("Fourth Sibyl," 371-76) accepts Flusser's suggestion and contends that 174-92 are also closely based upon the older oracle. Two references to the destruction of the temple (116, 125-26) dictate that the oracle, in its final form, is a post-70 C.E. composition.

stone set up as a temple . . . but one which is not possible to see from earth nor to measure with mortal eyes, since it was not fashioned by mortal hand.”¹³⁹ Continuing in the same vein, *Sib. Or.* 4.25-27 contends that those who love the great God “will reject all temples when they see them, altars too, useless foundations of dumb stones . . . defiled with blood of animate creatures, and sacrifices of four-footed animals.” The approach of *Sib. Or.* 4 diverges from that of *Oracles* 3 and 5 in two distinct ways. First, the negative attitude toward the temple and cult is a major reversal, with the sibyl arguing that God should never have had a house in the first place, and that none should again be rebuilt. Second, a heavenly temple seems to be envisioned. This idea is in agreement with the contemporary works of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* which will be discussed below, but in a departure from these two documents, it does not appear that the author of *Sib. Or.* 4 foresaw this temple descending to earth. Rather, the celestial temple will remain in heaven.

One other matter may betray the author’s negative view of the Jerusalem temple. In the above condemnation of temples and cults, *Sib. Or.* 4 does not distinguish very strongly between pagan temples and the Jewish temple in Jerusalem, nor does it directly attack the existence of this temple. Rather, as Collins has noted, the author ignores the Jerusalem temple to such an extent that he does not even differentiate it from pagan temples.¹⁴⁰ Exhibiting no remorse at the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, and

¹³⁹ Translation from John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 1.317-472.

¹⁴⁰ Collins, "Fourth Sibyl," 369.

providing no hope for its restoration, the fourth *Sibylline Oracle* is entirely incompatible with the more positive portrayal espoused in *Sibylline Oracles* 3 and 5.

3.4.7 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

Composed in the aftermath of the events of 70 C.E., *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* lament the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the temple of God.¹⁴¹ As one might expect, these two apocalypses have little to say in regard to the critiques of the temple and priesthood that have been surveyed above. The vagaries of historical circumstances necessitated a different appraisal of the situation. Rather than criticize priest and temple, each author looks forward to new realities which God will usher in.

In *4 Ezra*, the scribe recounts the distressing reality of the destroyed sanctuary and the pollution of the holy vessels (10:19-23). As consolation he is given a vision of a woman who is later transformed into the heavenly Jerusalem, a place which has co-existed with the earthly city but is only now revealed. The reality of this city is hinted at several times in this book (7:26, 8:52, 13:36), but it is only in chapter 10 that the city itself is shown to Ezra. Here Zion is depicted as an established city, one which retains “the brilliance of her glory and the loveliness of her beauty” (10:50). Remarkably, the eschatological vision given to Ezra reveals no trace of a temple in this glorious city (at

¹⁴¹ In addition to *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, *3 Baruch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* were also penned in response to the destruction of temple and city; see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 277-303; Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 160-61. Himmelfarb notes that the recipients of these apocalyptic visions, Baruch and Ezra, are not accidental choices. Baruch, through his connection with Jeremiah, was associated with the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple as well as with the hope for its restoration (Jer 32; 36; 45). Similarly, Ezra was one of the exilic leaders instrumental in rebuilding city and temple (Ezra 7-8).

least none is described), nor is there any mention of a resumption of the temple cult.¹⁴²

This, of course, does not necessarily mean that a temple was not envisioned. If the author of *4 Ezra* had in mind a picture of the future Jerusalem *sans* temple, he could have gone the route of the author of Revelation and explicitly stated that there would not be a temple in the city (Rev 21:10-14). Still, the lack of reference to a future temple in the New Jerusalem is striking.

Second Baruch also does not dwell on issues arising from the cessation of the cult and its reestablishment, nor is there a negative appraisal of the previous priesthood. Rather, in a manner similar to that of *4 Ezra*, it is disclosed to Baruch that the present city of Jerusalem is merely a copy of the heavenly Jerusalem, a Jerusalem which was revealed to the patriarchs and is presently preserved in Paradise (4:2-7).¹⁴³ Nevertheless, *2 Baruch* differs from *4 Ezra* in its construal of the future Jerusalem, for in this city it is explicit that there will be a functioning temple and cult. In preparation for this future day, *2 Baruch* 6:7-9 relates that all of the holy articles were gathered up by an angel and delivered into the earth for sake-keeping, “until the last times . . . the moment that it will be said that it [Jerusalem] will be restored forever.” In this future restoration the temple cult will recommence, replete with the same veil, ephod, mercy seat, holy raiment of the

¹⁴² See Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 324 n. 43.

¹⁴³ Michael E. Stone, "Reactions to the Destruction of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion," *JSJ* 12 (1981): 195-204, esp. 199-200.

priests, altar of incense, and other holy vessels. In the latter half of the book this reinstatement of the temple and service is once again affirmed.¹⁴⁴

In their respective inquiries into the cause of Jerusalem's downfall, both Ezra and Baruch are shown a vision of the heavenly Jerusalem, the reality behind the present destroyed city of Jerusalem. Their visions of this heavenly Jerusalem, however, differ with respect to the future of the temple and temple cult.¹⁴⁵ While *4 Ezra* is ambiguous as to whether a new temple will accompany the New Jerusalem, *2 Baruch* explicitly states that the ideal Jerusalem will house a temple, and that the same temple vessels will once again be used in the renewed temple cult and service.

3.4.8 Conclusion to Literary Evidence from the Second Century B.C.E. to the First Century C.E.

With *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, I come to the conclusion of this survey of Second Temple documents that betray a critical attitude toward either the temple or the Jerusalem priesthood. In this literature, accusations similar to those we have seen above continue to dominate the priests' laundry list of sins. Judging from *Pesher Habakkuk*, differing calendrical systems continued to be bone of contention for some, although this complaint is not again voiced outside this document.

¹⁴⁴ Details are scarce in this passage (68:5), as it is simply stated that "Zion will be rebuilt again, and the offerings will be restored, and the priests will again return to their ministry. And the nations will again come to honor it. But not as fully as before." Cf. *2 Bar* 59:4.

¹⁴⁵ Though *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* are literarily and ideologically connected, it is nearly impossible to determine the direction of influence. As a result, it is unclear whether the vision in *2 Baruch* is intended to correct *4 Ezra*, bring out what *2 Baruch* thought implicit in *4 Ezra*, or merely present an alternative understanding. See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 39.

The issue of illegitimate marriage appears again in this period, with the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Testament of Levi* directing scathing attacks against the Jerusalem priesthood for their alleged transgressions. In light of the above discussions on this issue, it is likely that the issue related to proper priestly endogamy. Furthermore, the charge of impurity through contact with blood, which almost certainly refers to improper marital relations with wives who have not been purified of menstrual impurity, continues in this period in the *Psalms of Solomon*. At least in the eyes of some, improper marriage and unacceptable conjugal relations continued to stain the priestly circles in Jerusalem throughout the Second Temple period.

In addition, the Jerusalem priests were perceived to be thieves, full of greed and arrogance. Second Maccabees, *Pesher Habakkuk*, and the *Psalms of Solomon* all agree in their condemnation of the priestly overseers on this point. Some high priests were charged with raiding the temple coffers for their own profit or advancement, while others were condemned for robbing the disenfranchised and stealing from fellow priests.¹⁴⁶ Accusations of arrogance often accompany these allegations of greed, with the priests in Jerusalem portrayed as ruthless, impious men who care more for the maintenance of their position than the Jewish people.

The priestly establishment is also often accused of being morally obtuse and of defiling the temple, complaints found throughout the Second Temple period and continued in this later period by *Pesher Habakkuk*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and the *Testament of Moses*. Specific instances of corruption are sometimes spelled out and other

¹⁴⁶ For the specific charge of stealing from fellow priests, see Josephus, *Ant.* 20.180-81.

times left vague, but the general sentiment is clear. In the eyes of some, the priestly overseers, and by extension the sanctuary itself, were defiled, and impure offerings and sacrifices were performed in this place.

Finally, a contrast is seen between the contemporary polluted temple and the glory of either the present heavenly temple or a future restored temple. For the *Testament of Levi*, this distinction is twofold. Not only is the polluted earthly temple sharply distinguished from the pure heavenly one, but the defiled priests are also contrasted with the pure angelic ministrants. This differentiation between earthly and heavenly/future temples is also seen in three works stemming from the period after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., the fourth *Sibylline Oracle*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*, all of which contrast the current situation with the glory of the heavenly temple. While *2 Baruch* envisions a restoration of the city and temple, *4 Ezra* only mentions a future city, and *Sib. Or.* 4 offers no hope of restoration for temple and city.

3.5 Concluding Observations

In the preceding chapter, I highlighted the centrality of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood. Due to its potent religious significance, the temple also became the economic and political hub of the Jewish nation, and came to symbolize Jewish unity and identity. As overseers of the temple, the priests were the religious, economic, and political powerbrokers of the nation for much of the Second Temple period. The intent of the present chapter has been to highlight the pockets of resistance which were woven through the fabric of Second Temple literature. Ironically, this negative attitude toward

the priesthood, and to a lesser degree the temple, was knit with the same threads which prompted decidedly more positive assessments of the situation: the continued centrality of the temple to Jewish life and the ongoing importance of the priestly elite who oversaw its daily functioning. I close below with five concluding thoughts.

First, the sharp invective directed toward the priesthood is not also leveled against the temple. Indeed, the only criticism of the temple found in the literature of the Second Temple period comes when it is juxtaposed with either the first temple or a future/heavenly temple, a comparison which reveals its inferiority (e.g. Ezra [and 1 Esdras], Tobit, portions of *1 Enoch* [the Animal Visions and Apocalypse of Weeks], the *Testament of Levi*, *Sibylline Oracle 4*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*).¹⁴⁷ With the exception of the Fourth *Sibylline Oracle*, each of these works laments the current state of the temple and looks forward to the day when it will be purified. For some, the purified temple would be a return to the imagined magnificence of the temple in days of old. For others, hopes were bound up with a new and glorious temple that God himself would bring in the not-too-distant future.

Second, condemnation in this period is reserved for the priesthood presiding over the temple. At its heart, this criticism is a reaction to the perceived impurity of the

¹⁴⁷ It is beyond the scope of this survey to get into much of the rabbinic commentary on the Second Temple and priestly elite. In a provocative address, Ben Zion Wacholder (*Messianism and Mishnah: Time and Place in the Early Halakhah* [The Louis Caplan Lecture on Jewish Law Hebrew Union College Press, 1979], 24-25, 32-34) suggested that the rabbis held a similarly disapproving view of the Second Temple. Citing several mishnaic passages, he notes that the halakhah regarding priestly privileges, the sacrificial cult, and regulations concerning purity and pollution refer primarily to what had been in existence during the time of the first temple as well as what would be reinstated in the third temple. This halakhah, however, does not necessarily embrace the Second Temple, and frequently ignores it. Cf. Cohen, "The Temple and the Synagogue," 308-9.

Jerusalem priesthood. Questions of legitimate and illegitimate marriage amongst priests emerge very early, and are soon joined by concern over the proper sexual behavior of these same priests. In the momentous years of the mid-second century B.C.E., much of the polemic directed towards these priests sharpens. The governing priests are now also suspected of financial improprieties, and sectarian groups flourish in reaction to the Hasmonean usurpation of the high priesthood. In addition, the issue of the calendar takes on a much greater emphasis. Moving forward in time, the critique of the temple and priesthood begins to take on a more formulaic, stereotypical feel. Allegations of arrogance, pride, and greed now accompany the earlier denunciations, and charges of priestly corruption are more frequently stated in terms of general defilement. In sum, critique of the priesthood occurs throughout the period and ranges from disillusionment to outright rejection. While some complaints remain static, others evolve over the course of several centuries.

In addition, several of the complaints are very specifically centered on the conduct of a specific high priest or group of priests, while others are more general in tone. Periods of crisis, which almost by definition meant that the temple was under threat, provoked the greatest outcry. The three main periods of crisis—the period of Antiochus Epiphanes and the aftermath of his reforms in the mid second century B.C.E., the beginnings of Roman sovereignty with the arrival of Pompey and his entrance into the temple in 63 B.C.E., and the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.—each produced strong literary reactions. But as noted earlier, at the heart of this critique was a fear that a defiled priesthood would result in a polluted temple and inefficacious sacrifices. As a

result, any change or modification in the temple service, or any breach of conduct by the officiating priests, is met with vigorous opposition.

Third, this critical assessment of the temple and priesthood appears to have arisen almost exclusively in circles geographically and socially contiguous to these two institutions, with most, if not all, of the condemnation originating in Judea and its environs.¹⁴⁸ In addition, this criticism likely developed in circles closest to the Jerusalem priests, as they, along with the emerging scribal class, were the only people with the education, finances, connections, and literary acumen to compose such literature.¹⁴⁹ If the Book of Watchers is any indication, those critical of the Jerusalem priesthood may at times have been priests themselves. Thus, in terms of geographical and socio-economic proximity to the temple and its presiding priesthood, the closer one was to the center, the sharper the critique.

Fourth, it is very likely that the above condemnations of the high priest and priestly establishment in Jerusalem were, to some degree, exaggerated. As Sanders has pointed out, polemic is often stylized, with those out of power often accusing those in power of sweeping crimes. In religious polemic, the charges often revolve around sexual and ritual misconduct.¹⁵⁰ From what has been surveyed above, these two charges

¹⁴⁸ The exceptions that prove the rule are *Sib. Or.* 4, for which the provenance is unclear, and one reference in Philo (*QE* 2:105) in which he castigates the high priest. “He represented Aaron as one possessed by God and by the prophetic spirit, (thereby) rebuking and shaming the indolence of the high priests after him, who because of negligence entrusted the performance of the holy service to second and third (assistants), since they themselves did not feel inexpressible pleasure in carrying out all (forms) of the ministerial service.”

¹⁴⁹ Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 10-16, 51-52; Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 29-108.

¹⁵⁰ Sanders, *Judaism*, 186-87.

comprise the bulk of the condemnation directed toward the priests. It is highly likely that some of these charges were accurate and appropriate with respect to a specific situation, but thereafter were simply recycled by those dissatisfied for various and sundry reasons. For example, the charge of “eating contemptuously with harlots” in the *Testament of Levi*, or the allegations of financial improprieties in the *Psalms of Solomon*, may have originated with specific Hasmoneans in mind. Even if these allegations are based in reality, there is little evidence that other Jerusalem priests participated or continued in these practices. It seems likely that these charges functioned more as slogans than as reflections of reality and were hurled against the priests with little knowledge of their origins or truthfulness. In addition, the extent to which this criticism of the temple, and more specifically of the high priest and his governance of the temple, was accepted and followed by others, is unclear.¹⁵¹ Most likely, the resistance and disillusionment was largely confined to certain dissident circles.

Fifth, defilement of the temple was not seen as an insurmountable problem. The temple had been polluted on various occasions: the first temple was destroyed, the temple of Malachi’s day was tarnished, the temple in the period of Antiochus Epiphanes was desecrated, and the temple in Pompey’s day was sullied. In each case, however, the holiness and purity of the temple was reconstituted and the sacrifices were continually

¹⁵¹ George W. E. Nickelsburg (*Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 153) notes: “This evidence need not indicate a continuous anti-temple movement over time, or a single anti-temple party at any given time. Nor do the polemics necessarily stem from a single concern or kind of criticism. Nonetheless, taken together they falsify the notion that all Jews in the postexilic period held the temple in high regard.”

performed.¹⁵² The real problem seems to have been when the impurity was not generally recognized. On these occasions, those who took issue with the priests had to resort to polemics and to attack those presiding over the temple. These attacks were almost wholly directed against the priesthood of the time. The temple may have been seen to be defiled, but it was the priests who had made it so.

In the next chapter I will focus on the few instances in which certain individuals or groups were so opposed to the religious leadership in the Jerusalem temple that they took the bold step of founding their own temple. I have already discussed one of these groups—those who settled on the shore of the Dead Sea and whose literature was discovered nearly sixty years ago. In addition to this community, I will also discuss two temples alternative to that in Jerusalem: that of the Samaritans and that erected by Onias IV at Leontopolis. The centrifugal forces swirling around the Jerusalem temple served to fling those who worshipped at these temples even further away from the sanctuary in Jerusalem than those responsible for many of the criticisms surveyed in the present chapter.

¹⁵² Schwartz, "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices," 86-87.

Chapter 4: The Emergence of Alternative Temples

In the previous chapter I argued that the Jerusalem temple and presiding priesthood had their fair share of critics. At times this disapproval erupted in virulent polemics, but more often than not this dissatisfaction formed an undercurrent which steadily wound its way throughout the length of the Second Temple period. This displeasure, however, does not seem to have been accompanied by a lack of participation in the temple and its cultic rites. While a few who opposed the Jerusalem priesthood may have chosen not to join in solidarity with their countrymen in worshipping the God of Israel in the temple in Jerusalem, there is no evidence that many or most of them abstained. Rather, even those who accused the priests of moral recklessness or vehemently disagreed with the priests' oversight of the sacred ceremonies appear to have viewed the temple as the divinely-ordained seat of God's presence on earth, and the high priest the officially sanctioned ministrant mediating the great divide between God and man.

Nonetheless, resentment against the Jerusalem leadership continued to simmer, reaching such heights in some quarters that several communities decided that they could no longer participate in the temple and cult in Jerusalem, choosing instead to divest themselves from all that accompanied participation in this temple. In this chapter I will take a closer look at three disparate communities that separated from the Jerusalem sanctuary and constructed alternative temples in opposition to, or in rivalry with, that in Jerusalem. I will begin this discussion with the Samaritans and their temple on Mount Gerizim. I will then focus attention on the Oniad temple at Leontopolis before

concluding with an investigation of the self-understanding of the Qumran community. As will be seen, the particular situations which led to separation from Jerusalem varied in the three cases. Amidst these differences, however, one may distill a set of common characteristics linking these three distinct communities. These include specific instances of sharp disagreement with the religious and/or political establishment in Jerusalem, an appeal to the authority of Scripture, and the presence of priests whose lineage lent legitimacy to these new temples.

4.1 The Samaritans

In this discussion of the Samaritans, I will focus on the role of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim in its function as a symbol of national identity and unity as well as the ways in which this temple affected the Samaritans' relationship with neighboring Jews. A few particular matters, however, need to be discussed at the outset. First is the matter of sources. Due to relatively recent excavations carried out under the direction of Yitzhak Magen, we know a great deal more today about the origins of the Samaritan temple than we did even fifteen years ago. Magen's findings challenge much of the scholarly consensus about the beginnings of the temple on Mount Gerizim, and the implications of his work will be explored below. The literary evidence is a bit more complicated. Most of the documentary remains were composed in the Common Era, which puts them at a great remove from the founding events of the Samaritan

community. This, unfortunately, includes all of the Samaritan writings, none of which can be dated prior to the fourth century C.E.¹

The biblical narrative, moreover, is not as helpful as some English translations might suggest. The account contained in MT 2 Kings 17:18-41, which is followed in large part by Josephus and many rabbis, states that the entirety of the Northern Kingdom was deported to Assyria, with the cities of Samaria being repopulated with peoples from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim. These new inhabitants initially refused to worship YHWH, choosing to venerate their own gods (17:25, 29-34), and eventually developed syncretistic forms of worship (17:41). As a result, they are portrayed in Second Temple literature as being at a considerable remove, both ethnically and religiously, from the Jews of Judea and Galilee in the early centuries B.C.E. and C.E. A major problem in using this account to deduce the origins of the Samaritans, however, is the fact that the term “Samaritans” is not actually mentioned. Although English translations generally follow the LXX in seeing Samaritans (Σαμαριῖται) in this text, the Hebrew is not as definite, using the term *השומרונים*, which is best translated as “Samaritans” or “the inhabitants of Samaria.”² That the Hebrew fails to mention the Samaritans by name suggests that the origins of this group may not be as straightforward as is often

¹ The two most important texts which deal with the history and traditions of the community are the *Sepher Ha-Yamin* (Samaritan Chronicle II) and the *Kitab al-Tarikh* of Abu'l-Fath. For text and translation see John Macdonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle No. II (or: Sepher Ha-Yamim) From Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar* (BZAW 107; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969); Paul Stenhouse, *The Kitab al-Tarikh of Abu 'l-Fath* (Sydney: Mandelbaum Trust, 1985). For an analysis of the Samaritan literature, see R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 116-31; Ingrid Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (JSOTSup 303; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 94-103, 239-72.

² See Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 9-10; V. J. Samkutty, *The Samaritan Mission in Acts* (LNTS 328; London: T & T Clark, 2006), 58-59.

thought. Our most important literary source is Josephus, whose information is supplemented by a few other Second Temple sources.³ All of these sources, however, are Jewish, and are centuries removed from the founding of the temple. Moreover, most of them betray an anti-Samaritan bent and must be used cautiously as historical sources.⁴

Second, the terminological choices that one makes in describing the peoples of this region—Jew and Samaritan—are fraught with difficulty. Just as the word “Jew” can have geographical, ethnic, and religious connotations depending on date and context,⁵ so also we encounter some thorny issues in attempting to define and use the term “Samaritan.”⁶ For this reason, I have chosen to use the term “Samaritan” when speaking

³ See R. J. Coggins, "The Samaritans in Josephus," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 257-73; Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' Attitude Toward the Samaritans: A Study in Ambivalence," in *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties: Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization held on Sunday-Monday, October 14-15, 1990* (ed. Menachem Mor; Omaha: Creighton University Press, 1992), 23-45.

⁴ This situation prompts Feldman ("Josephus' Attitude," 23) to comment that each of the literary remains “presents problems. Most of these are brief, late, apologetical, and/or polemical.” For a review of the tannaitic evidence, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah," *JQR* 75 (1985): 323-50. Cf. Rita Egger (*Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner: Eine Terminologische Untersuchung zur Identitätsklärung der Samaritaner* [NTOA 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], 310-316) who argues that Josephus is anti-Samaritan, not anti-Samaritan. Not many, however, have found her position convincing; see, for example, Feldman, "Josephus' Attitude," 39 n. 1.

⁵ Shaye J. D. Cohen, "*Ioudaios, Iudaeus, Judaeus, Jew*," in *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 69-106. It is worth remembering that יהודי and Ἰουδαίους originally referred to a person who lived in the area of Judah or was a member of the tribe of Judah. This is important, for if those of the northern kingdom wanted a term to describe themselves, they certainly would not have wanted to use the term יהודי/Ἰουδαίους, which had its root in the geographical/tribal distinctions which had originally separated the people. Hence, the category Israel/Israelite was maintained by the peoples of the north. The two groups which had formerly composed the larger “Israelite” nation were now divided in name (Israel/Judah or Israelite/Judean), but not much else: both were Yahwists, held the books of Moses as authoritative, practiced circumcision, observed the Sabbath, and held monotheist tendencies amidst a sea of polytheists. See Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 8-9; Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, 120.

⁶ Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 8-9; cf. Egger, *Josephus Flavius*, passim; Rita Egger, "Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans," in *Proceedings of the First International Conference of the Société d'études*

of the descendants of the inhabitants of the region of Samaria who were affected by the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel. In the resulting deportation and repopulation campaign carried out under the direction of Sargon II, some of the remaining inhabitants intermarried with the peoples brought into the land, though the extent of the intermarriage is a matter of debate.⁷ At a later time (exactly when is contested), at least some, if not all, of the Samaritans became known as Samaritans. The construction of a temple distinct from the one in Jerusalem, and the accompanying allegiance to Mount Gerizim and its cult, added a distinct religious aspect to later Samaritan identity. This is especially

Samaritaines; Tel-Aviv, April 11-13, 1988 (ed. Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin; Tel Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, 1991), 109-14.

⁷ It was Assyrian military and political strategy to deport native populations and to repopulate the conquered territory with peoples of other ethnicities, a practice which (at least theoretically) severed the deep attachment of the people to their land and increased the likelihood that they would rely upon Assyrian rulers for support. For more on this, see Bustenay Oded, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979), 41-74. For specifics on the Assyrian deportation and repopulation of Samaria, see Bob Becking, *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 61-104. This repopulation campaign was carried out by Sargon II (721-705 B.C.E.), and inscriptions assert that Sargon II deported 27,290 inhabitants from Samaria (James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (2nd ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 284-85). While it is difficult to ascertain the accuracy of ancient population estimates, this number clearly does not represent the whole of the northern kingdom. Coggins (*Samaritans and Jews*, 17) has estimated that only 3-4% of the population was taken away. Taking into account those who were taken captive and brought to Assyria, as well as those who would have been killed over the course of the various Assyrian campaigns against Samaria, Crown concludes that 14% of the population was lost, meaning that 86% remained where they were, see Alan D. Crown, "Another Look at Samaritan Origins," in *Essays in Honor of G. D. Sæviander: New Samaritan Studies of the Société d'études Samaritaines III & IV: Proceedings of the Congress of Oxford 1990, Yarnton Manor and Paris 1992, Collège de France: With Lectures Given at Hong Kong 1993 as Participation in the ICANAS Congress* (ed. Alan D. Crown and Lucy Davey; University of Sydney: Mandelbaum, 1995), 137. Moreover, an archaeological survey of the areas of Ephraim and Manasseh indicates that there was no discernable difference in the material culture between the Assyrian and Persian periods, meaning that the imported Gentiles seem to have immersed themselves quickly in native ways of living; see R. Gophna and Y. Porat, "The Land of Ephraim and Manasseh," in *Judaea, Samaria and the Golan: Archaeological Survey 1967-1968* (ed. Moshe Kochavi; Jerusalem: Carta, 1972), 200.

pronounced in the Samaritan diaspora, where devotion to Mount Gerizim left a marked imprint.⁸

Making the task of definitions even more difficult is Josephus' inconsistent use of terminology, as he uses the terms *Σαμαρείας* and *Σαμαρείται* interchangeably,⁹ and introduces yet further terminology in his description of the founding of the Samaritan temple (e.g. Cutheans, Sidonians, Shechemites).¹⁰ Moreover, Samaritan sources reveal that they derived their name from שמרנים, meaning "keepers" or "guardians," rather than from the geographical designation השמרנים.¹¹ Substantiating this self-designation is their devotion to the Pentateuch and desire to preserve its traditions, for, as Coggins notes, the very name implies a group which held tightly to tradition, was suspicious of change, and viewed itself as the authentic inheritor of the Mosaic traditions.¹² In their view, they

⁸ The earliest evidence for Samaritans living outside of Shechem/Samaria stems from the time of Alexander the Great, when Samaritan soldiers were settled in Egypt, and possibly Gaza as well. The existence of Samaritans in Egypt is confirmed by two accounts in Josephus in which Samaritans argue with Jews before the Egyptian authorities over the proper location to which they should send sacrifices, Gerizim or Jerusalem (*Ant* 12.7-10; 13.74-79). For an overview of the evidence, see Alan D. Crown, "The Samaritan Diaspora," in *The Samaritans* (ed. Alan D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989), 195-217. Samaritan presence on the island of Delos is also evident from two inscriptions, dated between 250 and 50 B.C.E., which speak of Israelites who offer sacrifices on Argarizein. For inscriptions and commentary, see Philippe Bruneau, "Les Israélites de Délos et la Juiverie Délienne," *BCH* 106 (1982): 465-504; A. T. Kraabel, "New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora has been found on Delos," *BA* 47 (1984): 44-46.

⁹ Egger, "Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans," 110.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 111-12. This will be discussed in greater detail below.

¹¹ Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 8-12; Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 59.

¹² Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 12.

alone had the right to claim ancestry from “Israel,” and as evidence they could point to their uninterrupted line of high priests and continuous cultic offerings.¹³

Whatever one makes of Samaritan origins and the differing terminology used to describe them, it is clear from various literary sources that, at the latest, the Samaritans were a distinct entity by the third century B.C.E., and that a Samaritan community existed in and around Shechem that was loyal to the temple on Mount Gerizim. Moreover, the establishment of a temple signaled a shift in this community’s religious predilections, as Samaritan identity rapidly became wrapped up in devotion to this sanctuary.

Accordingly, I will use the term “Samaritans” when referring to the period subsequent to the construction of this temple.

4.1.1 The Relationship Between Samaritans and Jews

מאימתי מקבלין אותם, משיכפרו בהר גריזים ויודו בירושלים ובתחיית המתים, מכאן ואילך הגזל את הכותי כאלו גזל את ישראל.

When shall we receive the Samaritans back? When they renounce Mount Gerizim and acknowledge Jerusalem and the resurrection of the dead. When this happens, he that robs a Samaritan shall be as one who robs an Israelite (*Massekhet Kutim* 2:8).¹⁴

These lines mark the conclusion of the tractate *Kutim*, a treatise concerned with the continuing relationship between Jews and Samaritans.¹⁵ This final statement is

¹³ Hjelm, *Samaritans*, 11.

¹⁴ Text from Michael Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1930), 46; translation mine.

¹⁵ *Massekhet Kutim* is part of a collection, commonly known as the “Seven Minor Tractates,” which seems to have circulated independently of the more established tractates included in the Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmud and Tannaitic Midrashim. Since these tractates are composed in classic mishnaic Hebrew, cite only Tannaitic rabbis, and are mentioned by several early midrashim, it has been suggested that they most likely originated in the third century C.E, though it is difficult to know precisely when they were first

instructive on several counts. First, it shows that Mount Gerizim, and the temple which once stood upon its peak, remained the central divisive point between the Samaritans and Jews. Even centuries removed from Hyrcanus' destruction of their sanctuary at the end of the second century B.C.E., the Samaritans remained staunch supporters of Mount Gerizim, and loyalty to this mount, and not to Jerusalem, remained a contentious issue long after both temples had been destroyed. Second, the opening question reveals a tacit acknowledgement that the current animosity between these two communities had not always existed. Questioning when the Samaritans will be received back implies that they and the Jews were once kindred peoples. Indeed, the tractate anticipates the possibility of reconciliation between these two communities descended from the nation of Israel, albeit in a future time.¹⁶

Any reconciliation between these two communities, however, would first require the two groups to overcome centuries of antagonism and mistrust. Our earliest clear indication of hostility between a distinctly Samaritan community and the neighboring Jews (as opposed to animosity between Samaritans and Jews) stems from the end of the third century B.C.E. Here Ben Sira relates: "Two nations my soul detests, and the third is not even a people: Those who live in Seir, and the Philistines, and the foolish people that

appended to the end of tractate Neziqin in the Babylonian Talmud; see M. B. Lerner, "The External Tractates," in *The Literature of the Sages* (ed. Shmuel Safrai; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1987), 401, Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. Markus Bockmuehl; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 232.

¹⁶ As it does not directly pertain to the issue of the temple, I will leave aside discussion of the resurrection of the dead. It is worth noting, however, that the Sadducees, the priestly sect in the Second Temple period and the counterparts to the priests of the Samaritan temple, also held that there would be no resurrection of the dead. See Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 157-58.

live in Shechem” (50:25-26). Josephus reveals that the antagonism described in Ben Sira had been festering for at least a century, and he views the construction of the Samaritan temple in the time of Alexander the Great as the catalyst for the deterioration of the relationship (*Ant.* 11.302-47).¹⁷ Continuing into the first century C.E., Josephus reports that some Samaritans defiled the temple in the time of Coponius (6-9 C.E.) by sneaking in just after midnight on Passover and scattering human bones amidst the temple cloisters (*Ant.* 18.29-30), and that tensions ensued under Cumanus’ watch (48-52 C.E.), as a few Galilean Jews passing through Samaria while on pilgrimage to Jerusalem were murdered by residents of the northern Samaritan town of Ginae (*Ant.* 20.118), with some Jews retaliating by burning Samaritan villages and massacring the inhabitants.¹⁸ Though less overtly hostile, John 4 also manifests animosity, since here the Samaritan woman states that “Jews do not share things in common with Samaritans,” and “Our ancestors worshipped on this mountain, but you (the Jews) say that the place where people must worship is in Jerusalem” (4:9, 20). Jews and Samaritans thus shared a history full of

¹⁷ Cf. Eileen Schuller, "4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph," *RevQ* 14 (55) (1990): 349-76, 371-76; Hanan Eshel, "The Prayer of Joseph, a Papyrus from Masada and the Samaritan Temple on APΓAPIZIN," *Zion* 56 (1991): 125-36. Both provide arguments linking 4Q372 1.11-12 to the hostility directed toward the Samaritans in the Second Temple period. This text refers to “fools” who had made “for themselves a high place upon a high mountain to provoke Israel to jealousy.”

¹⁸ Several discrepancies exist between the account in the *Antiquities* (20.120-21, 125) and that in the *Jewish War* (2.232-40). Among these differences are the statement in *J.W.* 2.232 that only one Galilean was murdered, and the note in 2.235 that many inhabitants of Samaritan villages were killed, regardless of age. Tacitus (*Ann.* 12, 54, 4) concurs with Josephus (*Ant.* 20.129-32) when he states that the Jews were punished and Cumanus summarily removed from office on account of these atrocities. Cf. Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 49.

mistrust and suspicion, and rabbinic statements indicate that this hostile relationship continued into the Roman and Byzantine periods.¹⁹

4.1.2 Similarities

Despite the many hostilities between Jews and Samaritans, some literature from this period reveals a tacit acknowledgement of a close relationship. Our earliest witness to the kinship between the two communities is from around the year 400 B.C.E., when the Jews at Elephantine wrote letters to Bigvai, governor of Judah, Johanan, the Jerusalem high priest and his fellow priests, and Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria.²⁰ In this correspondence, it seems that the Jews in Elephantine view the recipients of their letters as sharing a common descent, irrespective of whether they live in Jerusalem or Samaria. The joint reply of Bigvai and Delaiah seems to confirm the cordial rapport between these communities, at least on the political level.²¹ 2 Maccabees 5:22-23 also provides evidence of this close relationship, for it says that after Antiochus Epiphanes has looted the temple, he sends officials to both Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim to oppress the people (τὸ γένος). The inclusion of the Samaritans in “our people/race” by the author of 2 Maccabees assumes a close tie between the two

¹⁹ See Schiffman, "Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah," 323-50.

²⁰ See papyri 30-34 in A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 108-29.

²¹ Crown, "Another Look," 149; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 58.

communities, a surprising statement considering that the author of 2 Maccabees is such an ardent proponent of the primacy of the Jerusalem temple (2:22; 3:12; 5:15-20, etc).²²

In spite of Josephus' hostility toward the Samaritans, he also provides evidence for a close relationship between Jews and Samaritans. At several points he allows that Samaritans are, in fact, Jews, or at least have been so at one point.²³ First, in his description of the origins of the Samaritans, he deviates from the biblical narrative in a rather surprising manner. According to 2 Kings 17, the Cutheans who inhabited the region of Samaria were syncretists. In Josephus' account, however, the Cutheans repent of their previous actions and worship YHWH alone—in essence converting to Judaism (*Ant.* 9.289-90). Another indication is found in Josephus' description of the time of Alexander the Great (*Ant.* 11.340), where he portrays the Samaritans as apostates (*ἀποστατῶν*) from the Jewish nation. As Feldman has noted, on other occasions in which Josephus uses the term *ἀποστάτης* (*Ant.* 10.220, 221; 11.22, 24; 14.433 [alternate reading]; *Ag. Ap.* 1.135, 136), it always refers to a rebel, and thus one who was originally a member of a particular group but chose to remove himself from it.²⁴ In addition, Josephus notes that whenever a person was accused of breaking the Sabbath, eating foods in common, or any other halakhic transgression, that person would flee to Gerizim, with

²² Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 261; cf. Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, 129; Zsengellér, "Maccabees," 186-87.

²³ Feldman, "Josephus' Attitude," 34-39.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 35-36.

the inference that the Samaritans were closely enough related to the Jews that refuge could be taken with them (*Ant.* 11.346-47).

Moreover, at various times Josephus reports that the Samaritans also recognized a common ancestry with the Jews, alternately claiming kinship and repudiating it. In *Ant.* 9.291, he relates that when the Samaritans see the Jews prospering, they call themselves their kinsmen (συγγενεῖς), claiming a common origin due to their claimed descent from Joseph. Conversely, the Samaritans repudiated this claim to kinship (συγγενεῖς) during the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and even tried to hide the fact that they worshipped “the most High God” in their temple (*Ant.* 12.257). Similarly, when pressed by Alexander the Great as to whether they are Jews, they replied that they were not Jews (descendants of Judah) but rather Hebrews (presumably descendants of Abraham) (*Ant.* 11.343-44).

The issue of the Samaritans status vis-à-vis Israel has perplexed modern scholars nearly as much as it did Josephus. Over a century ago, Montgomery claimed that the Samaritans were “nothing else than a Jewish sect,” with the fundamental difference that “their cult centres on Gerizim, not on Zion.”²⁵ Most scholars today would not go this far, preferring either to talk of shared traditions and a common Israelite heritage, or professing agnosticism due to the lack of evidence to clearly define the relationship.²⁶

²⁵ James A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature* (Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1907), 46.

²⁶ James D. Purvis, "The Samaritans and Judaism," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 91-93; Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 2-3; Benyamin Tsedaka, "Samaritanism - Judaism or Another Religion?," in *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties* (ed. Menachem Mor; Omaha:

Discussions specifically centered on Jewish sectarianism have also engaged the issue of the Samaritans, with some arguing for their inclusion in Judaism and others against.²⁷

The somewhat malleable boundaries of Judaism in the Second Temple period make the question about the relationship between Samaritans and Jews particularly tricky, and ancient and modern authors alike have disagreed on whether the Samaritans should be included under the rubric of Judaism or were distinct from it.

4.1.3 Role of Temple in Dispute

In their search for the origins of a distinct Samaritan religious community, many recent scholars have concentrated on the fourth to second centuries B.C.E. as the time when the issues dividing Jews and Samaritans began to crystallize. This is due, in large part, to the belief that the Samaritan temple was constructed in the fourth century B.C.E. around the time of Alexander the Great's presence in Palestine.²⁸ This understanding is

Creighton University Press, 1992), 47-51; Feldman, "Josephus' Attitude," 38-39; Crown, "Another Look," 134-35; Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 84-85.

²⁷ The differences are largely in the respective definitions of what makes a certain group sectarian, and the issue of the Samaritan temple looms large in these discussions. Cohen (*From the Maccabees*, 125-27, 169-72) and Alan D. Crown ("Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans," *JQR* 82 [1991]: 17-50, 20-22) define Judaism with enough elasticity to allow for Samaritan inclusion. Cohen, for example, asserts that the Samaritans fit (somewhat uneasily) into his category of a sect, in that they were a small, organized group which had separated itself from the larger community and believed that it alone embodied the ideals of the larger group. Bauckham ("Parting of the Ways," 135-51) and Baumgarten (*Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 7-11) however, view the Samaritans as outside the boundaries of Judaism. Baumgarten, in particular, attributes this to the establishment of an alternative temple and the adoption of a biblical text which supported this action.

²⁸ James D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (HSM 2; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 102-06; Hans Gerhard Kippenberg, *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 30; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 56; Lester L. Grabbe, "Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *JBL* 106 (1987): 231-46, 241-42; Menachem Mor, "The Persian, Hellenistic and Hasmonaean Period," in *The Samaritans* (ed. Alan D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989), 7; Egger, "Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans,"

based on three main premises. First, the Jewish polemic against the Samaritans increases in this period, an antagonism reciprocated by the Samaritans. Second, this is the period in which Josephus locates the construction of this temple.²⁹ Third, it was believed that archaeology had confirmed Josephus' account. While below I will argue that the construction of the Samaritan temple should be dated to the fifth century B.C.E., I begin with a discussion of the arguments that have dated its formation to the fourth century B.C.E.

In *Antiquities* 11.302-47, Josephus provides a narrative account of the founding of the temple on Mount Gerizim during the reign of Darius III (338-331 B.C.E.). In his recounting of the events (11.302), Josephus reports that Manasseh, the brother of the high priest Jaddua, married Nikaso, the daughter of the Samaritan governor Sanballat. Uneasy at this marriage between the high priestly family and a foreigner, the elders of Jerusalem give Manasseh a choice: either divorce his wife or lose his privileges and responsibilities in the temple and its service (11.308). Hearing of this, Sanballat promises Manasseh the high priesthood of a temple to be built on Mount Gerizim (11.310). Manasseh accepts, as do many other priests and Levites similarly entangled in marriages with Samaritan women. At this point, Alexander the Great makes his way to Palestine, and while the Jews declare their allegiance to Darius III, Sanballat throws in his lot with the

113; Ferdinand Dexinger, "Der Ursprung der Samaritaner im Spiegel der frühen Quellen," in *Die Samaritaner* (ed. Ferdinand Dexinger and Reinhard Pummer; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 108-10; Crown, "Another Look," 135.

²⁹ While many are loath to rely too heavily upon Josephus for the history of this time period, his account is the only one that remains, and he dates the construction of the temple to the time of Alexander the Great (332 B.C.E.).

Macedonians (11.318-21). While doing so, he petitions Alexander to allow the construction of a Samaritan temple, arguing that it would be politically expedient for Alexander to do so in order to divide the Jewish nation (11.321-23). With Alexander's consent, Sanballat builds the temple on Mount Gerizim and installs Manasseh as high priest (11.324).

Scholars have criticized Josephus' narrative on several counts, especially in regard to perceived chronological inconsistencies. One of the more intriguing details in his version of the story is the report that Manasseh, the brother of the high priest, married Nikaso, the daughter of the Samaritan governor Sanballat *in the fourth century B.C.E.*³⁰ This account is quite reminiscent of that in Nehemiah 13:28, where *in the fifth century B.C.E.* an anonymous member of the high priestly family was run out of Jerusalem after his marriage to the daughter of a Samaritan governor similarly named Sanballat. These similarities suggested to many that Josephus had either conflated the two events, or had intentionally moved the events of the fifth century into the fourth.³¹ The discovery of the documents from Wadi-ed-Daliyeh, however, revealed that Sanballat may have been a

³⁰ Josephus' knowledge of events in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. has been sharply questioned. Grabbe and Smith both suggest that Josephus has very little of historical value to offer for this period, as he had few sources to rely upon for the period between the close of the Old Testament books and the beginning of 1 Maccabees; see Grabbe, "Josephus," 232, 244-45; Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 1987), 114; cf. Robert T. Anderson ("Josephus' Accounts of Temple Building: History, Literature or Politics?," in *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies 9* [Grand Rapids: Biblical Society, 1989], 247-49), who notes Josephus' tendency to conflate similar events in the fourth- to second-centuries B.C.E.

³¹ Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, 67-69; H. H. Rowley, "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1963), 250-60; H. G. M. Williamson, "The Historical Value of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities XI, 297-301," *JTS* 28 (1977): 49-66; H. G. M. Williamson, "Sanballat," in *ABD* (ed. David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5.973-75.

common name amongst the gubernatorial families charged with oversight of Samaria. Based on these papyrological finds, F. M. Cross suggested that we must distinguish between the late fifth century Sanballat I, known from Nehemiah and the Elephantine correspondence, the early fourth century Sanballat II known from the papyri in Wadi-ed-Daliyeh, and Sanballat III, who Josephus places in the late fourth century B.C.E.³² The finds at Wadi-ed-Daliyeh and the resulting reconstruction of Samaritan history granted Josephus' account an air of respectability.³³ Moreover, Josephus frames his account of the existence of a new temple in terms of political rivalry. The principal reason given by Sanballat for the necessity of the temple on Mount Gerizim was that it would split the loyalties of the Jewish nation, sapping some of their strength and resolve (*Ant.* 11.323). In Josephus' account, the issue of the temple seems to have played a prominent role in the increasing tensions between the Jews and Samaritans.

Archaeology also seemed to confirm the fourth-century dating of the Samaritan temple. In excavations at Tell er-Ras in 1968, Bull identified a large complex on the side of Mount Gerizim as the Samaritan temple, and a half cube of unhewn stone as the remains of the Samaritan altar.³⁴ A cache of pottery, the latest of which he dated to the

³² F. M. Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *HTR* 59 (1966): 201-11; a view seconded by Dexinger, "Ursprung," 105.

³³ While there is now little dispute about the existence of multiple governors named Sanballat, Cross's larger theory of the history of this period has not been immune from criticism. See Geo Widengren, "The Persian Period," in *Israelite and Judaeon History* (ed. John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977), 506-9; Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus*, 112-14.

³⁴ Robert J. Bull, "Er-Ras, Tell," in *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. Michael Avi-Yonah and Ephraim Stern; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978), 1022.

third century B.C.E., allowed for an early Hellenistic date of this structure.³⁵ In his excavations at Shechem, Wright came to similar conclusions. Based on numismatic evidence, he dated the rebuilding of Shechem to the end of the fourth century B.C.E. and speculated that the re-emergence of Shechem was linked to Alexander's destruction of the city of Samaria.³⁶ Shechem quickly became the new capital of the region, and the city was refortified and became home to many new public buildings.³⁷ Wright assumes that the construction of the temple on Mount Gerizim occurred soon after the city of Shechem was re-inhabited.³⁸

Moreover, various sources unambiguously date the existence of a Samaritan temple, as well as an escalation in hostilities between Jews and Samaritans over temple issues, to the late fourth and early third centuries B.C.E. Josephus reports that, during the reign of Ptolemy son of Lagus (305-283 B.C.E.) and Ptolemy IV (180-140 B.C.E.), bitter conflict erupted between Jews and Samaritans in Egypt over whether sacrifices should be sent to Jerusalem or Gerizim and which temple had been built according to the law of Moses (*Ant.* 12.7-10; 13.74-79). Similarly, 2 Macc 6:2 unequivocally states that a temple existed on Mount Gerizim, as it is mentioned that Antiochus IV wanted to call the temple in Jerusalem the temple of Olympian Zeus, and to call the one in Gerizim the temple of Zeus the Friend of Strangers. In addition, two inscriptions from Delos reveal that it was

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1022.

³⁶ G. Ernest Wright, *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 171-72, 178-81.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 175.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 173.

the custom of the Samaritans residing there to send offerings to Mount Gerizim. While the dating of these inscriptions is not very precise, with one dating from 150-50 B.C.E. and the other from 250-175 B.C.E, these inscriptions at least confirm the evidence of a temple on Mount Gerizim in the early to mid-second century.³⁹

4.1.4 Recent Archaeological Evidence

For many, the collocation of the account in Josephus, the archaeological evidence, and the increasing animosity between Samaritans and Jews in the third to first centuries B.C.E. all pointed to a fourth-century date for the construction of the temple on Mount Gerizim. This explanation has been challenged by recent archaeological findings. In a series of publications, Yitzhak Magen announced the discovery of the remains of a Persian period temple, stemming from the fifth century B.C.E.⁴⁰ This new evidence suggests that the impetus for the creation of the temple on Mount Gerizim may be found in the fifth-century activities of Sanballat the Horonite and the marriage of his daughter to

³⁹ Reinhard Pummer, "Samaritan Material Remains," in *The Samaritans* (ed. Alan D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989), 150-51, 172-73.

⁴⁰ Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," 1742-48; Yitzhak Magen, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions (Vol. 1)* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004), 3-11; Yitzhak Magen and Ephraim Stern, "Archaeological Evidence for the First Stage of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim," *IEJ* 52 (2002): 49-57 = Yitzhak Magen and Ephraim Stern, "The First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim - New Archaeological Evidence," *Qadmoniot* 120 (2000): 119-24; Yitzhak Magen, "Mount Gerizim - Temple City," *Qadmoniot* 120 (2000): 74-118, esp. 97, 113-17. These conclusions reverse Magen's earlier statement that "the excavations have so far produced no evidence of a temple or settlement from the time of the Ptolemies," see Yitzhak Magen, "Gerizim, Mount," in *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. Ephraim Stern; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society & Carta, 1993), 2.487.

a member of the high priestly family, as narrated in Neh 13:28.⁴¹ Though these recent excavations present a direct challenge to the accepted notion of a fourth-century Samaritan temple, they do help straighten out two puzzling statements in Josephus' account.

First, some scholars have found Josephus' version of the marriage between Manasseh and Nikaso implausible, as this would require almost identical events occurring within a century.⁴² Many years ago, Cowley succinctly summed up this position: "The view that there were two Sanballats, each governor of Samaria and each with a daughter who married a brother of a High Priest at Jerusalem, is a solution too desperate to be entertained."⁴³ With the discovery of a fifth-century sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, we are in a position to see more clearly that Josephus may have conflated the two accounts and pushed the events of the fifth century to the fourth.⁴⁴ To quote Cowley again, "events may have happened somewhat as he says, but not when he says."⁴⁵

⁴¹ This new evidence adds further weight to the view of those who argue that the origins of a distinct Samaritan community are to be found in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. While it may be improper to talk of a "schism" or "breach" between Jews and Samaritans in this period, the construction of a temple alternative to that of Jerusalem set the wheels in motion for a future break between the two communities; see Nathan Schur, *History of the Samaritans* (BEATAJ 18; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992), 32-33.

⁴² Some have also wondered about the presence of the name Manasseh in this story. While it is possible that Josephus may be preserving accurate historical information in providing the name Manasseh for the first (Jewish) Samaritan high priest, he may also be purposely invoking the name of the apostate king *par excellence* in Judean history. See Grabbe, "Josephus," 237; Anderson, "Josephus' Accounts," 248. For the phenomenon of giving names to nameless people, see Bruce Metzger, "Names for the Nameless in the New Testament. A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann; Münster Westfalen: Verlag Aschendorff, 1970), 1.79-99.

⁴³ Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 110.

⁴⁴ See especially the conclusions of Daniel R. Schwartz, "On Some Papyri and Josephus' Sources and Chronology for the Persian Period," *JSJ* 21 (1991): 175-99; cf. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 400-401.

⁴⁵ Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 110.

Second, Josephus' version of the building of the Samaritan temple requires that it be constructed in nine months, an astonishingly short period of time for such a monumental building (*Ant.* 11.324-25, 342). Prior to Magen's work, some scholars had already insisted on the impossibility of such a feat, suggesting that construction of the temple had its beginnings in the aftermath of the Tennes rebellion in which the Persians rewarded Sanballat for his refusal to take part in this uprising in the middle of the fourth century B.C.E by allowing him to build a temple,⁴⁶ or that it was begun as a result of a power vacuum that enveloped the region during the military engagements between Alexander and the Persians.⁴⁷ Thanks to Magen's recent archaeological work, it is now clear that the temple most certainly predated the arrival of Alexander, by nearly one hundred years. Thus, the issue of a quick construction is no longer problematic; the temple had been standing for many decades, and if Alexander played any role in the Samaritan temple, it was likely that he only gave the existing structure official sanction.

With Magen's recent archaeological findings dating the Samaritan temple's construction to the fifth century B.C.E., presumably during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, we are nearly bereft of literary evidence to explain the motivations behind its construction. Nehemiah 13:28, then, is probably our most important clue in attempting to discern the origins of this temple, and it seems likely that its erection was in response to

⁴⁶ Crown, "Another Look," 151-52.

⁴⁷ Mor, "Persian, Hellenistic," 7; cf. M. Delcor, "Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments," *ZDPV* 78 (1962): 34-48, 36, who noted the discrepancy between *Ant.* 11.324 and 11.342.

Ezra and Nehemiah's insistence on the maintenance of the purity of the Jewish line.⁴⁸

After two centuries, the original descendants of the ten northern tribes who had remained in the land, along with the descendants of the foreign colonists settled by the Assyrians who had intermarried and taken up residence, were demanding access to the Yahwist temple in Jerusalem and full equality with the Judeans.⁴⁹ According to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, these two leaders refused these requests, though it seems that many Jews in the Persian period did not concur with their exclusivist policies.⁵⁰ This policy resulted in at least one priest from the high priestly family being kicked out of Jerusalem and forced to renounce his priestly responsibilities at the Jerusalem temple due to his marriage to the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, a leading figure in Samaritan politics. Indeed, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah testify that the type of marriage condemned by Ezra and Nehemiah was not all that unusual (Ezra 9-10; Neh 10:30; 13:23-29), and it is quite likely that other priests and Levites also refused to give up their wives of Samaritan

⁴⁸ On the "isolationist ideology" of Ezra and other exilic leaders, see Moshe Weinfeld, "Universalistic and Particularistic Trends During the Exile and Restoration," in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (LSTS 54; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 260-63.

⁴⁹ Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 115.

⁵⁰ Prior to the arrivals of Ezra and Nehemiah, the leadership of Samaria and the Jewish aristocracy appear to have been on friendly terms, and despite the efforts of Ezra and Nehemiah, some of this familiarity seems to have remained. At least some Samaritan leaders offered to help restore the Jerusalem temple (Ezra 4:1-2), several of the prophets and prophetesses in Jerusalem seem to have opposed Nehemiah's actions (6:10-14), and members of the more prominent families clearly intermarried with leading Samaritan families (Neh 13:28; Ezra 9:1-2). The thorny issue of intermarriage seems to have been where resolve was especially tested, and the mention of this problem in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 13:28) reveals that Ezra had not been completely successful in rooting out this problem. See Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus*, 1.131-36; Crown, "Another Look," 147; Schur, *History*, 31. Himmelfarb (*Kingdom of Priests*, 115-16) has also noted that the author of Chronicles appears to have taken great pains to show that some of the Northerners participated in the Passover feast instituted by Hezekiah after the fall of the northern kingdom. Similarly, she argues that the book of Ruth attempts to legitimate the presence of proselytes in the Jewish community and to present them as being fully Jewish.

or foreign descent, choosing instead to follow this scion of the high priestly family who was compelled to relocate due to his marriage to a Samaritan woman. This, at least, is the picture given by Josephus, although he dates this exodus of priests and Levites a century later (*Ant.* 11.307-12).

In addition, the political conflict between the districts of Judea and Samaria almost certainly played a large role in the construction of the temple on Gerizim. There was a long history of tension and antagonism between north and south which must be taken into account if we are to understand the emergence of a distinct Samaritan community. As Coggins has noted, the Hebrew Bible reveals that:

[t]ension between North and South in Israel goes back to a very early date. Such tension is a recurrent theme even in the time of the United Monarchy, and probably goes back at least to the time of the Judges . . . It is clear that there is some link between this tension and that which later developed between Jews and Samaritans. It would be wrong to identify them, and suppose that the Samaritans can simply be identified as a continuation of the old Northern kingdom—as we shall see, there is much in Samaritan tradition that militates against that—but it would be equally wrong to deny all connection and continuity.⁵¹

This uneasy relationship was allowed to continue as long as those descended from the northern tribes still participated in the Jerusalem temple and cult. With the rejection of the offer of Samaritan assistance in rebuilding the temple (Ezra 4:1-5) and Ezra's clear demarcation between the Jews and the neighboring peoples, the sanctuary was now, at least officially, closed off from the inhabitants of the province of Samaria. The appointment of Nehemiah as governor several decades later probably heightened the tension, for now the main proponent of Judean nationalism was also the political

⁵¹ Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 81.

authority in the province of Judea.⁵² Just as the Judeans were strengthening the ties between secular and religious authority in Jerusalem, the Samaritan aristocracy seems to have felt the need to create a central religious symbol which would strengthen the loyalties of the Samaritan people to the civil government.⁵³ In this, Sanballat was probably urged on by a mixture of political and religious motivations. The high places at Dan and Bethel, which had been set up by Jeroboam, were outside the province of Samaria, and the Samaritans were no longer welcome in Jerusalem due to the stringent policies of Ezra and Nehemiah. This left those in Samaria without a uniquely Samaritan cultic center and place of prayer. At Gerizim, Sanballat had a site which had the requisite sacred pedigree, and having a temple in Samaritan land would obviate the felt need for the Yahwistic portions of the population to travel to Jerusalem, for now they would be able to make pilgrimage instead to a Yahwistic sanctuary in the heart of the province of Samaria.⁵⁴ The main obstacle for Sanballat was that he lacked a proper priesthood to officiate at this temple. The marriage of his daughter to the grandson of the high priest in Jerusalem thus proved fortuitous. Presumably, this priest became the first high priest in the temple on Mount Gerizim, bringing with him the important credentials of descent

⁵² For a list of previous governors of Judah, see Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25C; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 19.

⁵³ Widengren, "The Persian Period," 511-14; Ferdinand Dexinger, "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition Volume 2* (ed. E. P. Sanders; London: SCM, 1981), 99; cf. Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 185.

⁵⁴ Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 11.

from Aaron and kinship with one of the most respected priestly families in Jerusalem.⁵⁵

The other priests and Levites who, according to Josephus, also removed themselves from Jerusalem, very likely assisted him at the temple on Mount Gerizim.

4.1.5 Destruction of Temple

According to Josephus, John Hyrcanus destroyed the Samaritan temple in 128 B.C.E., and in 108 he followed this up by demolishing the city of Shechem (*Ant.* 13.254-56; *J.W.* 1.62-63).⁵⁶ Magen's excavations have revealed that Hyrcanus also set fire to both temple and city. As the burning of a defeated city was often intended to deter future settlement, it is likely that Hyrcanus meant to settle the issue of the Samaritan temple once and for all.⁵⁷ This, however, was not to be the case. The Samaritans staunchly refused to acknowledge Jerusalem, choosing instead to revere Gerizim long after their temple's demise.⁵⁸ For example, John 4 details the tight hold that Mount Gerizim held on the Samaritans even several centuries after its destruction, and the account of armed Samaritans converging on Mount Gerizim during the time of Pilate in *Ant.* 18.85-89 reveals the continued veneration of this sacred site as well as the potential it still held for

⁵⁵ Ibid., 11. Inscriptions of priestly titles and names at Mount Gerizim, such as Elazar and Phineas, add credibility to the account in Nehemiah. See pages 25-26 and inscription numbers 1, 24, 25, 32, 61, 384, 389, and 390.

⁵⁶ These dates have been the subject of some debate. Most recently, it has been argued that the final destruction of the city most likely occurred in 112-111 B.C.E. See Magen, "Mount Gerizim - Temple City," 118; Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 13.

⁵⁷ Magen, "Mount Gerizim - Temple City," 118; Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 12.

⁵⁸ Dexinger, "Ursprung," 116.

engendering disturbances.⁵⁹ In fact, several have argued that the destruction of the Samaritan temple at the end of the second century B.C.E. was the decisive event in the split between Jews and Samaritans, as the Samaritans responded by refusing to acknowledge Jerusalem as the legitimate temple to the God of Israel.⁶⁰ Hyrcanus's actions accelerated the already deepening divide between the two peoples.

4.1.6 What gave Gerizim legitimacy, and why was it destroyed?

What made the Gerizim temple such a potent symbol? Why did Hyrcanus feel the need to destroy it, and why did the memory of this temple remain so powerful long after the physical structure was destroyed? Above, I argued for a political and religious scenario which led to the construction of a temple on Mount Gerizim. Below I shall suggest some reasons why the Jews, and especially the Jewish leadership in Jerusalem, may have found the Samaritan temple so troubling. We shall see that some of the very reasons which provided the stimulus for the construction of this temple were also likely contributing factors to its destruction at the end of the second century B.C.E.

First, Shechem and Mount Gerizim had ancient roots and were seen as sacred places.⁶¹ It was here that Abraham and Jacob built altars and brought sacrifices (Gen

⁵⁹ M. F. Collins, "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions," *JSJ* 3 (1972): 97-116.

⁶⁰ Dexinger, "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example," 107-9; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 186.

⁶¹ Joseph Heinemann, "Anti-Samaritan Polemics in the Aggadah," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13-19 August, 1973* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 3:57-69; Dexinger, "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example," 99-100; Crown, "Redating," 32-33.

12:7; 33:18-20), Joshua renewed the covenant (24:1), and Joseph's bones were buried (24:32). Moreover, Mount Gerizim stood prominently in the instructions given to the Israelites when they were about to enter Canaan—six of the tribes were to ascend Mount Gerizim and bless the people from the height (Deut 27:11-14, cf. 11:26-29). All of these arguments had the weight of time on their side, as the sacredness of Shechem/Gerizim could be traced back to the patriarchal period, prior to any sacred status being ascribed to Jerusalem. Furthermore, Jews of the period could not refute this evidence, as it was also in their sacred writings. The Samaritans went even further, however, by altering the place-name in Deut 27:4 from Mount Ebal to Mount Gerizim so as to provide evidence that the first sacrifice in Canaan took place atop Mount Gerizim.⁶² In addition, they inserted another commandment into the Decalogue (after Exod 20:14 and Deut 5:18) stressing the legitimacy of Gerizim as the official cultic site.⁶³ Pseudo-Eupolemus, considered by many a Samaritan source, continued this justification of Gerizim as an ancient and sacred location. In his account Abraham, after his successful rescue of Lot

⁶² Some scholars have suggested that the reading of "Gerizim" is original, and that later Jews replaced "Gerizim" with "Ebal" in order to remove any traces of the sanctity of Gerizim; see Siegfried Bülow, "Der Berg des Fluches," *ZDPV* 73 (1957): 100-07, esp. 104 n. 14; A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 341. This seems unlikely for two reasons. First, as Jeffrey H. Tigay (*Deuteronomy* [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996], 394 n. 12) points out, if a Jewish scribe had been responsible for removing Gerizim from verse 4, it is likely that he would have also replaced the mention of Gerizim in verse 12, or switched Ebal in verse 13 with Gerizim in verse 12 so as to highlight Gerizim as the mountain on which the curses, and not the blessings, are recited. Second, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Vetus Latina are the only textual witnesses which contain the word Gerizim in Deut 27:4. Though the presence of the reading "Gerizim" in the Vetus Latina complicates the picture somewhat, the tendency throughout the Samaritan Pentateuch to emphasize the importance of Gerizim makes it intrinsically likely that the Samaritans are responsible for the emendation of Deut 27:4 from "Ebal" to "Gerizim." Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 94-95.

⁶³ Heinemann, "Anti-Samaritan Polemics," 58-59; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 188-200; Emanuel Tov, "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritans* (ed. Alan D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989), 403-4.

and other captives, received gifts from Melchizedek, the ruler and high priest of *the city which housed the temple Argarizin, the "mountain of the Most High"* (9.17.5-6, emphasis mine).⁶⁴ Altering the biblical account found in Gen 14, Pseudo-Eupolemus connected Melchizedek with the temple at Gerizim, and Salem with Shechem instead of Jerusalem.⁶⁵

Jewish authors were also complicit in this type of textual emendation. The author of LXX Joshua changed chapter 24 to read Shiloh instead of Shechem, and Joseph is said to be buried in Hebron and not near Shechem in *Testament of Joseph* 2:6.⁶⁶ The ancient status that proponents of Gerizim could claim, combined with the textual emendations on both sides, highlight the threat that the temple on Gerizim posed for some Jews. Its location lent to the Samaritan temple an air of authority, based on its ancient, sacred status.⁶⁷ Moreover, the temple on Mount Gerizim seems to have been built very similarly to that in Jerusalem; Josephus notes several times that it followed the model of the Jerusalem temple (*J.W.* 1.63, *Ant* 11.310, 13.256), and the recent excavations by Magen have confirmed the resemblance.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Two fragments from Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* have been attributed to a Pseudo Eupolemus, and are commonly dated prior to the first century B.C.E, see Robert Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 2.880; Magen, "Mount Gerizim - Temple City," 108.

⁶⁵ For more on this connection, see Schur, *History*, 38.

⁶⁶ Heinemann, "Anti-Samaritan Polemics," 58. Heinemann also traces this polemic in the later Jewish and Samaritan sources.

⁶⁷ Dexinger, "Ursprung," 87-90; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 184.

⁶⁸ Magen, "Mount Gerizim - Temple City," 108-10; Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 6.

A second reason for Hyrcanus' destruction of the Samaritan temple may have been the considerable threat that the priests who conducted the sacred rites at Mount Gerizim posed to the Jerusalem priesthood and its aristocracy. With the founding of the Samaritan temple now being dated to the fifth century B.C.E., the evidence from Nehemiah 13:28 must be re-assessed. In this account, Nehemiah drives away from Jerusalem the grandson of the high priest Eliashib, who had married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, the governor of Samaria.⁶⁹ The strong reaction seems predicated on what Nehemiah viewed as the recurring, and particularly distressing, phenomenon of intermarriage with non-Jewish women.⁷⁰ It is possible that this banished priest became the first high priest at the temple on Mount Gerizim. If so, then a separate Zadokite line may also have been established on Mount Gerizim.⁷¹ This meant that when the Zadokite line in Jerusalem was eventually replaced by the Hasmonean usurpers, the more illustrious and ancient Samaritan high priestly line could command a respect that the

⁶⁹ Though Nehemiah mentions Sanballat several times (2:19; 4:1-2, 7; 6:1-9, 12-14; 13:28), he never explicitly states that Sanballat the Horonite was also the governor of Samaria. This identification is clear, however, from the Elephantine Papyri; see TAD A4.7 = AP 30.29.

⁷⁰ Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 183. Cf. Ezra 10:18, which provides a list of those priests who had taken wives from among the neighboring peoples. The sons of Jeshua, the first high priest of the Persian period, figure prominently in the list.

⁷¹ For the strongest statement of this position, see John Bowman, "Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood," *TGUOS* 16 (1955-56): 1-14; *ibid.*, *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity* (trans. Alfred M. Johnson, Jr.; PTMS 4; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975), 33-34, 111-17; cf. Mor, "Persian, Hellenistic," 17, Rainer Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit, Teil 2: Vom Exil bis zu den Makkabäern* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 8/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 584, 588; Crown, "Another Look," 153-54; Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, 11.

priesthood in Jerusalem could not.⁷² Hyrcanus's actions reveal that this threat to the Hasmonean priesthood proved fatal for both the Samaritan priests and their temple.⁷³ Even though Josephus was misinformed as to the date of the temple's construction, he agrees with the idea that members of a Zadokite family were involved with the Gerizim temple, although he denigrates their position and downplays their importance.⁷⁴

If Zadokite priests from Jerusalem were now officiating on Mount Gerizim, then we have no reason to assume that the Samaritan temple differed significantly from that of Jerusalem either halakhically or liturgically, as both would have derived their cultic rituals from the Pentateuch.⁷⁵ Indirect support for the observance of similar rituals may be found in Josephus' narration of disagreements between the Jewish and Samaritan communities in Egypt (*Ant.* 12.8-10; 13.74-79). In both cases, the divisive issue seems to have been the location to which one should send sacrifices, not whether or not sacrifices offered at each temple were valid. Furthermore, Josephus acknowledges that the temple on Gerizim was that of the Most High God, allowing that the Samaritans did indeed worship the same God as did the Jews (*Ant.* 12.257).

⁷² Bowman, *Samaritan Problem*, 34; Mor, "Persian, Hellenistic," 17; Dexinger, "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example," 101-2.

⁷³ Not all have agreed that the Samaritan priests were descendants of Zadok, and Bowman's thesis has been criticized; see Rowley, "Sanballat," 264-65; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 65-68; Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 143-44. The dating of the temple to the fifth century B.C.E., along with the dismissal from Jerusalem of a scion of the high priestly family due to a marriage with the daughter of the Samaritan governor, makes the Zadokite connection more plausible.

⁷⁴ *Ant.* 11.312, 340. Josephus reports that many priests and Levites left with Manasseh, and that these dissidents were "apostates of the Jewish nation." It is doubtful that these priests considered themselves apostates. More likely, they left Jerusalem because they disagreed with the exclusive claims promulgated by Ezra and Nehemiah; see Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte*, 588-89; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 183.

⁷⁵ Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 185; cf. Crown, "Redating," 34.

Third, an increasing emphasis on temple and priesthood in the Hasmonean era may have contributed to Hyrcanus' desire to destroy the Samaritan sanctuary.⁷⁶ After surveying Jewish, Greek, and Samaritan literature, Mendels concludes: "The wish for only one religio-political center is a dominant motif in much of the literature of the period. At that juncture of their history the Jews knew well that in the past, competitive religio-political centers had brought about their own national destruction; and, indeed, ten tribes were lost."⁷⁷ He adds further that although the Hasmoneans may have been uneasy with other Jewish religious centers such as Leontopolis, it was the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim that posed the biggest threat, for the Samaritans could claim Shechem/Gerizim as an ancient and sacred location, and their temple was in close proximity to the one in Jerusalem. Indeed, this threat may explain some aspects of Hyrcanus' foreign policy.⁷⁸ In his military campaigns against his neighbors to the east and north, Hyrcanus dealt harshly with the Hellenistic cities he conquered. When he turned to the Idumeans in the south, however, he compelled them to be circumcised and admitted them as Jews (*Ant.* 13.254-58). Why did he not treat the Samaritans, who were already circumcised, in the same manner as the Idumeans, choosing instead to raze their temple and completely destroy the city of Shechem (*Ant.* 13.255-56, 275-81)? The rivalry between the two temples, and the perceived threat the Samaritan temple posed to the Jerusalem leadership, probably played a leading role in its destruction by Hyrcanus at

⁷⁶ Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 107-59.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 150.

⁷⁸ Mor, "Persian, Hellenistic," 16.

the end of the second century B.C.E. While the existence of two temples may have been a tolerable situation when the districts of Judea and Samaria were under different administrations, Hyrcanus' conquest of Samaria changed the situation. Two temples in one Jewish state were one too many, leading to Hyrcanus' destruction of the Samaritan temple.⁷⁹

Fourth, a Jewish polemic describing the Samaritans as Gentiles and/or uncircumcised may have been instrumental in Hyrcanus' actions against the Samaritans. When describing the people living in and around Shechem and Mount Gerizim, Josephus and other literary documents stemming from the Second Temple period use not only the term "Samaritans," but also "Cutheans," "Sidonians," "Shechemites," the "foolish people in Shechem," and "those on Gerizim." While these last two terms are more descriptive, the terms "Cutheans," "Sidonians," and "Shechemites" are hardly innocuous.

In describing the Samaritans as "Cutheans," Josephus and the rabbis seem to have relied on 2 Kings 17 for their understanding of Samaritan origins (*Ant.* 9.288-90; 10.184; 11.19-20, 88, 302; 13.256; for the rabbis, see *b. Hullin* 6a; *b. Yoma* 69a; the tractate *Kutim*). In the first reference in the *Antiquities*, Josephus portrays the Samaritans as idolatrous non-Jews who originated in Cuthah, a Mesopotamian city, and who were brought to Samaria by the Assyrians. Similarly, when Josephus describes the destruction of the Samaritan temple, he states that Hyrcanus captured "Shechem and Gerizim and the Cuthaeon nation, which lives near the temple built after the model of the sanctuary at Jerusalem." From these references, it seems evident that Josephus used the term

⁷⁹ Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, 127-29.

“Cuthean” not only as a geographic designation, but also in an ethnic and religious sense—the Samaritans were descendants of uncircumcised immigrants who worshipped foreign gods, which made their temple and cult suspect.⁸⁰ In addition, Josephus also calls those living in the region of Samaria Sidonians (*Ant.* 11.340-45; 12.257-64).⁸¹ The animosity between the Sidonians and Jews, which is on the same level as that between Samaritans and Jews, suggests that Josephus is equating the two terms in order to further denigrate the Samaritans.⁸²

The term “Shechemites,” though, may be the most interesting designation for the Samaritans in this period (*Ant.* 11.342-46; 12.10). Though also possibly a geographic label, the term may carry a much more polemical intent, as Genesis 34 holds the Shechemites responsible for the rape of Dinah. Extra-biblical sources elaborate upon this story, emphasizing the godlessness of the Shechemites, and, with the exception of *T. Levi* 6:6, either ignoring or denying that the Shechemites were ever circumcised (Theod., *On the Jews* 7-8; *T. Levi* 5:3-4; 6:6-8; 7:3; *Jub.* 30:12-13; *Jdt* 9:2; *Ant.* 1.337-40; Philo, *Migration* 224; *Names* 193-195, 199-200; *L.A.B.* 8.7).⁸³ In addition, *Jubilees* and *Judith*

⁸⁰ Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 63-64.

⁸¹ Egger (*Josephus Flavius*, 251-83) has argued against connecting the Sidonians with the Samaritans, suggesting instead that there was a Sidonian colony in the region of Samaria. This seems unlikely, since Josephus seems to use the two terms interchangeably, and there is no reason for the Sidonians to have revered Gerizim if they were not Samaritans.

⁸² Coggins, "Samaritans in Josephus," 266. It is conceivable that the Sidonians, as foreigners, were viewed as idol-worshippers, and that literary connections were drawn between the Sidonians in Shechem and Isaiah 23, which reserves severe censure for those from Sidon. See Thomas Fischer and Udo Rüterwörden, "Aufruf zur Volksklage in Kanaan (Jesaja 23)," *WO* 13 (1982), 45-48; Coggins, "Samaritans in Josephus," 266.

⁸³ For an argument in favor of connecting the Shechemites in these extra-biblical sources with the Samaritans, see John J. Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *HTR* 73

name these Shechemites as Gentiles (*Jub.* 30:12-13; *Jdt* 5:16), and *T. Levi* 7:3 describes the city of Shechem as the “City of the Senseless,” and their inhabitants as fools. Moreover, violence against the Shechemites is either specifically ordained by God or highlighted in several of these texts (*T. Levi* 5:3-4; 6:8; *Jub.* 30:18; *Theod.* 7-8). While it is probably unwise to draw direct parallels between these Second Temple texts and Josephus’ use of the term Shechemites for the Samaritans, the connections are suggestive. If these texts contain some semblance of the common understanding of the Samaritans in the late Second Temple period—that they were uncircumcised Gentiles who were deserving of God’s punishment—then we may have further insight into Hyrcanus’ decision to destroy Shechem and the temple on Gerizim. In the ultra-nationalistic Hasmonean era, the text of Genesis 34 may very well have been wielded as a weapon, resulting in serious consequences for the Samaritans/Shechemites.⁸⁴

In summary, the political and religious motivations which prompted the construction of the temple on Mount Gerizim also contributed to its demise, and the destruction of the Samaritan temple toward the end of the second century B.C.E. did not bring to an end the hostilities between the Samaritans and Jews. If anything, it seems to have cemented this tension, as many of the issues that provoked the devastation of the

(1980): 91-104. For a counter-argument, see Reinhard Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *HTR* 75 (1982): 177-88; cf. Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 66-69. Though I find Pummer’s cautions salutary, Collins seems to be correct in noting that the consistent denial of Shechemite circumcision in many third- and second-century texts occurs precisely in the period of increasing tension between Jews and Samaritans.

⁸⁴ Collins, "Epic of Theodotus," 98. Kippenberg (*Garizim*, 90) also notes the importance of this text: “So ist nicht zu übersehen, dass die at. Erzählung Gen 34 von der heimtückischen Erschlagung der Bewohner Sichems durch Simeon und Levi zur Magna Charta jüdischer Gewalttätigkeit gegen die Sichemiter wurde.”

temple did not dissipate. Samaritans continued to claim Gerizim as a sacred place and maintain the ancient status of their priesthood and cult. The exclusive claims on both sides were accompanied by a simmering distrust, and in the ensuing tension the sanctity of Mount Gerizim remained central. Though even centuries later the authors of tractate *Kutim* held out hope that the Samaritans would renounce Gerizim and once again return to the fold, this was not to be.

4.2 Leontopolis

A second example of a Jewish temple built outside of Jerusalem in the Second Temple period is the Oniad sanctuary in Egypt. Egypt had long been a haven for Jews who, for various reasons, had decided to leave their homeland and establish a life for themselves elsewhere. According to Genesis, Abraham, Joseph, and all of Jacob's family settled in Egypt to escape famines (Gen 12, 37, 46-50), and the book of Jeremiah recounts how an individual (Uriah son of Shemaiah) and a whole host of people (Johanan son of Kareah and those with him) escaped to Egypt to avoid persecution (Jer 26, 42-43). During the Second Temple period this trend continued, as Jews built a temple in Elephantine⁸⁵ and several synagogues in Alexandria.

Sometime in the middle of the second century B.C.E., another contingent of Jews left Palestine and settled in the Nile Delta in Lower Egypt. This settlement was

⁸⁵ The temple at Elephantine could also have been included in our survey of alternative temples to that in Jerusalem. But its erection and destruction occurred at such an early date that it is inconsequential for understanding how Jews in the first century C.E. would have understood the phenomenon of alternative Jewish temples.

noteworthy for several reasons. The founder of this colony was none other than Onias, the heir to the highly esteemed Zadokite line that had held the office of high priest for centuries. Moreover, Onias established a Jewish temple at this site, in a region which was to become known as the “land of Onias” (ἡ Ὀνίου χωρά) (*Ant* 14.131, *J.W.* 1.190).⁸⁶ Located roughly thirty miles northwest of Memphis, in the nome of Heliopolis, the temple at Leontopolis was to remain in existence for over two centuries before finally succumbing to the Romans in their suppression of the Jewish revolt in Judea.⁸⁷

4.2.1 Sources

Details of this temple are found in several sources, with Josephus being the most significant. The *Jewish War* and *Antiquities* provide details of the foundation of the temple by Onias, although each provides differing motivations for its construction. Outside of Josephus, however, contemporary literary evidence for this temple is lacking. Philo never mentions the existence of this sanctuary in his native country, and

⁸⁶ Aryeh Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985), 119-31; Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian* (trans. Robert Cornman; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 129-33; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 186. Cf. Claudius Ptolemy (*Geog* 4.5.53), Eusebius (*Chron.* 2.126), Jerome (*Chron.* 127; *Expl. Dan.* 3.11.14), and *CJP* III, 520, which all note that the region around Heliopolis was named Ὀνίου. For text and translation of Ptolemy, Eusebius and Jerome, see Gideon Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 25-26; for discussion of *CJP* III, 520, see *ibid.*, "CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple," *JSJ* 26 (1995): 32-41.

⁸⁷ Leontopolis is almost assuredly to be identified with the site Tel el-Yehoudieh, although Bohak has recently argued that Heliopolis is the more likely candidate for this site. Many remains of Jewish settlements have been discovered in this general area, including Leontopolis, Heliopolis and Demerdash. See Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 25-30; Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 127.

pseudepigraphical works of Egyptian provenance provide only tantalizing hints.⁸⁸ Later sources, however, do acknowledge the temple's existence. Rabbinic literature contains halakhic discussions on the acceptability of priests and offerings in the Oniad temple,⁸⁹ and a reference to the story of Onias and the founding of the temple appears in Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁹⁰ Archaeological evidence also exists, though its authenticity has been questioned.

We are largely reliant on the testimony of Josephus for our information regarding this temple, yet his accounts occasionally contradict one another. Indeed, Josephus has left differing reports regarding the identity of the founder of the temple, the date of its

⁸⁸ Collins ("Sibylline Oracles," 356; *ibid.*, *Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*, 51) has argued that the third *Sibylline Oracle* was written by those interested in and sympathetic toward Onias, but before the temple at Leontopolis had been built. He makes it clear, however, that when a temple is discussed in *Sib. Or.* 3, the primary referent is the Jerusalem temple. M. Delcor ("Le Temple d'Onias en Égypte: Réexamen d'un vieux problème," *RB* 75 [1968]: 188-203, esp. 201-2) has also argued that Artapanus hints at the temple at Leontopolis, though not explicitly mentioning it. Bohak (*Joseph and Aseneth*, *passim*) on the other hand, has argued that the central portion of *Joseph and Aseneth* (14.1-17.10) should be read as a "fictional history" defending the existence of the Oniad temple at Heliopolis, not Leontopolis, and that *Josephus and Aseneth* is a type of foundation narrative for the Jewish temple in Egypt. Despite Bohak's argument, there is no strong evidence tying the Oniad temple to Heliopolis. Bohak admits that Tel el-Yehoudieh was originally an Oniad settlement, and even if Onias was guided by MT Isaiah 19:18-20, which mentions a "city of the sun," he may well have settled in the district of Heliopolis and not the city itself. Indeed, Josephus explicitly states that Onias built his temple at Leontopolis, in the district (νόμος) of Heliopolis. If this link between Onias and the city of Heliopolis is severed, then Bohak has lost the essential connection tying his thesis to the story of *Joseph and Aseneth*. While his reading of the honeycomb scene (14:1-17:10) is suggestive, Bohak's inability to directly tie the Oniad temple to the city of Heliopolis greatly attenuates the merits of his argument. Outside of Bohak's reading of *Joseph and Aseneth*, there is no explicit reference in Egyptian Jewish literature to Onias' sanctuary in Egypt, an omission that is striking. It may be that the temple was an important part of the life of Egyptian Jewry, and Philo and other authors pass over it in silence in order to give the impression that this temple was of no great consequence. A second, more plausible, understanding is that this temple was not a focal point of Egyptian Jewish life, and that it is not mentioned because there was no real reason to do so. An ancillary reason for its relative unimportance may be directly tied to its location, as it was not particularly close to the thriving Jewish community in Alexandria.

⁸⁹ *m. Menah* 13:10; *t. Menah* 13:12-15; *b. Menah* 109b; *b. Abod. Zar.* 52b; *b. Meg.* 10a; *y. Yoma* 6:3.

⁹⁰ Robert Devreesse, ed., *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste Sur Les Psaumes (I-LXXX)* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), 351-53.

founding, and the motivations in so doing. In the *Jewish War*, Onias III is clearly the founder of the sanctuary, whereas in the *Antiquities* it is unambiguously stated that the initiator of this temple was Onias IV. Reflecting the confusion in the sources, modern scholarship is also divided on this issue, with most preferring the account in *Antiquities*,⁹¹ and a minority arguing for the narrative contained in the *Jewish War*.⁹² Below I will discuss the accounts of the founding of this temple in *J.W.* and the *Antiquities*, survey the relevant archaeological data and a few peculiar characteristics of this temple, and conclude with a discussion of possible motivations for Onias's construction of this Jewish temple at Leontopolis.

4.2.2 The Jewish War

Accounts of the construction (1.31-33; 7.423-32) and destruction (7.433-36) of the Oniad temple at Leontopolis bookend Josephus' portrayal of the Jewish revolt in the *Jewish War*. In 1.31-33, he recounts the dissension and power struggles in Jerusalem

⁹¹ Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias," 188-93; Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 124-25; Erich S. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple," *Scripta Classica Israelica* XVI (1997): 47-70; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 188-90; Schürer, *HJP*, 3.145-46; Peter Schäfer, "From Jerusalem the Great to Alexandria the Small: The Relationship between Palestine and Egypt in the Graeco-Roman Period," in *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture* (ed. Peter Schäfer; TSAJ 71; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998), 134-36; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 214-22.

⁹² Isaac Leo Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (FAT 40; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2004 [orig. 1948]), 252-57; F. Parente, "Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Proceedings of the Josephus Colloquium 1992 in San Miniato (Italy): Essays in Honor of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Seivers; Leiden: Brill, 1994); Joan Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias," *JSJ* 29 (1998): 297-321.

during the disputes between Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy VI.⁹³ In these disputes the high priest Onias succeeds in expelling from the city the Tobiads, a wealthy land-owning Jewish family with important political ties to both the Ptolemies and Seleucids.⁹⁴ This expulsion, however, turns out badly for Onias and Jerusalem, for the Tobiads, having taken refuge with Antiochus Epiphanes, convince him to march against Jerusalem. In the ensuing assault on the city, the temple is plundered and Onias forced to flee to Egypt. After petitioning Ptolemy, Onias is granted land in the nome of Heliopolis where he builds a “small town on the model of Jerusalem and a temple resembling ours” (1.33). With a promise to discuss these matters in due course, Josephus here breaks off the narrative of Onias and the Leontopolis temple.

A similar account of the founding of the temple is found toward the end of the *Jewish War* (7.423-32). Once again Onias, the son of Simon, is portrayed as fleeing the invading Antiochus and settling in Ptolemaic Egypt. Josephus, however, now goes into further detail in his discussion of the founding of the temple at Leontopolis. Aware of Ptolemy VI Philometer’s hatred toward Antiochus, Onias tells him he would make the Jewish nation his ally if the king would grant him permission to build a temple to the Jewish God in Egypt, for after Antiochus’ desecration of the temple the Jews would flock

⁹³ Though his criticism of the Oniad temple at Leontopolis may be more muted in the *Jewish War* than in the *Antiquities* (where Onias’ request to build a temple on a site where a sacred temple stood already is declared to be a “transgression of the law”), Josephus’ presentation of this event at the beginning and end of his account of the Jewish revolt tips his hand a bit, for the construction of this temple stems from Onias’ anti-Seleucid campaign to encourage his fellow Jews to adopt a more pro-Ptolemaic position. In short, the stimulus is party strife, the very factor which Josephus blames for the Jewish revolt and defeat in 66-70 C.E. See Robert Hayward, “The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 429-43, 431-32.

⁹⁴ For more on the Tobiads, see Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus*, 192-98.

to Onias for the sake of religious toleration (7.423-25). Compelled by this statement, Onias is given a tract of land, a hundred and eighty furlongs distant from Memphis, where he erects a fortress and builds a temple sixty cubits in height, made out of huge stones. In contrast to his earlier statement (1.33), Josephus here declares that the temple resembles a tower and is unlike the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The altar and all of the temple furnishings, excepting the lampstand, are designed on the model of that in the home country (7.426-30). According to this account, Onias' aim in constructing this temple is to rival the Jews in Jerusalem against whom he is still bitter, hoping to attract many Jews away from it. Moreover, Isaiah (19:18-20) had predicted six hundred years earlier that a temple would be built in Egypt by a man of Jewish birth (7.431-32).

In the above passage, Josephus explicitly states that the high priest who fled to Egypt and was responsible for the construction of this temple was the "son of Simon." This Simon is Simon II, the high priest depicted in glowing terms in Ben Sira 50 and acclaimed by the rabbis as Simon the Just.⁹⁵ If so, then Onias must be Onias III, who held the office of high priest in the early second century B.C.E. The rabbis and Theodore of Mopsuestia both concur on this point, identifying Onias III as the founder of the temple at Leontopolis.⁹⁶ Moreover, Onias III would have legitimate reasons to found another temple. Unfairly ousted from his presiding role at the Jerusalem temple, he was forced to flee to Egypt after witnessing an opposing high priest (Jason) alter the temple

⁹⁵ *Abot* 1:2; *t. Sotah* 13:6-8; *y. Yoma* 6:3; *b. Yoma* 39a-b; *b. Menah* 109b.

⁹⁶ *b. Menah* 109b; *y. Yoma* 6:3; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Comm. Ps.* 54.

cult and undertake a hellenization campaign.⁹⁷ In addition, Antiochus Epiphanes' desecration of the Jerusalem temple a few years later rendered it unfit for use. If the account in the *Jewish War* is followed, the unusual state of affairs in Jerusalem between 167 and 164 B.C.E. most likely drove Onias to construct an alternative temple in which the proper worship of God was maintained and legitimate sacrifices continually offered.⁹⁸

A major problem with the narrative in *J.W.*, however, is that according to 2 Macc 4, Onias III never went to Egypt. Instead, he was deposed by Jason around 175 B.C.E., and, at the instigation of Menelaus, killed a few years later by Andronicus in the temple at Daphne, at Antioch on the Orontes. This means that either Josephus' account in the *Jewish War* or 2 Maccabees is mistaken. Those who identify Onias III as the founder of the Oniad Temple have needed to oppose the claims of 2 Maccabees.

One way these critics have countered the narrative of 2 Maccabees is to undermine its plausibility. According to 2 Maccabees, Onias III seeks asylum in Daphne in what was presumably a pagan temple. This, however, seems suspicious to some, as it is unlikely that a Jewish High Priest would have taken sanctuary in a pagan temple.⁹⁹ Moreover, according to 2 Maccabees, Andronicus was killed by Antiochus Epiphanes for his impetuous act of murdering Onias III. Diodorus Siculus and John of Antioch (7th century C.E.), however, recount Andronicus' death differently, stating that he was put to death at the hands of Antiochus IV due to his role in the death of Antiochus, the son of

⁹⁷ Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 310.

⁹⁸ See Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 125; Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 310.

⁹⁹ Parente, "Onias III's Death," 73-74, 96.

Seleucus IV Philopator.¹⁰⁰ According to these two independent witnesses, Andronicus' death was a result of his involvement in the death of the boy Antiochus, and not for the death of Onias. Due to this inconsistency, Parente has argued that the author of 2 Maccabees replaced the story of Andronicus' killing of the young Antiochus with the murder of Onias III, and that Onias III remained alive and subsequently fled to Egypt.¹⁰¹ Taylor has provided a second reservation about the account in 2 Maccabees, noting that there was no reason for Onias to remain in Jerusalem after his removal in 175 B.C.E. Indeed, in the three-year gap between his deposition and death, he had ample time to found a sanctuary in Egypt.¹⁰² Third, proponents of Onias III as the founder of the temple also often appeal to passages in the *Mishnah*, *Tosefta*, *Talmud*, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, which are all in agreement that it was Onias III who founded the temple at Leontopolis.

These arguments are all intended to either cast some doubt upon the story of Onias' death in 2 Maccabees or to reconcile the account in 2 Maccabees with that found in the *Jewish War*. A persistent problem, however, is the simple fact that 2 Maccabees stands so much closer in time to the events which it describes. As Gruen has observed, the text of 2 Maccabees was "composed probably within two generations of Onias III's

¹⁰⁰ Diodorus 30.7.2-3; John of Antioch, fr. 132 (text found in Umberto Roberto, *Ioannis Antiocheni: Fragmenta ex Historia Chronica* [TUGAL 154; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005], 200, 202).

¹⁰¹ Parente, "Onias III's Death," 74, 96; cf. Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 49.

¹⁰² Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 302-3. Taylor also states that the dating of events in 1 and 2 Maccabees is difficult to reconcile, and that the impression gained is that "the redactor, or the author Jason of Cyrene, was rather vague on dates." The somewhat loose chronological framework of 2 Maccabees may allow for a longer period of time than three years.

death—or indeed rather less if Onias actually survived to establish the Heliopolitan temple several years later.”¹⁰³ According to Gruen, those who privilege the reports in rabbinic documents and Theodore of Mopsuestia have little on which to base their historical reconstruction. While proximity does not guarantee accuracy, it does present a greater degree of historical probability, all other things being equal.

4.2.3 The Jewish Antiquities

A second account of the founding of the temple at Leontopolis appears in Josephus’ *Antiquities*, with the core of the story occurring in 13.62-73.¹⁰⁴ In this passage, the province of Judaea is being ravaged by the Macedonians. In the hopes of securing fame and glory for himself, the “son of the high priest Onias, who had the same name as his father” and who is now living in Alexandria, writes a letter to Ptolemy and Cleopatra seeking their permission to build a temple in Egypt similar to the temple in Jerusalem (13.63). Spurred on by a prophecy in Isaiah (19:18-20), as well as by the “many and great [military] services” he has provided Ptolemy in his military campaigns in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, Onias requests that he be allowed to repair and cleanse a temple lying in ruins and dedicate it to the Most High God. This temple will serve the purpose of uniting the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt and keeping them beholden to the Egyptian

¹⁰³ Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 49-50. This observation leads Gruen to remark: “The account in II Maccabees can stand. Onias III perished in Daphne and could not have led a Jewish exile community to Heliopolis.”

¹⁰⁴ Sanders (*Judaism*, 476) remarks that in writing the *Antiquities*, Josephus often goes on to supplement or revise his account in the *Jewish War*. While Sanders does not specifically cite this instance, this seems to be the case with the account of the founding of the temple in Leontopolis. Unfortunately, his “revisions” do not add much clarity to the picture.

rulers (13.64-68). Expressing surprise at Onias' choice of locale for this temple, Ptolemy and Cleopatra nevertheless grant his request. With their authorization, Onias proceeds to build a temple and altar similar to, but smaller than, that in Jerusalem, and, at its completion, fellow priests and Levites join him in administering the temple rites (13.69-72).

In this version of the story, the Onias in question is necessarily Onias IV. Josephus makes this identification irrefutably clear, recounting the death of Onias III when his son Onias is an infant (νήπιος ἦν ἕτι; *Ant.* 12.237-39) and stating that the Onias who had fled to Ptolemy in Egypt was "Onias, the son of the high priest, who . . . had been left a mere child (ἕτι παῖδα) when his father died" (12.387).¹⁰⁵ Many have found plausible the identification of Onias IV, rather than Onias III, as the founder of the temple in Egypt, especially as this does not contravene the account given in 2 Maccabees. If this version of the story is correct, the founding of the temple must have occurred sometime between 163-162 B.C.E., when Ptolemy Philometer returned from Rome and Alcimus became high priest in Jerusalem, and 145 B.C.E., when Ptolemy Philometer died.

The account in *Antiquities*, however, also contains serious inconsistencies. First, Josephus twice describes Onias IV as an extremely young man at the time of his father's death.¹⁰⁶ If one takes this description at face value, Onias IV would have become an

¹⁰⁵ The death of Onias III may also be alluded to in Dan 9:26 and 1 Enoch 90:8. See Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), 252; John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 356, 382; Tiller, *Commentary*, 354; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 400. Gruen ("Origins and Objectives," 51) however, has cautioned that this identification is not a certainty.

¹⁰⁶ According to 2 Maccabees the death of Onias III occurred in 172 B.C.E., but Josephus dates it to 175 B.C.E.

established military leader, in command of a significant number of men, as a young teenager.¹⁰⁷ Second, it is unclear which military engagements Onias might be describing, as the only war fought by Ptolemy VI in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia was against Antiochus IV in 170-168 B.C.E., only a handful of years after Onias, according to Josephus, was a νήπιος.¹⁰⁸ Third, Josephus explains Onias IV's flight to Egypt as being the result of Alcimus receiving the high priesthood, thus severing the Oniad, and hence the Zadokite, claim on the office. But 2 Maccabees informs us that Menelaus, Alcimus' predecessor, already was of non-Zadokite descent, rendering Josephus' claim highly improbable.¹⁰⁹

Two arguments, though, may place Onias IV in Egypt much earlier than Josephus allows. First, in 164 B.C.E., a personal letter to a certain Onias was appended to a circular sent from the Egyptian administrator Herodes to various officials in Egypt (*CPJ* I, 132). Only the first three letters are legible (Ὀνί[αι]), but this is enough to plausibly identify the addressee as Onias.¹¹⁰ In this missive, Herodes requests that cultivation of

¹⁰⁷ Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 53; Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 307.

¹⁰⁸ Some have argued that Onias may have given aid to Ptolemy VI in other military campaigns, but the battles between Ptolemy and Antiochus in 170-168 were the only ones fought in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. For a suggestion that Onias' assistance occurred in 150 B.C.E. during the conflict between Demetrius I and Alexander Balas, see Kasher, *Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 133-34.

¹⁰⁹ See Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 52. Josephus makes this error right at the beginning of his description of Onias IV, stating that Menelaus and Jason were both brothers of Onias III; see *Ant.* 12.237-38. Further confusion in the high priestly line is evident in *Ant.* 20.235-36, where Menelaus is also called Onias, and Onias IV is named the nephew of Onias III.

¹¹⁰ See Ulrich Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde)* (2 vols.; Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1927), 1.487-88. This reading was subsequently followed by Victor Tcherikover, ed., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957-1964), 1.245-46; Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias," 192; Kasher, *Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, 60-61, 135; Modrzejewski, *Jews of*

farmland be encouraged, as an economic crisis necessitates the working of the land. The courteous tone of this letter, and the mention of the health of the royal family, presupposes that the recipient is a well-respected official in Egypt, perhaps even personally known to the king and Herodes.¹¹¹ As 2 Maccabees recounts Onias III's death, the only known candidate would be Onias IV. If so, Onias IV came to Egypt sometime prior to 162 B.C.E., rendering Josephus's chronology incorrect on this point.¹¹² Most likely, Onias IV traveled to Egypt sometime after 172 B.C.E., the year in which his father was murdered and Menelaus, a non-Zadokite priest, ascended to the high priesthood. This relocation probably occurred soon after his father's death, for the account in *Antiquities* assumes that some time had elapsed between Onias' arrival in Egypt and his establishment of the temple at Leontopolis.¹¹³

In addition, James VanderKam has advanced a second argument against the narrative in *Antiquities*.¹¹⁴ Focusing on the chronology of the death of Onias III in the *Antiquities*, as well as the terminology used to describe Onias IV at this juncture in his

Egypt, 124; Schäfer, "From Jerusalem the Great," 136. For a contrary view, see Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 21; Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 55-56.

¹¹¹ Tcherikover, ed., *CPJ*, 1.245-46; Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 124; Schäfer, "From Jerusalem the Great," 136.

¹¹² As Delcor ("Le Temple d'Onias," 192) states: "Si, comme il est vraisemblable, Onias dans ce papyrus n'est autre que le grand prêtre du même nom, Onias IV, il faut évidemment sacrifier des données de Josèphe à la précision d'un papyrus, car la chronologie de cet historien, pour la période précédant la révolte maccabéenne, est loin d'être certaine. Cf. Tcherikover, ed., *CPJ*, 1.245-46; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 218-22.

¹¹³ See Tcherikover, ed., *CPJ*, 1.45; M. Stern, "The Death of Onias III," *Zion* 25 (1960): 1-16, esp. 16 and n. 99.

¹¹⁴ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 214-22, esp. 218.

life, VanderKam suggests that Onias IV may not have been as young as Josephus insinuates. First, Josephus connects Onias III's death to the date of Jason's acquisition of the high priesthood, meaning that the events described stem from 175 B.C.E.¹¹⁵ Second, Josephus' use of the term *νήπιος* in *Ant.* 12.237 to describe Onias IV at the death of this father may be misleading, for although the term may be translated as "infant," *νήπιος* may also mean one who is a "minor, not yet of age."¹¹⁶ This understanding of *νήπιος* agrees with Josephus' description of Onias IV elsewhere, as he twice refers to him as a *παῖς* ("boy, youth").¹¹⁷ If Onias IV was a minor in 175 B.C.E., it is certainly plausible that he was old enough by 168 to throw his aid behind Ptolemy in his military campaigns against Antiochus Epiphanes.¹¹⁸ As the legitimate heir to the high priestly office, he presumably would not have had a difficult time gaining a following. Moreover, he had ample reason to dislike the Seleucids: his father had been murdered at their hands.

From the account in *Antiquities*, then, we may ascertain two possible dates for the founding of the temple in Egypt by Onias IV. Strictly following Josephus' account, the construction of this temple would have occurred sometime after the high priesthood was conferred upon Alcimus and prior to the death of Ptolemy Philometer. This means that the sanctuary at Leontopolis would have been established sometime between 162 and 145 B.C.E. If, however, Josephus' assertion that Onias remained in Jerusalem until 162 is

¹¹⁵ As opposed to 172/1 B.C.E., when 2 Maccabees registers his death.

¹¹⁶ See *BDAG*, 671; cf. Gal 4:1 and various passages in Josephus, e.g. *Ant.* 7.86; 10.172.

¹¹⁷ *BDAG*, 750.

¹¹⁸ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 218.

fallacious, then it is quite possible that he journeyed to Egypt sometime in the early to middle 160s, and the founding of the temple may be dated to the years directly following that. If so, Onias IV's construction of the temple at Leontopolis could have occurred in the same general period as that founded by Onias III, and for similar reasons. The difference between these two datings is important, and I will return to it below.

4.2.4 Archaeology

Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence for the temple at Leontopolis is not as conclusive as in the case of the Samaritan temple. Excavations at Tel el-Yehoudieh (the modern name for Leontopolis) were first carried out in 1887 by Naville and Griffith,¹¹⁹ and soon thereafter Flinders Petrie embarked on a more thorough archaeological survey of the site. In his final reports he concluded that he had found the remains of the ancient Jewish temple and fortress of Onias, based on location (in the Heliopolite nome at approximately the correct distance from Memphis), existence of a temple and a great deal of building material, Jewish names in the nearby cemetery, and the great number of bones from the burnt sacrifices that had been thrown outside the city.¹²⁰ Taking his cue from

¹¹⁹ Edouard Naville and F. L. Griffith, *The Mound of the Jews and the City of Onias* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1890), passim.

¹²⁰ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities* (London: British School of Archaeology, 1906), 27; cf. *ibid.*, *Egypt and Israel* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1923), 102-10. The inscriptional evidence from a necropolis adjacent to Tel el-Yehoudieh reveals that a significant Jewish population existed at this site. While both Greek and Hebrew names were found in nearly equal numbers, these names were almost exclusively written in Greek. See W. Horbury and D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), inscriptions 29-105, pages 51-182 (= *CPJ* III.1451-1530); cf. D. Noy, "The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa," in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (ed. J.W. Van Henten and P.W. Van der Horst; AGJU 21; Köln: Brill, 1994), 162-72.

Josephus, who states that the temple and city were built to resemble Jerusalem, Flinders Petrie painstakingly drew parallels verifying Josephus' account.¹²¹ First, basing himself on the dimensions of the Solomonic temple (20 cubits by 70 cubits), he noted that the dimensions of the Oniad temple seem to have been almost exactly half of Solomon's temple (10 cubits by 35 cubits). Built on a 2:1 scale, this Oniad temple may have very closely resembled the temple in Jerusalem at the time, since the book of Ezra states that the Jerusalem temple was nowhere near the size of the earlier temple.¹²² Second, Flinders Petrie takes into account the site as a whole, comparing the topography of this settlement with that of Jerusalem.¹²³ Like the Jerusalem temple, which had valleys on both its eastern and western faces and a massive staircase to reach the temple courts, the Oniad temple was flanked on both sides by valleys, and access to the temple on the eastern side was gained via a monumental staircase. Moreover, Flinders Petrie contends that the Antonia fortress in Jerusalem, which lay directly north of the temple, had a direct counterpart in a fortress to the north of Onias' temple, providing both protection and a view into the temple courts for those manning the citadel.

Comte du Mesnil du Buisson was one of the earliest scholars to contest Flinders Petrie's analysis. While in agreement that Tel el-Yehoudieh was the site where Onias

¹²¹ In many ways, Flinders Petrie seems to have been attempting to prove the historical value of Josephus' account. After criticizing Naville for declaring that Josephus may not have given precise information for the different Jewish communities in Egypt, Flinders Petrie (*Hyksos*, 20) states that "in this, and other cases, when we ascertain the facts, it is seen that we do best to stick closely to our authorities." He certainly cannot be accused of doing otherwise.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 24.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 27; A. Barucq ("Leontopolis," in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément* [Paris: Létouzey et Ané, 1957], 364) agrees with Flinders Petrie's findings, citing similar evidence.

had built a fortress, he disagreed with Flinders Petrie's assertion that a large temple had been built at the site, noting: "Tout cela ne s'accorde guère avec le miserable edifice de M. Petrie sur le dessus de la colline."¹²⁴ Instead, he posited that a temple on the grand scale described by Josephus may have been located in the neighboring Hyksos military camp, which certainly provided more room for a monumental building.¹²⁵ Many modern scholars are similarly uncertain of Flinders Petrie's excavations (though rarely do they give reasons for their skepticism).¹²⁶ This reticence is due, in part, to the impossibility of validating or denying his conclusions, as local residents have done considerable damage to the site.¹²⁷

In the end, we are left with little archaeological evidence to support the existence of an Oniad temple at Leontopolis. The grand claims of Flinders Petrie, dulled somewhat by du Mesnil du Buisson's criticisms, are now unverifiable, and it is nearly impossible to tell what once existed at Tel el-Yehoudieh. Below, I will discuss two further distinctive features of Josephus' accounts before concluding with a discussion of possible motivations for the construction of the Oniad temple at Leontopolis.

¹²⁴ Comte du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Temple D'Onias et le Camp Hyksos à Tell el-Yahoudiyé," *BIFAO* 35 (1935): 59-71, esp. 64; cf. Comte du Mesnil du Buisson, "Compte Rendu Sommaire d'une Mission à Tell El-Yahoudiyé," *BIFAO* 29 (1929): 155-77.

¹²⁵ du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Temple D'Onias," 70.

¹²⁶ Hayward, "Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 431 n. 20; Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 127; Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 28; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 186; cf. Horbury and Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions*, xvii.

¹²⁷ Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 319. Destruction of antiquities from this site was already underway in the late nineteenth century, see Greville J. Chester, "A Journey to the Biblical Sites in Lower Egypt," *PEFQS* (1880): 136-38.

4.2.5 Description of Temple/Tower

In *Antiquities*, along with one of the two accounts in the *Jewish War*, Josephus states that the sacred structure at Leontopolis resembled the temple in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 12.388; 13.63, 72, 285; 20.236; *J.W.* 1.33). One version in the *Jewish War*, however, disagrees, explicitly stating that the temple at Leontopolis was unlike that in Jerusalem. Instead, it resembled a tower (*J.W.* 7.427). Hayward has noted that this discrepancy is more apparent than real, for a number of Jewish sources stemming from the Second Temple period and beyond portray the temple symbolically as a tower (see *1 Enoch* 89:50, 73; *Tg. Isa.* 5.2; *Exod. Rab.* 20.5; *Herm. Sim.* 9.3-13; *Barn.* 16.5).¹²⁸ *1 Enoch* 89, for example, describes Jerusalem as a house and twice characterizes the temple as a tower (89:50, 73). Significantly for our purposes, this section of *1 Enoch* appears to have been composed in the 160s B.C.E., as it concludes with a description of the exploits of Judah Maccabee.¹²⁹ Intriguingly then, we find a contemporaneous account of the temple at Jerusalem as a tower in the same period as the building of the tower/temple at Leontopolis. As a result, Josephus' statement about the Oniad sanctuary being unlike the temple at Jerusalem is mistaken, for the temple-tower image appears to have been part of the common parlance of the day, used to represent the temple in Jerusalem symbolically.

In his description of the temple at Leontopolis, Josephus also states that the height of the tower was sixty cubits (*J.W.* 7.427), and that this temple was "smaller and poorer"

¹²⁸ Hayward, "Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 432-34. This paragraph is reliant upon many of Hayward's observations.

¹²⁹ There may have been earlier versions of this document which were updated to include Judah Maccabee; see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 361, 398-401.

than the one in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 13.72). Sixty cubits, however, are the exact dimensions given for the restored temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 6:3; 1 Esd 6:24, *Ant.* 11.99; 15.385; *J.W.* 5.215).¹³⁰ It seems highly probable, though, that Josephus' statement of dissimilarity between the two temples is anachronistic, as the appearance of the temple in Josephus' day would have been quite different than the form of the temple in the Maccabean era. In the waning years of the first century B.C.E., Herod undertook a massive reconstruction of the temple. In so doing, he altered many details of the temple structure, including the height of the temple, alternately given as 80 or 100 cubits (*Ant.* 15.385, 391; *J.W.* 5.207-21). This discrepancy may explain Josephus' contradictory statements, for the height of Herod's temple, the one that Josephus would have been familiar with, certainly differed from that of the Oniad temple in Egypt.

Though Josephus tries to downplay the similarities between the two temples, it is clear that Onias was consciously patterning his temple after the current one in Jerusalem, and not after Solomon's temple. This imitation was undoubtedly intentional, for just as Onias' ancestor Jeshua ben Jozadak had led a small number of Israelite exiles out of Babylon with the intention of establishing a restored temple and unadulterated worship (Ezra 5:2), so also a legitimate high priest now led a small band of Jews into exile, constructing a temple in a symbolic Jerusalem.¹³¹ Moreover, Josephus narrates that Onias exactly copied all of the temple furnishings, excluding the menorah (*J.W.* 7.428-

¹³⁰ Hayward, "Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 433. Interestingly, both the Jerusalem and Leontopolis temples differed from Solomon's temple, whose height is variously given as thirty cubits (1 Kgs 6:2), or one hundred twenty cubits high (2 Chr 3:4).

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 433.

29). In nearly every way, Onias seems to have been replicating the blueprints of the second temple in Jerusalem. Though Josephus' description of this temple as a tower, as well as his remark that the temple was sixty cubits in height, seems to have been an attempt at portraying the disparity between these two temples, he unwittingly may have actually revealed their striking similarities, for Josephus' description of Onias' temple matches up well with what we know of the Jerusalem temple in the days Onias fled to Egypt.

4.2.6 The prophecy of Isaiah

The accounts in *Antiquities* and the *Jewish War* also suggest that Onias had a biblical warrant for building the temple where he did.¹³² At the conclusion to the Onias story in *J. W.*, Josephus briefly mentions a prophecy regarding a Jew who would erect a temple in Egypt (7.432). This prophecy is fleshed out a bit more in *Antiquities*, where Josephus portrays Onias as being motivated by Isaiah's prophecy that "that there was certainly to be a temple built to Almighty God in Egypt by a man who was a Jew" and that "the prophet Isaiah foretold that 'there should be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God'" (*Ant.* 13.64, 68). Isaiah 19.19 is unquestionably the passage in mind, as it states: "On that day there will be an altar to the Lord in the center of the land of Egypt, and a pillar to the Lord at its border" (for text and translation, see below). Armed with the belief that he

¹³² See especially *ibid.*, 438-41; Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 60-61.

was the man spoken of in Isaiah's prophecy, Onias petitioned Ptolemy and Cleopatra for the right to build this temple.¹³³

MT Isaiah 19:18-21

18 בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיוּ חֲמֵשׁ עָרִים בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מְדַבְּרוֹת שְׂפַת כְּנָעַן וְנֹשְׁבֹת
לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת עִיר הַהָרֵס וְאָמַר לְאַחַת
19 בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה בְּתוֹךְ אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּמַצֵּבָה אֶצְל־גְּבוּלָהּ לַיהוָה
20 וְהָיָה לְאוֹת וּלְעֵד לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם כִּי יִצְעֲקוּ
אֶל־יְהוָה מִפְּנֵי לְחָצִים וְיִשְׁלַח לָהֶם מוֹשִׁיעַ וְרַב וְהִצִּילָם:

Isaiah 19:18-20

¹⁸ On that day there will be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan and swear allegiance to the LORD of hosts. One of these will be called the City of Destruction. ¹⁹ On that day there will be an altar to the LORD in the center of the land of Egypt, and a pillar to the LORD at its border. ²⁰ It will be a sign and a witness to the LORD of hosts in the land of Egypt; when they cry to the LORD because of oppressors, he will send them a savior, and will defend and deliver them.

LXX Isaiah 19:18-20

¹⁸ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται πέντε πόλεις ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ λαλοῦσαι τῇ γλώσσῃ τῇ Χανανίτιδι καὶ ὀμνύουσαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου πόλις-ασεδεκ κληθήσεται ἢ μία πόλις ¹⁹ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται θυσιαστήριον τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ στήλη πρὸς τὸ ὄριον αὐτῆς τῷ κυρίῳ ²⁰ καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κυρίῳ ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου ὅτι κεκραῶνται πρὸς κύριον διὰ τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτούς καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς κύριος ἄνθρωπον ὃς σώσει αὐτούς κρίνων σώσει αὐτούς

Isaiah 19:18-20

¹⁸ In that day there shall be five cities in Egypt speaking the language of Canaan, and swearing by the name of the Lord of hosts; one city shall be called the city of Righteousness. ¹⁹ In that day there will be an altar to the Lord in the land of the Egyptians, and a pillar to the Lord by its border. ²⁰ And it shall be for a sign to the Lord for ever in the land of Egypt: for they will presently cry to the Lord by reason of them that afflict them, and the Lord will send to them a man who will save them; judging he will save them.

¹³³ Hayward ("Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 438) notes that Onias' interpretation of Isaiah—of the necessity of the building of the temple in Egypt by a Jewish man—is not an interpretation with which Josephus would have himself agreed, for he proceeds to call the building of this temple a "sin" and "transgression of the Law." It is easy to see, however, how this type of interpretation could easily have sprung from Onias himself or within circles sympathetic to him and the temple project in Egypt.

Onias' attempt at fulfilling this prophecy may provide a clue as to why he chose the location that he did.¹³⁴ The previous verse, MT Isaiah 19.18, states: “[O]n that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt . . . [O]ne of these will be called the city of destruction” (עיר ההרס). The reading of “city of destruction” is found in the majority of the Hebrew manuscripts, but a few Hebrew texts, including the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran, render “city of destruction” (עיר ההרס) as “city of the sun” (עיר החרס), an understanding followed by Symmachus and the Vulgate¹³⁵ and which corresponds to Josephus' information that the Leontopolis temple was in the nome of Heliopolis. In an interesting textual variant, the Targum to Isaiah combines these two readings: “the city of Beth-Shemesh which will be destroyed.”¹³⁶

A different reading, however, is found in the Septuagint: “On that day there shall be five cities in Egypt . . . the one city shall be called the city of righteousness” (πόλις-ασεδεκ). Since ασεδεκ is clearly a transliteration of the Hebrew צדק and thus dependent on a Hebrew text, the LXX may preserve an original reading, or at least an early variant; one which called the city that was to be built in Egypt the “city of righteousness” (עיר הצדק). The only other place in the Hebrew Bible where this phrase occurs is also in Isaiah, in

¹³⁴ In what follows, I am indebted to Hayward, “Jewish Temple at Leontopolis,” 438-40.

¹³⁵ See George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX* (ICC 20; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), 1.335-37; Delcor, “Le Temple d'Onias,” 200-1; Hayward, “Jewish Temple at Leontopolis,” 439-41; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39* (AB 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 317-20. For the text of 1QIsa^a, see Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, eds., *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): A New Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 30-31.

¹³⁶ Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts: Volume III: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), at Isaiah 19:18, page 38; cf. *b. Menah* 110a.

which Isaiah predicts a time when a restored Jerusalem and Mount Zion will be redeemed by justice and filled with righteousness (Isa 1:26-27). If Onias was familiar with the Hebrew reading (עיר הצדק) behind the LXX, then it is not too difficult to see how he might have read Isaiah 19:18 in the light of 1:26-27, and imagined that a new Jerusalem should be built in Egypt.

Seeligman has argued that the reading עיר הצדק is likely the original, and that this reading was glossed at a later date to read עיר ההרס as an attempt to identify Heliopolis as the city where Onias built his temple.¹³⁷ According to him, a later generation altered עיר ההרס to עיר הצדק in an attempt to delegitimize Onias' temple at Leontopolis and denounce this "illegitimate competitor."¹³⁸ This reading seems likely, providing a plausible explanation for the switch from עיר הצדק to the dissimilar עיר ההרס, as well as making sense of the alteration from עיר ההרס to the more negative עיר ההרס. This understanding of the trajectory of scribal emendation may also explain one of Josephus' cryptic statements, as he relates not only that the temple was patterned after the Jerusalem temple, but also that the city Onias built resembled that of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 1.33). Onias may very well have been trying to build a restored Jerusalem in Egypt, replete with a temple, as a result of his juxtaposition of Isaiah 1:26-27 with the Hebrew form behind LXX Isaiah 19:18.

Josephus also narrates that Onias had claimed that the temple in Egypt had to be built by a Jew, a detail not found in Isaiah 19:19. Isaiah 19:20, however, may provide a

¹³⁷ Seeligman, *Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 220; cf. Hayward, "Jewish Temple at Leontopolis," 439-41.

¹³⁸ Seeligman, *Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 220.

clue as to why Onias read himself into this prophecy.¹³⁹ Whereas MT Isaiah 19:20 states that the altar and pillar set up in Egypt will be a sign and witness to the Lord of Hosts in the land of Egypt, and that he will “send them a savior and a mighty one” who will deliver them, LXX Isaiah 19:20, reads: “the Lord will send to them a man who will save them, judging he will save them.” The Septuagintal reading is confirmed by *Targum Isaiah*, which renders “savior and mighty one” as “redeemer and judge,” with 1QIsa^a also holding that this savior will go down (גָּרַד) to Egypt and deliver them.¹⁴⁰ As the legitimate high priest could claim ultimate authority in political, religious, and judicial matters,¹⁴¹ it is likely that Onias read Isaiah 19:20 self-referentially.

Since Josephus twice states that Onias was directed by Isaiah 19:18-20 (*Ant.* 13.64; *J.W.* 7.432), it seems apparent that this passage played an important role in the founding of the temple at Leontopolis. It may be that Onias read himself into these prophecies, believing it his appointed task to go down to Egypt and construct a temple and city patterned after that of Jerusalem. This passage may thus reveal some of Onias’ underlying motivations for his actions. It may also be the case, however, that these scriptural passages were interpreted in this way so as to bolster an argument for the legitimacy of an already existing temple in Egypt. Read this way, reflection upon the prophecies in Isaiah may have granted the proponents of this temple increasing warrant

¹³⁹ In this paragraph I am again indebted to the insights of Hayward, “Jewish Temple at Leontopolis,” 440-41.

¹⁴⁰ See Sperber, ed., *Bible in Aramaic*, 38; Parry and Qimron, eds., *Isaiah Scroll*, 30-31; Hayward, “Jewish Temple at Leontopolis,” 441.

¹⁴¹ See Chapter Two.

for their own temple. To a certain extent, both understandings are probably correct. On the basis of this passage in Isaiah, Onias and his followers founded a temple at Leontopolis, and then proceeded to argue for its authority and legitimacy on the basis of the same prophecy. In their reckoning, God had indeed sent a mighty judge down to Egypt to construct a new “city of righteousness” in the region of Heliopolis, city of the sun.¹⁴²

4.2.7 Motivations

Onias’ founding of the temple at Leontopolis reflected personal, political, and religious motivations. This much Josephus makes clear. Adjudicating among these impulses, however, largely depends upon the date in which the Oniad temple was founded. Below I will offer two different possible scenarios. Because it is unlikely that Onias III was the founder of this temple, due to the direct contradiction between the *Jewish War* and 2 Maccabees,¹⁴³ I shall focus attention on Onias IV and his possible motivations for establishing an alternative temple to the one in Jerusalem.

¹⁴² Moreover, the significance of the sun may explain the peculiar difference in temple furnishings at the Oniad temple. According to *J.W.* 7.428-29, Onias imitated the temple in Jerusalem in all places except the menorah. In placed of this lampstand, Onias made “a lamp wrought of gold which shed a brilliant light and was suspended by a golden chain.” Hayward compellingly argues that this lamp was meant to represent the sun, and was the product of a specific interpretation of Isaiah 30:26. See Hayward, “Jewish Temple at Leontopolis,” 434-37.

¹⁴³ See above, section 4.2.2.

If we follow Josephus' narrative in *Antiquities*, the Leontopolis temple must have been built sometime between 162 and 145 B.C.E.¹⁴⁴ From 162 to 159 B.C.E. Alcimus served as high priest in Jerusalem, and his death in 159 B.C.E. ushered in a seven-year period in which there was no known high priest there. In 152 B.C.E., Jonathan was granted the office of high priest, and this title was to stay within the Hasmonean family for nearly a century. Since the Jerusalem temple had been purified and its worship reinstated in 164 B.C.E., it would not have been necessary to erect a new temple in Egypt in order for these rituals to be performed between 164-159 B.C.E. It is possible that Onias' concern for the maintenance of the temple cult during the interregnum from 159 to 152 B.C.E. led him to found the Leontopolis temple.¹⁴⁵ It is more likely, however, that Onias founded the temple in Egypt in an attempt to establish a sanctuary in which the Oniad line, possessing the proper pedigree, would once again serve.¹⁴⁶ Beginning with Menelaus in 172 B.C.E., non-Zadokites dominated the office of the high priest. As the legitimate Zadokite successor to the high priesthood, Onias may have been spurred on by the promise of personal and political gain, especially after the Hasmonean usurpation of the high priesthood in 152 B.C.E. This, at least, is the motivation Josephus attributes to Onias (*Ant.* 13.63). Having quit Jerusalem as the legitimate priestly successor to the high

¹⁴⁴ Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias," 196; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 279-80; Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 69; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 191.

¹⁴⁵ Gruen, "Origins and Objectives," 69. That Onias was not asked to assume the high priesthood at the death of Alcimus may indicate that he had created enough enemies among the pro-Seleucid camp in Jerusalem that he was no longer welcome in the city, let alone in such an authoritative position.

¹⁴⁶ Bohak, "CPJ III, 520," 36; Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple," 192.

priestly office, Onias journeyed to Egypt to found a temple over which he and his descendants could preside.

As I noted above, however, it is likely that the upper limit of Josephus' chronology (162 B.C.E.) is incorrect, and that Onias IV founded the temple at Leontopolis in the early to mid 160s and thus was firmly ensconced at Leontopolis prior to 164 B.C.E. If so, then alongside any personal motivations mentioned above, political and religious rationales may have governed Onias' founding of a temple alternative to the one in Jerusalem. Politically, it is easy to imagine that Onias would have had strong pro-Ptolemaic leanings, since his father had held similar sentiments. With Antiochus Epiphanes' increasing encroachment upon Jerusalem, moreover, Onias IV's fortunes quickly took a turn for the worse. Not only was his father murdered, but his position was also taken away and handed to others who did not possess the family pedigree. Presumably, Onias would have preferred the safe haven of Ptolemaic rule to the hostile Seleucid administration.¹⁴⁷ While these same motivations would have been in place in the years following 162 B.C.E., they would have presented a more immediate incentive in the years immediately following the death of Onias' father. Moreover, the religious motivations for Onias to found the temple at an earlier date would presumably have been more acute, for the altering of the temple rituals by Jason, and the continuation of these policies by the non-Zadokite Menelaus, were trumped by the desecration of the temple by

¹⁴⁷ Bohak, "CPJ III, 520," 36-38, has noted that Onias came at an opportune time for the Ptolemies, as they were losing ground to the Seleucids and were also beset by internal dissension. A military man loyal to the Ptolemies and who could guard the entry into Egypt from the northeast while keeping an eye on the native population would have been welcomed with open arms (see *Ant.* 13.65). See also Bohak (*Joseph and Aseneth*, 31-37) for the continued military aid provided to the rulers of Egypt by Onias and his descendants.

Antiochus Epiphanes in 167 and its continuing pollution until it was renewed in 164 B.C.E. These seismic shifts in the religious landscape and the impugning of the integrity of the temple may very well have prompted Onias IV to establish a sanctuary where a legitimate cult could be maintained and proper worship offered to God in the years in which the temple in Jerusalem was defiled.¹⁴⁸

Onias likely also found motivation in the prophecies in Isaiah 19. In his reading of Isaiah, Onias was granted a powerful biblical warrant for the establishment of a temple in Egypt, as well as justification for his own role in this mission, for the exclusive claims of the Jerusalem temple could be biblically countered through reflection on Isaiah. Moreover, this temple appears to have been built as close to the actual dimensions of the Jerusalem temple as possible, and was replete with nearly identical temple furnishings. This imitation suggests that Onias' actions were deliberate: he was intentionally establishing an alternative, and rival, temple to that in Jerusalem.¹⁴⁹

It seems, then, that sometime prior to 164 B.C.E., the high priest and heir apparent to the temple in Jerusalem left Judea and founded a temple at Leontopolis. If the lack of reference to this temple in Egyptian Jewish literature is any indication, it had little impact on Egyptian Jewry, nor was it ever considered a serious rival to the Jerusalem temple.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 125; Schäfer, "From Jerusalem the Great," 136; Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt," 310.

¹⁴⁹ Gruen ("Origins and Objectives," 69-70) has argued that Onias was attempting to provide a companion temple to that in Jerusalem, one that would reinforce the supremacy of the Jerusalem temple, not rival it. But why would Onias have extended his support to a Hasmonean high priest who had usurped his oversight of the temple?

¹⁵⁰ Taking his cues from 2 Maccabees, Daniel R. Schwartz ("The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven," *Zion* 57 [1997]: 5-22, esp. 11-22) has argued that Egyptian

But it did have some weighty arguments on its side. Founded by the legitimate Zadokite priest, fueled by a prophecy from Isaiah, and designed to replicate the temple in Jerusalem, the Oniad temple presented itself as an alternative to the one in Jerusalem.

4.3 Qumran

Our discussion of the temples at Mount Gerizim and Leontopolis has shown the ways in which opposition to Jerusalem and its temple could take concrete form. In these two locales the God of Israel continued to be worshipped, and the sacrifices performed, even as the very buildings within which this activity took place testified to the physical separation of these communities from Jerusalem. In the sectarians at Qumran, we encounter a community similarly at odds with the presiding priesthood in the Jerusalem temple. In this case, however, antagonism toward the priests did not result in the establishment of a physical temple, nor the institution of animal sacrifices.¹⁵¹ Rather, the sectarians at Qumran came to view their community as a metaphorical temple, a substitute sanctuary in which pleasing sacrifices could be offered to God sans the blood of animals.

Jewish disinterest in the Oniad temple should not be contrasted with their enthusiastic endorsement of the temple and cult in Jerusalem. Rather, he argues that the general lack of interest in the temple at Leontopolis is a reflection of Egyptian Jewry's indifference to all cultic matters.

¹⁵¹ Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1958), 74-77, was the first to advocate that those at Qumran practiced animal sacrifice, but this theory has since been roundly criticized; see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Essenes and the Temple - A Reappraisal," in *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 57-61; Todd S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 118-19; Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 117-26.

The Qumran community was quite critical of the priesthood presiding over the temple and viewed the rituals performed therein as illegitimate.¹⁵² Since I have already explored this critique in detail above, I will only summarize these findings here. Particularly intolerable to the community at Qumran were the observance of a different calendar from that used in the Jerusalem temple, halakhic differences relating to priestly and cultic purity, and allegations of a priestly penchant for ill-gotten wealth, and these provoked the greatest outcry.¹⁵³ Below I will discuss the community's origins and priestly orientation, the extent to which contact was maintained between Qumran and Jerusalem, and how the sectarians dealt with their separation from the temple.

4.3.1 Community Origins

It is clear from several of the documents from the Dead Sea that sectarian ruminations on Scripture played a large role in the group's departure from Jerusalem and the practices in the temple which they found so distasteful. Embedded in one of the

¹⁵² See Chapter Three, sections 3.3.6, 3.3.7, and 3.4.3.

¹⁵³ Although differing in some details, many of the primary sectarian documents, such as CD, 1QS, 1QpHab and 4QMMT, all share this polemical attitude toward the temple and priesthood in Jerusalem, providing testimony to the key issues that separated Qumran from Jerusalem. For a consideration of the similarities and differences between the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*, see Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document," 6-7; Sarianna Metso, "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* (ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85-93. For the relationship between the *Damascus Document* and 4QMMT, see Charlotte Hempel, "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* (ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 69-84; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 90-94, 97.

earliest layers of the *Rule of the Community* is the manifesto of Isaiah 40:3, instructing the sectarians, “in the desert prepare the way of the Lord” (1QS 8.14).¹⁵⁴ The sectarians appear to have taken these opening lines of Isaiah 40 quite literally, choosing to inhabit the wilderness and there await God’s redemptive work. Similarly, reflection upon the *ברית החדשה* of Jeremiah 31:31 seems to have contributed to their separation from Jerusalem. At several junctures in the *Damascus Document* the members of the community are named as those who have entered into a new, or renewed, covenant (e.g. CD 8.21—*כל האנשים אשר באו בברית החדשה*), and as the opening lines of CD explicitly mention the former covenant between God and Israel, it is clear that the authors of this text viewed themselves as the retainers of the special covenantal bond between God and Israel, to the exclusion of all others in Israel.¹⁵⁵ For this community, the reaffirmation of this covenant necessitated removing themselves from those now deemed to be outside it. In their obedience to the voice of Isaiah directing them toward life in the desert, and their

¹⁵⁴ For the significance of Isaiah 40:3 in the sectarian worldview, see George J. Brooke, "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117-32; James H. Charlesworth, "Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 197-224; for the importance of Isaiah more generally at Qumran, see J. J. M. Roberts, "The Importance of Isaiah at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 273-86. Many have seen 1QS 8-9 as the earliest layers of the *Rule of the Community*, but this has been challenged by Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 9-11, 118, 143. Even though she prefers to see 1QS 5-7 as the earliest layer of the document, she notes, however, that “complete certainly in the matter cannot be achieved.”

¹⁵⁵ For a persuasive argument that *ברית החדשה* is best rendered as renewed covenant, see Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3-24.

appropriation of the new covenant language from Jeremiah, the sectarians separated from the temple and the traditional means of effecting atonement.

The sect's reliance on Scripture, however, does little to help explain its identity and history, and ascertaining the origins of this community which separated from Jerusalem and lived on the shores of the Dead Sea, has proved quite difficult. Many scholars today believe that the sectarians at Qumran were composed of a splinter group of the larger Essene party.¹⁵⁶ Descriptions of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus accord well with evidence from the scrolls themselves, and Pliny's contention that the Essenes inhabited the west side of the Dead Sea further tightens the connection (*Nat. Hist.* 5.15.73). Nevertheless, the exact parameters of the relationship between the Essenes and the covenanters at Qumran have proved more difficult to define, due especially to our incomplete knowledge of the Essenes and their beginnings.¹⁵⁷ Early on in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, some saw the origins of Essenism in the Hasidim who supported the Maccabees in their revolt against Antiochus Epiphanes and his imposition of Hellenism upon Judea.¹⁵⁸ Others, however, posited an earlier existence for the Essene movement. Nearly twenty years ago, García Martínez argued that the Essene movement

¹⁵⁶ For a history of this Essene connection, see VanderKam, "Identity and History," 487-500; cf. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 39-43; Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 3-7.

¹⁵⁷ For a review of various positions, see Charlotte Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316-18.

¹⁵⁸ Vermes, *Les Manuscrits*, 67-80; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 217-241. The sources contain so little information on the Hasidim that others have urged caution in attempting to see the Hasidim as forerunners of the Essenes. For one example, see Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 161.

was a widespread national movement which originated in the third or early second century B.C.E. as a Palestinian apocalyptic group.¹⁵⁹ At some point early in the Hasmonean era, a small group of Essenes loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness split off from the parent movement and formed the community at Qumran, deliberately isolating themselves from their fellow Jews through this move to the desert. More recently, Bocaccini has maintained that the Qumran community was an offshoot of a larger Enochic Judaism, which had its roots in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E.¹⁶⁰ As he describes it, this Enochic Judaism “is the modern name for the mainstream body of the Essene party, from which the Qumran community parted as a radical, dissident, and marginal offspring.”¹⁶¹ From these Enochic-Essene origins, the sectarians at Qumran inherited their apocalyptic worldview as well as their opposition to the Hasmonean priesthood and legitimacy of the temple.

García Martínez and Bocaccini are not alone in their view that the Qumran community had historical antecedents, as scholars have often argued that the *Damascus Document* provides evidence of sectarian thinking prior to the community’s arrival at

¹⁵⁹ Florentino García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *FO* 25 (1988): 113-36; Florentino García Martínez and A. S. van der Woude, "A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-41; Florentino García Martínez, "The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera; trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77-96. For a discussion of the merits of this hypothesis, see a collection of essays found in Gabriele Bocaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 249-326.

¹⁶⁰ Bocaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 170. See now the collection of essays in Bocaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 1-16, 329-454.

¹⁶¹ Bocaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 16.

Qumran.¹⁶² García Martínez and Boccacini have advanced the discussion, however, in their attempts to flesh out the similarities and differences between the larger Essene and Enochic parent movement and the sectarians at Qumran. For example, it has long been thought that the issue of the calendar was one of the principal reasons for Qumran's separation from the temple. While not denying this, García Martínez has added a further wrinkle, suggesting that dissent about the calendar was one of the issues that also separated the Qumran sect from the larger Essene movement.¹⁶³ Similarly, many have thought that a hallmark of the Qumran community was their insistence upon Zadokite leadership in the temple, but Boccacini has argued that the questions of Zadokite and non-Zadokite leadership in Jerusalem have a far earlier history in Enochic Judaism, and these debates were simply continued by those who inhabited the shores of the Dead Sea.¹⁶⁴ The above theories on the antecedents of the Qumran community have helped to increase awareness of the broad phenomenon of an animus toward the Jerusalem establishment that may have been percolating in the third century B.C.E. and they have shown that the Qumran community was not a sudden aberration in second century B.C.E. Jewish society. Yet, if one is looking for reasons for the Qumranian's separation from the temple in Jerusalem, it may be largely inconsequential whether they inherited this tension from broader currents in society or developed this hostility on their own. In either

¹⁶² For the most recent position arguing for the importance of the *Damascus Document* in determining communal origins, see Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 141-318.

¹⁶³ García Martínez, "Origins," 93.

¹⁶⁴ Boccacini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 71-79.

case, the scrolls testify to the sect's critical view of the priesthood in Jerusalem and their opinion that the rituals performed therein were illegitimate.¹⁶⁵

4.3.2 Priestly Influence at Qumran

The critical eye cast toward the priests in Jerusalem, coupled with the intense interest in the minutiae of halakha related to priestly matters, has suggested to many scholars that the members of the Qumran community were themselves priests.¹⁶⁶ Indeed, evidence for a priestly orientation at Qumran is not difficult to come by.¹⁶⁷ The Teacher of Righteousness, widely considered to have played an instrumental role in the development of the community, is unequivocally described as a priest on several occasions (4Q171 3.15; 1QpHab 2.8-9, 7.4-5), and the hundreds of references to priests in the scrolls, including many which explicitly cite the Zadokites, suggests the importance of this group.¹⁶⁸ Priests are described as holding prominent positions in

¹⁶⁵ A point agreed upon by both García Martínez and Boccaccini. See García Martínez, "Origins," 86-96; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 68-79.

¹⁶⁶ Frank Moore Cross, "The Early History of the Qumran Community," in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (ed. David Noel Freedman and Jonas D. Greenfield; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), 69-79; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 113-14; John J. Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period* (International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1; [Ramat Gan]: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 1998), 13; Florentino García Martínez, "Priestly Functions in a Community without 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* (ed. Beate Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999), 303-5.

¹⁶⁷ See Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 73-76.

¹⁶⁸ Robert A. Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 93-103. In addition to roughly 300 references in the scrolls to priests, Kugler also catalogues numerous references to the high priest, sons of Zadok, and sons of Aaron. An implicit hierarchy in Qumran's communal structure is also in view in several texts, where the priests are listed at the head of the community, followed by the Levites and Israelites (e.g. CD 14.3-6 and 1QS 2.19-22).

community gatherings (1QS 1.18-21; 2.1-11; 5.2-4; 6.3-6; 1Q28a 2.19), and important roles in the community's eschatological imagination (1Q28a 1.2, 16, 23-24; 2.12-13; 1QpHab 2.7-8). The Qumran community believed that, in the new age, priests would once again offer sacrifices at a restored temple (1Q19; 1QM 2.5-6; 2Q24 4; 11Q18 20). In addition, they displayed a marked interest in a priestly messiah (1QS 9.9-11; CD 12.22-13.1; 14.18-19; 19.10-11), and when the scrolls mention a priest alongside a Davidic Messiah, the priest always has the more prominent position (1Q28a 2.11-14; 4Q161 8-10.17-24; 4Q285 5.4-5; cf. 11Q19 58.18-19). Moreover, priestly concerns have been detected in the wisdom texts at Qumran and are not restricted to the documents often defined as sectarian (e.g. 4QInstructions, 4QMysteries).¹⁶⁹

The collocation of this evidence has suggested to some scholars that priests and priestly interests dominated the sect from the very outset. Nevertheless, the idea of priestly, and especially Zadokite leadership in the formative years of the community's existence has not gone unchallenged. As early as 1987 Philip Davies announced his skepticism,¹⁷⁰ and in more recent years several scholars have argued on redaction critical grounds that references to the Zadokites in the *Rule of the Community* and the *Rule of the*

¹⁶⁹ Armin Lange, "In Discussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998), 113-59; Armin Lange, "Eschatological Wisdom in the Book of Qohelet and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 824-25; Torleif Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* (ed. John J. Collins et al.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67-87.

¹⁷⁰ Philip R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 51-72.

Congregation are the work of a later editor, and that the original texts from Cave 4 make no mention of this priestly family.¹⁷¹ Noting this possibility, Kugler has suggested that perspectives on Qumran origins were skewed from the very beginning due to the publication of a few texts which emphasized the priestly nature of the sect and its origins.¹⁷² Moreover, as Collins has noticed, one issue that does not seem to have been of major concern to those at Qumran, or at least one that is not spelled out in the scrolls, is the lineage of the high priest in Jerusalem.¹⁷³ While the Hasmonean usurpation of the high priesthood may have contributed to the sect's departure from Jerusalem, the primary evidence suggests instead that the heart of the matter was not proper descent but rather proper practice. According to Collins, it was the reprehensible behavior of the Jerusalem priesthood, and not the end of the Zadokite hold on the high priesthood, that served as the catalyst for the formation of the Qumran community.

Even so, claims that the Qumran community was not especially concerned about priestly lineage seem overstated. First, on paleographic grounds it has been suggested that 1QS should be dated earlier than the Cave 4 fragments of the *Rule of the Community*, thus calling into question the primacy of the Cave 4 fragments.¹⁷⁴ If so, then priestly

¹⁷¹ Charlotte Hempel, "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa," *DSD* 3 (1996): 253-69; Metso, *Textual Development*, 69-155; Albert I. Baumgarten, "The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration," *DSD* 4 (1997): 137-56; cf. Alice Hunt, *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History* (LHBOTS 452; New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 166-75.

¹⁷² Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 93-94, 113-14.

¹⁷³ See John J. Collins, "The Origins of the Qumran Community," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* (ed. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989), 162-67; Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 112-13.

¹⁷⁴ Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437-56.

concerns are evident from the beginning of the sect. Second, the ubiquity of references to priests, alongside the very evident priestly concerns in many of the scrolls, suggests the influence of priests not only in the continuation of the sect but also in its formation. Thus, even if Zadokite priests were not directly involved in the early stages of the Qumran community, other priests certainly were. Third, the assertion that the scrolls do not explicitly denounce the Hasmoneans on charges of illegitimate genealogy does not necessarily imply that lineage was not an issue. It may mean only that matters of piety trumped hereditary issues. While those at Qumran may have been able to overlook the end of the Zadokite line and the installation of a new priestly family in office, what they could not ignore was the conduct of these new priests upon taking up the reins of the high priesthood. Fourth, 4QMMT, a document stemming from the early days of the sect's history, is concerned with halakhic matters, most of which relate to the purity of the temple and priesthood.¹⁷⁵ Priests, then, probably did play a significant role in the formation of the Qumran community.

4.3.3 Qumran and Sacrifice in the Temple?

The physical removal from the temple by the sectarians, and the harsh polemic directed toward the Jerusalem priesthood, has often been thought to indicate a complete rift with the temple in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there are hints that some sectarians may have still participated, albeit to a limited extent, in the temple cult. This possibility arises

¹⁷⁵ For dating of this text, see Chapter Three section 3.3.6.

from comments by Philo and Josephus on the relationship between the Essenes and the Jerusalem temple, as well as from some of the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves.

Philo notes that the Essenes had shown themselves to be “especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds” (*Good Person*, 75). This statement seems to imply that the Essenes did not participate in the sacrificial cult at the temple, choosing instead to focus on their own personal piety. Philo’s comments, however, may also be understood as a comparison in which the devout character of the sectarians is contrasted with “mere” animal sacrifice.¹⁷⁶ Seen in this manner, Philo may be suggesting that the Essenes did indeed offer sacrifices at the temple, but that this was not central to their religious identity.¹⁷⁷

Josephus is more open in his acknowledgment of Essene participation in the temple, stating that the Essenes “send votive offerings to the temple, but perform their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification. For this reason they are barred from those precincts of the temple that are frequented by all the people and perform their sacrifices by themselves” (*Ant.* 18.19). Several difficult issues arise from Josephus’ statement. First, there is a major discrepancy in the manuscript evidence. Whereas the Greek manuscripts provide the basis for the above translation, the Epitome and Latin versions reflect a negative οὐκ, “they do not perform sacrifices.” As Beall has noted, this matter is not easily decided, but here I follow Feldman and Beall in their reliance on the

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Heinz Kruse, "Die 'Dialektische Negation' als Semitisches Idiom," *VT* 4 (1954): 385-400, who argues that a semitic construction of “not A, but B” may be better understood as “not so much A, as B.”

¹⁷⁷ Ralph Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics," *JBL* 73 (1954): 157-61, esp. 158; Baumgarten, "Essenes," 67; Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 118.

Greek tradition.¹⁷⁸ A second difficulty lies in ascertaining what Josephus meant by the Essenes performing sacrifices *by themselves*. While some have advocated that spiritual sacrifices in the community are here intended,¹⁷⁹ others have seen in this a reference to animal sacrifice at Qumran,¹⁸⁰ limited participation in the temple cult,¹⁸¹ or an error on the part of Josephus.¹⁸² Following Beall, it is probably best to leave the matter unresolved, as the issue of Josephus' intentions appears insoluble on this point.¹⁸³ Josephus does, however, suggest that the Essenes had not determined to boycott the temple wholesale, as he mentions on several occasions the presence of Essenes in and around the temple courts (*Ant.* 13.11-13; *J.W.* 1.78-80; 5.144-45). Though Josephus and

¹⁷⁸ See Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVIII-XX* (LCL 9; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 16-17; Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 115. Scholars on both sides of the issue have noted that there is no decisive evidence, on internal grounds, for or against the presence of an original οὐκ. For those in favor, see Joseph Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 v. J.-C. - 300 apr. J.-C.)* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1935), 12-17; John Nolland, "A Misleading Statement of the Essene Attitude Toward the Temple," *RQ* 9 (1978): 555-62. For those against, see John Strugnell, "Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII.18-22," *JBL* 77 (1958): 106-15, esp. 113-15. The external evidence is no more decisive. On the one hand, no Greek mss, save the Epitome, contain the term οὐκ. On the other hand, Nolland ("Misleading Statement," 558) observes that the sixth century C.E. Latin text, which does contain the negative, is 500 years older than the existing Greek mss, thus giving it an air of authority. Neither the Greek or Latin texts, however, are free from difficulty, as the Greek text of *Ant.* 18 is more corrupt than other portions of Josephus' works, and there is no truly critical Latin text of *Ant.* 18; see Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 24, 44. Moreover, an appeal to Philo's account is of little help, for as I argued above, his statement on Essene sacrifice in the temple can be variously read (*Good Person*, 75). In all, since there is no compelling reason to prefer the Latin or Epitome, it seems reasonable to agree with Feldman (*Jewish Antiquities XVIII-XX*, 16-17) in following the Greek version.

¹⁷⁹ Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," in *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 52-54.

¹⁸⁰ Cross, *Ancient Library*, 51-52, 74-77; Strugnell, "Flavius Josephus," 113-14.

¹⁸¹ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 66-67. This is a change from his earlier position on the spiritual nature of these sacrifices. Here he argues that the Essenes may have participated to a limited degree, utilizing an isolated corner of the temple.

¹⁸² Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 48-49.

¹⁸³ Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 119.

Philo both appear to leave room for Essene participation in the temple, the extent of this participation remains unclear. What is left to decide is whether this involvement in the temple was true only for the larger Essene movement, or if it also included the sectarians at Qumran.

The primary text that many have used to illustrate the sectarians' avoidance of entry into the Jerusalem temple and participation in the temple cult is CD 6:11b-14a.¹⁸⁴ It reads: "All those who have been brought into the covenant shall not enter the temple to kindle his altar in vain. They will be ones who close the door, as God said: Whoever amongst you will close my door so that you do not kindle my altar in vain! [Mal 1:10]." Since those who have been "brought into the covenant" are undoubtedly to be connected to those living at Qumran, this passage seems to be a direct statement disallowing the sectarians from temple participation. Moreover, the quotation from Malachi 1:10 admonishes those at Qumran to do all within their power to see that sacrifices are no longer offered in the sanctuary, since God pleads with his people to close the doors of the temple so that sacrifices will no longer be offered "in vain." According to Malachi, the closing of the temple doors is a positive development, for the offering of polluted sacrifices has become an abomination to the Lord of Hosts. In the Qumran text, the order to desist from temple participation is in line with the surrounding context, which

¹⁸⁴ See Lawrence H. Schiffman, "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* (ed. Beate Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999), 271-72. His statement well represents the basic position: "We must accent the specific statement that those who become members of the sect described in the *Zadokite Fragments* are prohibited from entering the Jerusalem Temple and offering sacrifices there."

denounces priestly impurity and greed by providing an inventory of the depth of the priests' transgressions (CD 4.15-5.21; 6.15-17). On this reading, separation from the temple seems complete.

Not all, however, have agreed with this reading. Collins, for example, has suggested that the instructions not to "kindle my altar in vain" implies not a prohibition on all temple sacrifice, but that the sectarians should not participate in any rituals that the sect deemed inappropriate.¹⁸⁵ But the inclusion of the quotation from Malachi makes the intent of the phrase "in vain" clear: sacrifices are not to be offered at all due to the pollution of the sanctuary. A second objection to the sectarians' complete separation from the temple and cult has been found in statement immediately following the directive to not "kindle the altar in vain": "unless [סב צס] they take care to act in accordance with the exact interpretation of the law." Some have read in this line permission for sectarian participation in the sacrificial system of the temple, provided the one bringing the sacrifice has exactly followed the laws and is in a state of purity.¹⁸⁶ As with the position of Collins above, this is a plausible reading if only these two lines are in view, but the force of the passage seems to lie with the quotation from Malachi and the obligation of

¹⁸⁵ Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple*, 12.

¹⁸⁶ See Baumgarten, "Essenes," 70-72; Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document," 51 n. 77. Philip R. Davies (*The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* [JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983], 134-40) claimed that CD 12b-14a was an interpolation by a later redactor. In his reconstruction, the original lines read: "And all who have been admitted into the covenant (are not) to enter the sanctuary 'to light His altar in vain' . . . unless they are observant in doing according to the law," thus omitting the words preceding the quotation from Malachi along with the quotation itself. As Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 116-17 n. 74, has noted, this radical proposal is unwarranted, for aren't all who enter the covenant understood to be properly following the law? If not, they are to be expelled from the community (4Q266 11.5-16). Moreover, why would the author intimate that those of the community who do enter the temple "kindle the altar in vain"?

the sectarians to be closers of the temple doors rather than entrants into the temple. As the document continues with a renewed invective against the priests in Jerusalem, it seems best to understand this passage as referring to a complete separation from the temple and its cult.¹⁸⁷

Other sections of the *Damascus Document*, however, do seem to be more open to participation in the temple and sacrificial system. For example, CD 11.17-20 states: “No-one should offer anything upon the altar on the Sabbath, except the sacrifice of the Sabbath. . . . No-one should send to the altar a sacrifice, or an offering, or incense, or wood, by the hand of a man impure from any of the impurities, so allowing him to defile the altar.” These lines suggest some degree of sectarian involvement in sacrifice in the temple. This is evident not only from the assertion that Sabbath sacrifices should indeed be offered, but also from the statement that sacrifices should not be sent to the altar through means of an impure person. By implication, sacrifices could be sent to the temple via those who were ritually pure.¹⁸⁸ Moreover, CD 3.20-4.2 and 16.13 also allude to participation in the temple and its cult as a present reality for the sectarians.

Schiffman has suggested that the rules prescribed in CD 11:17-20 should be understood as ideal legislation that would be enacted in the days of a restored temple and

¹⁸⁷ Schiffman, "Qumran Community's Withdrawal," 271-72; J. Murphy O'Connor, "The Translation of Damascus Document VI, 11-14," *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553-56; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 51-53; Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 116-17 n. 74; Paul Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst for Division: Cult Disputes as the Motive for Schism in the Pre-70 Pluralistic Environment* (STDJ 65; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 349-58.

¹⁸⁸ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 68.

cult in Jerusalem.¹⁸⁹ This is an intriguing possibility, since it circumvents the problem of the differing views contained within the Qumran documents regarding the sectarians' continued participation in the temple. On this reading, any references to participation in the Jerusalem temple should be understood as legislation intended for a future period. His suggestion, however, seems to go beyond the evidence, since the *Damascus Document* does not present itself as a lawcode for the future. Rather, the prescribed laws appear to be of immediate consequence.

In summary, it is clear that the sectarians at Qumran physically separated from the temple and city, choosing instead to inhabit the shores of the Dead Sea. The harsh polemic found in some of the scrolls, as well as the evidence from CD 6:11-14, also point to the community's intent to distance itself from Jerusalem. It is difficult, however, to be too dogmatic about the sect's total separation from the temple, as there are hints in other sections of the *Damascus Document* that the sect continued to participate, albeit in a limited manner, in the sacrificial cult. These differing impulses contained in CD are most likely to be explained through the document's lengthy and complicated history of composition and transmission.¹⁹⁰

While most scholars, however, agree that the *Damascus Document* contains various literary strata and was compiled over an indeterminate period of time, there is little consensus on the best way to reconstruct the history of the community behind the

¹⁸⁹ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 129.

¹⁹⁰ Most recently, see Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), passim; Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, passim.

document and the exact relationship of the sect to the temple in Jerusalem over the course of this history. Some have thought that early in the community's existence its members were willing participants in the temple cult, breaking with the temple only at a later period marked by heightened tension and a condemnation of the Jerusalem priesthood, while others have argued that there is no reason to believe that this polemically charged atmosphere could be sustained for decades, and that the redress of specific complaints that caused the sect to avoid the temple may have resulted in a softening of the sectarian position, allowing for the resumption of temple involvement.¹⁹¹ In short, while it is certain that the sectarians definitively broke with the temple at a specific point in time, it is unclear if matters remained the same throughout the sect's existence.

4.3.4 Three Responses to Separation from Jerusalem Temple

The Qumran community's separation from Jerusalem was not due to rejection of temple and cult *per se*, since in principle these retained their vital role in religious life.¹⁹² Rather, current priestly practices in Jerusalem appear to have caused the condemnation of the contemporary sanctuary and ritual that led to withdrawal to the shores of the Dead

¹⁹¹ Interestingly, Baumgarten provides a good example of both positions. Earlier in his career, he ("Sacrifice and Worship," 43-44) stated that the regulations contained in CD "are survivals from a period when the sectarians were still participating in the worship of the temple" and that they were "preserved in the hope of some day restoring the worship of the Temple to its proper sanctity." In a reversal of his opinion, Baumgarten ("Essenes," 68-74) later argued that the initial break with the temple would have been sharpest in the earliest days of the sect's existence, and that this sharpness subsided over time, leading to the possibility of renewed participation in the temple. Cf. the discussion in Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 117-18 n. 75.

¹⁹² Baumgarten, "Essenes," 67; Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document," 51 n. 77; García Martínez, "Men of the Dead Sea," 65; Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple*, 13; Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, 138-67; Heger, *Cult as Catalyst*, 338-48.

Sea. This self-imposed exile generated contemplation on the former and present temples, as well as speculation on a purified and renewed third temple. Specifically, the sectarians dealt with their separation from the temple in three ways. First, they looked forward to a new, renewed temple. Second, they turned their minds to the heavenly temple and cult. Third, they viewed their community as a replacement for the temple.

4.3.5 The Eschatological Temple

It is clear from some of the scrolls that the break with the current temple had the effect of orienting the community towards the hope for a glorious future temple.¹⁹³

Probably the earliest reference to an eschatological temple established by God in the Dead Sea Scrolls is found in column 29 of the *Temple Scroll*. It reads:

They shall be for me a people and I will be for them forever; and I shall dwell with them for ever and always. I shall sanctify my [t]emple 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.

Two temples appear in this passage. The first, which God says he will sanctify with his glory, is the temple described in the major sections of the *Temple Scroll*. This sanctuary appears to have been conceived of as an interim and man-made temple, one that anticipated the final sanctuary which God himself would build.¹⁹⁴ The eschatological

¹⁹³ This idea was not restricted to Qumran, as the idea of a temple established by God at the end of days appears in other literature from the Second Temple period. See, for example, *Jubilees* 1:15-17, 27-29 and *I Enoch* 90:29; cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1.182-87.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.182-83; Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83-91, 86; Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 187-88; Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 110-16; George J. Brooke, "The Ten

temple, on the other hand, would be built by God himself in the “day of creation.” This same eschatological temple is also mentioned in the *Florilegium*, a fragmentary manuscript which provides a midrash on 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1-2. It begins:

“[Nor will] a son of iniquity [afflict] him [aga]in as in the past. From the day on which [I appointed judges] over my people, Israel” (2 Sam 7:10b-11a). This (refers to) the house which [he will establish] for [him] in the last days, as it is written in the book of [Moses: “The temple of] YHWH your hands will est[a]blish. YHWH shall reign for ever and ever” (Exod 15:17-18). This (refers to) the house into which shall not enter [... for] ever either an Ammonite, or a Moabite, or a bastard, or a foreigner, or a proselyte, never, because his holy ones are there. “Y[HW]H [shall reign for] ever.” He will appear over it for ever (4Q174 1-2.2-5).

In the opening lines of this midrash, 2 Samuel 7:10 is set alongside, and read in the light of, Exodus 15:17-18. The author clearly understands Exodus 15:17-18 as referring to an eschatological temple, for he believes the “temple of YHWH” (מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים) will last forever. The connection between the verses in Exodus 15 and 2 Sam 7 is most likely found in the first half of 2 Sam 7:10, which, though unfortunately missing from the text, is commonly assumed to have been a part of the original document.¹⁹⁵ This biblical passage reads: “And I will appoint a place (מִקְדָּשׁ) for my people Israel and will plant them (וַיַּנְטְעֵנִי), so that they may live in their own place. . . .” With this reconstruction, the natural connection between Exodus 15:17 and 2 Sam 7:10 becomes clearer, for the “temple of YHWH” (מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים) from Exodus 15:17 is used to elucidate the meaning of the “place” (מִקְדָּשׁ) of 2 Sam 7, so that both become a reference to the “house” which God

Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 424-25, 430.

¹⁹⁵ See George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), 97-99.

will build in the last days (lines 2-3).¹⁹⁶ Although in Nathan's discussion with David in 2 Samuel 7 the term "house" refers both to a family/dynasty and to a temple,¹⁹⁷ the author of the *Florilegium*, in interpreting the biblical passage, takes it as a temple, infusing the term with eschatological significance through its juxtaposition with Exodus 15:17.¹⁹⁸ According to the *Florilegium*, in the last days God will create a new temple, which will be inhabited by his holy ones.

Above I argued that the word מִקְדָּשׁ is what links 2 Samuel 7:10 with Exodus 15:17-18 in the *Florilegium* passage. Brooke, however, has suggested that the primary link between these two biblical passages is supplied by the verb נָתַע "to plant," even though the term is not explicitly cited in either passage.¹⁹⁹ In support, he notes that the term "eternal plantation" (מִטְעַת עוֹלָם) is a common metaphor for the community, especially in texts which describe its founding (1QS 8.4-6; 11.7-9; 1QH^a 14.15; 16.6, cf

¹⁹⁶ Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 173. As Dimant notes, the word "house" often means "temple" in biblical parlance, and this sense is already present in Nathan's original prophecy to David. This equation of the terms "house," "place" and "temple" is certainly not novel, for these words are often used synonymously in the biblical text. For the equation of house and temple, see Chapter Two, section 2.1.1. For מִקְדָּשׁ, see Deut 12.5, 11, 26; 14.25; 1 Kgs 8.29; Neh 1.9; 2 Chr 6.20; see especially the replacement of מִקְדָּשׁ with מִקְדָּשׁ in Ps 96:6 and 1 Chr 16.27.

¹⁹⁷ For the meaning of family/dynasty, see 2 Sam 7:11, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 29; for house as temple, see 2 Sam 7:5, 6, 7, 13.

¹⁹⁸ The ambiguity of the term was clearly not lost on the author of the *Florilegium*. Lines 1-9 consistently understand the term house as referring to a temple, whereas lines 10 and following understand it as referring to a descendant of David.

¹⁹⁹ See Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 178-83; Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 291-92. As was noted above, it is often assumed that the first half of 2 Sam 7:10, which contains the root נָתַע, existed in the original manuscript. The first part of Exod 15:17, however, is not explicitly cited, and it must be assumed that the portion of the verse which held the root נָתַע either existed at some point and is now lost, or the author mentally linked the two verses by means of *gezerah sawah*, but chose not to cite the appropriate phrases. As mentioned above, a more likely link between the two verses is the term מִקְדָּשׁ. Cf. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 173.

16.10-11; CD 1.7-8).²⁰⁰ Moreover, Brooke asserts that the theme of the plant is twice explicitly linked to Eden (1QH^a 16.4-37) and that Eden imagery, in turn, is closely linked to the cult and sanctuary (4Q500 1; 4Q265 7.2.11-17; 4Q421 11-12; cf. *Jub.* 1:15-17).²⁰¹ He then claims that the threads which connect the plant metaphor, Eden, and the cult are so interwoven that the distinctive outlook connecting Eden and the sanctuary is often subsumed under the motif of planting, and that the author of the *Florilegium* looks forward to the time when God will recreate all things and “the whole of God’s purposes as set out in Eden would be re-established.”²⁰² Though the connections drawn by Brooke between planting, Eden, and the sanctuary are intriguing,²⁰³ his evidence is tenuous. Some of the scrolls he cites do not really seem to bear the weight of the conclusions drawn from them (e.g. 4Q265; 4Q421), and, as Brooke himself admits, the connections are often more implied than directly stated.²⁰⁴ Even so, Brooke does seem to have put his finger on a complex of ideas found in the scrolls, most notably that the eschatological age

²⁰⁰ Patrick A. Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 312-35, 326-35.

²⁰¹ Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 292-95. He states in summary: “The cultic connection is part of the very woop and warf of the tapestry of images which are held together around the metaphor of planting.”

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 297.

²⁰³ The connection between Eden and the temple is a theme already evident in *Jubilees* 8:19. See J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, "Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*," 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* (ed. Beate Ego et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 223-24; G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT 17; Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2004), 66-80.

²⁰⁴ Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 293.

will be a return to the glory of creation and to what existed in the garden of Eden.²⁰⁵ The statement in 11QT that the eschatological temple will be founded in the “day of creation” may be a further link connecting the sanctuary and the vision of a return to Eden, since the future establishment of a temple in the last days may also harken back to the original design of God for the purity of the world and temple.

The *Temple Scroll* and the *Florilegium* both attest to the future orientation of the Qumran sectarians and their hope for a glorified temple. Though the community had broken with Jerusalem over the present defilement of the temple, this situation would be remedied in an eschatological restoration engineered by God himself. In this future day, God would establish a pure temple and cult that would last for all time.

4.3.6 Participation in the Heavenly Temple

Other scrolls, however, reveal that, in the meantime, the sectarians focused their attention on the heavenly temple and cult.²⁰⁶ The presence of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* at Qumran reveals that interest in the heavenly temple and cult, and participation in its worship, was a strong component of the worship of God at Qumran.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ These connections are also pertinent for our discussion of the interim *מקדש אדם*, to which we will turn below.

²⁰⁶ Newsom, *Songs*, 39-72; Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 235-45; Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple*, 14-16.

²⁰⁷ Likely inspired by reflection upon the angelic worship of God in Isaiah 6 and the visions of the divine throne in the opening chapters of Ezekiel, interest in the heavenly liturgy and angelic activity in heaven grew in the Second Temple period and beyond. *1 Enoch* 14, *Jubilees* 31, and *Aramaic Testament of Levi* 2-5, 8 all continue this interest in the heavenly temple, angelic praise, and human participation in the latter. See Carol A. Newsom et al., "Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400 - 4Q407, 11Q17,

This liturgical collection of thirteen songs, divided into three sections, is designed to bring the worshipper ever deeper into the mysteries of the heavenly temple and the praise of God by the angelic priests.²⁰⁸ Central to the first five *Songs* is an account of the angelic priesthood, its responsibilities, and a description of the angelic praise.²⁰⁹ *Songs* 6 through 8 culminate in a call to praise, as the seventh *Song* describes how the angels and the heavenly temple—including the foundations of the holy of holies, the supporting columns, and the corners of the building—extol His virtues (see 4Q403 1 i.41). This is followed by a description of the various elements in the heavenly temple in *Songs* 9 through 13, culminating in a description of the throne of God and the grandeur of the angelic high priests and their sacrificial service. Though the purpose of these *Sabbath Songs* at Qumran has been the subject of some debate, most scholars agree with Newsom that they are a “quasi-mystical liturgy designed to evoke a sense of being present in the heavenly temple.”²¹⁰

The praise of God which fills these *Sabbath Songs* is most often found on the lips of angels, though humans are also seen as participants in this heavenly praise (4Q400 2.1-

Mas1k),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 4B: Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (ed. James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 9-10.

²⁰⁸ Newsom, *Songs*, 5-21; Newsom et al., “Angelic Liturgy,” 3.

²⁰⁹ While the idea of angels serving as priests is found in various Qumran texts as well as in pseudepigraphical and rabbinic literature, an explicit terminological link is found only in the *Sabbath Songs*. Not only are the angels called “priests” on several occasions (4Q400 1 1.8, 19, 20, 4Q403 1 2.19, etc.), but they are also identified as “ministers of the presence” (4Q400 1 1.4, 8; 4Q405 23 1.3). See Newsom et al., “Angelic Liturgy,” 7.

²¹⁰ Newsom, *Songs*, 59; Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple*, 15-16; cf. Björn Frennesson, *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 14; Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999), 100; cf. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 37-38.

3, 8). The liturgical recitation of these *Songs* seems designed to draw the worshipper into the heavenly temple and allow him to partake in the praise of God alongside the angels. This sense of participation in the heavenly worship is also evident in 1QS 11.7-8, where the covenanters are chosen by God to be united with the assembly of the sons of heaven, resulting in the council of the community and the foundation for a building of holiness. Furthermore, the *Rule of the Blessings* expects that in the eschatological age members of the community will join with the angels in praise of God and service in the temple (1QSb 3.25-26; 4.24-26). The *Hodayot* express a similar sentiment, as the penitent enters into the community of the heavenly beings and stands amidst these holy ones in their assembly (1QH 11.21-22; 19.10-13 [Sukkenik 3.21-22; 6.10-13]).

The idea that humans may, alongside the angels, partake in the divine worship was an important tenet for those living at Qumran, for in this shared praise they were able to participate in the worship of the God of Israel even though they were separated from the temple. Moreover, the passages analyzed above describe the sectarians being caught up into an experience of communion with the angels in their worship of God in the heavenly temple.²¹¹ Most likely, these experiences had the effect of strengthening the sectarian resolve to maintain their avoidance of the present, earthly temple, for if the God of Israel could be worshipped in the desert in the same manner in which he was acclaimed in heaven, what was the need for traveling to the polluted temple in Jerusalem?

²¹¹ Newsom et al., "Angelic Liturgy," 9.

4.3.7 The Community as Temple

In the Dead Sea Scrolls we also find descriptions of the sectarian community and its rituals acting as functional substitutes for the Jerusalem temple. Significant portions of the *Rule of the Community* are dedicated to this theme,²¹² and this suggests both its importance to the community and its early origin.²¹³ Beginning in column 8, the community council is understood to be “founded on truth, to be an everlasting plantation, a holy house (בית קודש) for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies (קודש קודשים) for Aaron” (1QS 8:5-6).²¹⁴ Moreover, the community is described as a “tested rampart,” a “precious cornerstone” whose foundations will never “shake or tremble from their place,” and a “house of perfection and truth in Israel” (1QS 8:7-9). Priestly functions are arrogated to those within the community, as they are said to “atone for the land” through both their knowledge of the covenant and their efforts to be faithful to the everlasting decrees (cf. 1QS 5.1-7; 1QM 2.5-6). In imagery derived from the temple cult, the sectarians’ endeavor to institute this covenant is described as a “pleasant aroma” to the Lord (1QS 8:6, 9-10). Only in this way will a “house of perfection and truth” be established in Israel.

Column 9 repeats and expands upon these themes. Atonement is mentioned once again, but now the community members are charged with atoning for the “guilt of iniquity and for the unfaithfulness of sin” (1QS 9.4). This expiation, however, is not to

²¹² Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 50-74.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 89, 92, 152.

²¹⁴ Cf. lines 8-9; in both instances the priests (“Aaron”) are associated with the Holy of Holies, and the community at large with the temple in general. See Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 132.

be sought through the “flesh of burnt offerings” or the “fats of sacrifice.” Rather, the “offering of the lips” will be like “the pleasant aroma of justice,” and “the perfectness of behaviour will be acceptable like a freewill offering” (1QS 9.4-5). It is in the sacrifices of prayer and pious living that the sectarians are able to atone for sin and guilt. In offering these metaphorical sacrifices, the community becomes a holy sanctuary, for through these sacrifices the men of the community “separate themselves²¹⁵ (as) a holy house (בית קודש) for Aaron, in order to form a most holy community, and a house of the Community for Israel” (1QS 9.6).

The idea of prayer as a substitute for sacrifice is also found in CD 11.20-21. After cataloguing various Sabbath requirements, the author quotes Proverbs 15:8 as confirmation of these previous Sabbath rules. The biblical citation, however, has been altered, for in place of “the prayer of the upright is his delight (רצונו),” which is devoid of cultic connotations, CD 11.21 states that “the prayer of the just ones is like an agreeable offering (כמנחת רצון) cf. 1QS 9:5). The sectarian rendering of this verse indicates the intent to equate the prayer of the righteous with sacrifices, thus agreeing with the *Rule of the Community* that metaphorical sacrifices can replace physical ones, provided they are performed by people in a state of ritual purity.²¹⁶

²¹⁵ Here I differ from the translation found in Garcia Martinez. He renders אנשי היחד בית קודש לאהרון as “the men of the community shall set apart a holy house for Aaron,” but it seems better to understand the hiphil in a reflexive sense, emphasizing that the men of the community are separating *themselves* as a holy house for Aaron. For a similar use of the verb in a reflexive sense, see Ezra 6:21; 9:1; 10:11, 16; Neh 9:2; 10:29.

²¹⁶ See Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 94-97; Hultgren, *Damascus Covenant*, 309-10.

The tendency toward fulfilling the sacrificial requirements of the law through non-physical means is also found in 11Q5, an elaboration upon Psalm 154.²¹⁷ In column 18, the author argues that praise directed toward God is as effectual as the offering of physical sacrifices: “The person who gives glory to the Most High is accepted like one who brings an offering, like one who offers rams and calves, like one who makes the altar greasy with many holocausts, like the sweet fragrance from the hand of the just ones.” In this scroll, the offering of animal sacrifices is not denigrated, since if it was the analogy would be of little worth. Rather, the author argues that the praise of God is an equally viable offering, one that is altogether acceptable to the Lord.

The passages cited above indicate that the sectarians viewed personal and communal prayer, righteous living, and worship of God as substitutes for the sacrifices that were performed in the Jerusalem temple. Having largely cut themselves off from this institution, the sectarians thought that atonement could now be effected in the community through alternative means. Moreover, from our discussion of 1QS 8-9, it is evident that the sectarians could describe their own community in terminology befitting the sanctuary in Jerusalem. In this text, the community at large is deemed a “house of perfection and truth,” a “tested rampart,” and a “precious cornerstone.” Interestingly, more specific terminology is reserved for the leadership of the community, since the council of the community is depicted as a “holy house (בית קודש)” and the “foundation of the holy of holies (קודש קודשים).”

²¹⁷ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 67-68.

This concept of the community as a temple, however, is expressed somewhat differently in the *Florilegium*, a document slightly later than the *Rule of the Community*.²¹⁸ Here, no division apparently exists between the leadership of the sect and the rank and file members. All are subsumed under the same terminology.²¹⁹ In our previous discussion of the sect's view of the eschatological temple, it was noted that the opening lines of this midrash on 2 Sam 7 refer to an eternal, pure temple that God will build with his own hands. Following this, the text proceeds to discuss two more temples,²²⁰ a temple of Israel, which was laid waste in the past on account of the sins of Israel, and an interim temple, a מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם. The translation of this phrase has been the subject of much debate.

Some have understood this phrase to mean a “sanctuary amongst men”²²¹ or a “man-made temple.”²²² The first option, however, is a difficult rendering of the

²¹⁸ 4Q174 is usually dated to the first half of the first century B.C.E. See Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch Zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 202-10, 215, for an argument dating this document to 71-63 B.C.E. The copy of the *Rule of the Community* from Cave 1 has been dated to between 100 and 75 B.C.E., and most agree that this is a copy of a prior manuscript. For more on the dating of the *Rule of the Community*, see Michael A. Knibb, "Rule of the Community," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 794.

²¹⁹ While this is speculative, it is possible that by the time of the composition of 4Q174, some of the more rigorous stratification in the sect had been partially or wholly dissolved.

²²⁰ There has been considerable discussion as to whether two or three temples are envisioned in 4Q174. For a review of various possibilities, see Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 107-10. Those who see two temples do so by linking the מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם with the מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים, and this is often done by equating the מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים of Exodus 15:17 with the קֹהֵל יְהוָה of Deut 23:3-4.

²²¹ Y. Yadin, "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)," *IEJ* 9 (1959): 95-98; David Flusser, "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. vii," *IEJ* 9 (1959): 99-109; Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 83-84.

²²² John M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4: 1 (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 54; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 51; Schwartz, "Three Temples," 86; Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 131; André Caquot, "La Secte de Qoumrân et le Temple," *RHPR* 72 (1992): 3-14, esp. 5-7.

construct, and the second makes little sense of the following admonition to offer “deeds of Torah” as sacrifices in the temple, since a physical building would seem to necessitate physical offerings.²²³ A second rendering of this phrase understands it to be a “temple of Adam.”²²⁴ If so, this text may provide a further link between the garden of Eden and the sanctuary and cult, a connection discussed above. Those who hold this position assert either that God has already inaugurated a return to the garden of Eden in the life of the community,²²⁵ or that the Edenic state will be re-established in a future temple built by God.²²⁶ While the lack of an article in front of אדם may indeed highlight the proper name “Adam” instead of providing a more general reference to humanity, this understanding also has its difficulties. First, though the connection between Adam and Eden is a natural one, it is not explicitly spelled out in the text. Second, the scroll contains a command to build a מקדש אדם, but what, in fact, would this “temple of Adam” look like? How would it be constructed? This language may be an imaginative or metaphorical rendering of the temple idea rather than a description of a physical building.²²⁷

²²³ See Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 178; Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 287-88.

²²⁴ Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 123-32; Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 285-301; Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 244-45.

²²⁵ Brooke, "Miqdash Adam," 291.

²²⁶ Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 132; cf. Brooke, "Ten Temples," 427, who notes: "In a single phrase is all of the community's *Urzeit und Endzeit* theology."

²²⁷ Cf. Brooke ("Miqdash Adam," 288-89) who refers to the polyvalence of the term, noting that מקדש אדם can be interpreted in several ways, and that more than one may have been intended.

This brings us to the third and most likely option: a “temple of men” or “temple consisting of men.”²²⁸ According to this understanding, the community at Qumran functioned as an interim temple, with prayer and worship substituting for the sacrifices in the temple.²²⁹ Grammatically, this rendering makes the most sense, and it also accords well with the tendencies we have seen in the *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*. Two arguments, however, are often brought against this interpretation.²³⁰

First, it is asserted, the proximity in the text between the defiled “temple of Israel” and the מקדש אדם, as well as the contrast between them, implies that the temples are essentially similar. As the temple of Israel was a physical building, so also is the מקדש אדם. This, however, is not necessarily the case. The apparent physicality of the temple of Israel in no way determines the architectural plan of the מקדש אדם.

²²⁸ Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 16-46; Otto Michel and Otto Betz, "Von Gott Gezeugt," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift Für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. Walther Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), 9-10; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 163-76; Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of "Netinim" and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," in *Studies in Qumran Law* (ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten; SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 9-10; Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 178-93; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 258-72; Jacob Milgrom, "Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1-2," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 248-51.

²²⁹ Most scholars simply equate the community with the temple, but Schwartz ("Temple and Desert," 38) has cautioned that no Qumran document explicitly does so, and that the avoidance of this precise connection may have been important to them. He points out that modern Orthodox Jews usually call their houses of worships “synagogues” and not “temples,” and argues that the same ideology may have been present at Qumran. “Functionally, however, synagogues may well satisfy the same needs as the temple did, and the Qumran community did substitute for the Temple.” I find Schwartz’s cautious approach salutary, but this attitude is largely conditioned by his view of the מקדש אדם in 4Q174 as a reference to Solomon’s temple.

²³⁰ Here I follow the arguments of Schwartz, "Three Temples," 84.

A second argument against the understanding of מקדש אדם as a temple consisting of human beings comes from scholars who see two rather than three temples in this text, and equate the eschatological temple (מקדש אדוני) with the מקדש אדם. In this interpretation, the מקדש אדם becomes an eschatological and physical building,²³¹ or a future temple comprised of human beings.²³² This understanding, however, is not sustainable. A glance at the *Temple Scroll*, and the two temples envisioned in 11QT 29.7-10, illustrates that the sectarians could envision both an interim and an eschatological temple, and that these two need not be viewed as identical.²³³ A similar juxtaposition is evident in our text, where the מקדש אדוני and the מקדש אדם are placed in this same type of relationship, implying that the interim temple, in this case the מקדש אדם, will give way to the temple which God himself will establish on earth with his own hands, the מקדש אדוני.²³⁴ The phrase מקדש אדם seems to be best understood in this third sense: this temple of men consists of the members of the community.

This brings us to the next controversial phrase in the *Florilegium*. After the command to build a מקדש אדם for YHWH, line 7 continues with the admonition that the sectarians are to offer before the Lord either מעשי תורה or מעשי תורה. The original editor of the scroll understood this phrase as a reference to works of the Law/Torah, a reading

²³¹ See, e.g., Flusser, "Two Notes," 102; Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 112-32.

²³² See, e.g., Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 30-42; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 258-62.

²³³ Schwartz, "Three Temples," 85-86.

²³⁴ Brooke ("Miqdash Adam," 289-91) has noted that CD 3:19-4:2 may also be a reference to this interim temple.

followed by many scholars.²³⁵ An equally impressive number of scholars, however, have argued that a *dalet* should be read instead of a *resh*, resulting in the phrase “works of thanksgiving.”²³⁶ The present state of the manuscript does not allow for a definitive reading, but the existence of the parallel *מעשי התורה* in 4QMMT has lent weight to reading the *resh* rather than the *dalet*.²³⁷ If works of Torah are indeed in view, obedience to the precepts that God has handed down should be seen as the offerings that are to be presented to God in the community, which is the temple of men.

Moreover, the idea that the members of the community are the building blocks of a temple is evident in several scrolls. Above we have already seen that 1QS 8:4-10 depicts them as a “holy house,” “the foundation of the holy of holies,” “the tested rampart,” and “the precious cornerstone” (cf. 1QS 5:5; 4Q511 35.3-5). This idea is also present in 4Q164, a peshar on Isaiah 54:11-12 in which the subject is the renewed city of Jerusalem. In this scroll, the glorious city will consist of various stones, and each stone is given an equivalent in the Qumran community. The foundation of sapphires are

²³⁵ Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4*, 53-54; followed by, among others, Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 169; Baumgarten, "Essenes," 82; Schwartz, "Three Temples," 87; Wise, "4QFlorilegium," 109-10, 131-32; Steven D. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 46-69, 63-65; Milgrom, "Florilegium," 248-51. As the most recent proponent of this position, Milgrom ("Florilegium," 24) states: "The reading 'works of thanksgiving' . . . is paleographically and logically inferior," noting the existence of the similar phrase in 4Q398 [MMT] frgs. 14-17 2.3.

²³⁶ John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163-276, 221; Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien* (2 vols.; EBib 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 2.578; Steudel, *Midrasch*, 44; Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 205-6; Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 108.

²³⁷ For example, see the assertion by Fraade ("Interpretive Authority," 63) that Strugnell has since changed his mind on this issue following the publication of 4QMMT, now preferring to read the phrase as *מעשי תורה*.

interpreted as the priests and the people who laid the foundations of the community, the battlement of rubies are the twelve chief priests, and the gates of glittering stones are understood to refer to the chiefs of the tribes of Israel. The depiction of community members as stones in the new city of Jerusalem shares several conceptual parallels with the idea of the community as a temple. In both cases, the members of the community are identified with architectural structures.²³⁸

This idea of a “temple of men” is also evident in the community’s tight restrictions on membership, and it is here that the three responses to the sect’s separation from the temple, namely the anticipation of a future purified temple, interest in the heavenly temple and cult, and transfer of temple terminology to the community, join most closely. The necessity for priests to maintain a high level of purity is clear in the Hebrew Bible (Lev 21-22). Those with physical impurities were barred from approaching the tabernacle to effect atonement for the people, and any priest who became ritually unclean had to be purified and wait the requisite number of days before once again serving in the temple. In addition, priests were required to be pure when eating meat that had been sacrificed in the temple (Lev 6:8-7:38). At Qumran, this concern for priestly purity extended to all members of the community, priest and layperson alike.²³⁹ The reason for this elevated concern for purity seems to have been that the ability to effect atonement was incumbent upon all of the community members at Qumran, not just

²³⁸ Cf. 11QMelch [11Q13] 2.23-24, where Zion is identified as “[the congregation of all the sons of justice, those] who establish the covenant, those who avoid walking [on the pa]th of the people.”

²³⁹ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 37-52.

the priests. Therefore, those who did not comply with community regulations were not allowed to participate in the community assembly, nor to eat pure food or drink pure water (1QS 5.13-14; 6.25; 7.3, 16, 19-20).²⁴⁰ Moreover, those who were physically deformed or unfit in any way were not allowed to join the community, either at the present time or in the future eschatological age (CD 15.15-17; 1QSa 2.3-11; 4QFlor 1.2-5; 1QM 7.4-6; 11QT 45-51; 4QMMT B 39-49). Since the sectarians looked forward to a pure eschatological temple, it would not do to have members in their midst who would defile an unsullied temple. This, at least, is the implicit reasoning behind the exclusion of the physically unsound. Yet a different reason is explicitly stated for their exclusion, as the regulations barring the unfit person from the community are usually linked to the presence of angels in its midst (or in the case of the *Temple Scroll*, the presence of YHWH himself).²⁴¹ Here, then, we see the inverse of the texts that speak of community participation in the heavenly liturgy: the presence of the angels with the community, not only in the eschatological age, but also in the present one. For this reason, the entirety of the community must maintain the highest standards of purity. God is worshipped and

²⁴⁰ These communal meals appear to have been of great significance in the life of the community, and the highly formalized nature of these banquets is detailed in 1QS 6.2-7. Many have argued for the sacral nature of these meals, asserting that the Qumran meal was intended as a replacement for the priestly meals in the temple where the remaining meat from the sacrifices was consumed. As evidence, the priestly orientation at Qumran is cited, as well as the rigorous purity requirements observed by the sectarians, allowing for all to partake of this sacred meal in a pure state. See Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 10-13; M. Delcor, "Repas Culturels Esséniens et Thérapeutes, Thiases et Haburoth," *RevQ* 6 (1967): 401-25; Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 113-26. Magness has explained the presence of animal bones at Qumran as a byproduct of these communal meals, in which animals were consumed in a manner similar to that which occurred in the temple.

²⁴¹ Newsom, *Songs*, 62-63; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 49-51. Of the texts listed above, 4QMMT B 39-49 is the only one without an explicit link to the presence of angels in the community.

atonement effected here on earth in the “temple of men,” but this worship and atonement occur in the presence of the heavenly angels.

Preferring life in the desert to participation in a polluted sanctuary and defiled priesthood, the sectarians at Qumran withdrew to the wilderness near the Dead Sea. This separation from the Jerusalem temple, however, was not accompanied by a disinterest in cultic issues. Rather, the community seems to have had a heightened sensitivity to these matters, rejecting only the current practices which contributed to its defilement, and not to the temple in principle. In the interim period before God established a new temple, the sectarians were able to function without a temple, as usually defined, due to their belief that the community, in the present, acted as a substitute temple. Not only were the prayers of the righteous able to atone for sins, but the members of the community itself were understood to comprise a spiritual temple responsible for the praise of God. Moreover, the sectarians saw themselves as participants in the divine liturgy and angelic worship of God, and looked forward to the day when their “temple of men” would give way to a glorious new temple established by God himself.

4.4 Concluding Thoughts

In previous chapters I discussed the religious, economic, and political significance of the Jerusalem temple and its officiating priesthood throughout the Second Temple Period. The centrality of these institutions, however, did not preclude persistent critique. While some Second Temple Jews may have been wary of the concentration of power and influence in one central institution, many others were critical of the Jerusalem priesthood

due to perceived halakhic irregularities. For those who dissented, the faults of the priesthood stained the sanctuary and polluted the rituals performed within its precincts. Even so, the deep suspicion and distrust of the priesthood did not seem to be accompanied by a withdrawal from involvement in the temple and its cult. Critique co-existed with participation.

This was not the case, however, for the three distinct communities discussed in this chapter. The Samaritan temple, the Oniad temple at Leontopolis, and the “temple of men” at Qumran provide *de facto* evidence that some groups felt strongly enough about the happenings in Jerusalem that they deemed it better to strike out on their own and found alternative and/or rival temples. As we have seen, these communities constructed their own temple in their own way and for their own reasons. The founding of the Samaritan temple had its roots in the exclusivist policies of Ezra and Nehemiah in the fifth century B.C.E., which rebuffed all attempts at Samaritan participation in the Jerusalem temple. Built on sacred ground and presided over by Zadokite high priests, this temple rivaled that in Jerusalem for several centuries, and the memory of it proved to be even stronger than the physical building itself. Several centuries later, the Oniad temple was established in the wake of the usurpation of the high priesthood from the Zadokite and Oniad line, and the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. The legitimate Oniad high priest fled to Egypt and established a temple and city built on the model of that in Jerusalem. In roughly the same period, a sectarian community was established at Qumran. In this case, the opprobrium of the priests and pollution of the temple in Jerusalem provided the pretext for the founding of a “temple of men,” an

interim and substitute temple where prayer and piety effected atonement for the community, in place of the sacrifice of animals.

Differences between these temples are not hard to discern. The Samaritan temple was founded centuries prior to the temples at Leontopolis and Qumran and overlapped them by only a few decades. Geographically they were quite disparate, as these temples were established in the regions of Samaria and Judea as well as in Egypt. The Samaritan and Oniad temples were physical expressions of the dispute of their founders with the temple and priesthood in Jerusalem, while the sectarians at Qumran eschewed this sort of physical response, constructing instead a temple consisting of the community's members. These three temples also differed in terms of their effectiveness in rivaling the Jerusalem temple religiously and politically. The Oniad temple does not appear to have gained much of a following even in Egypt, and that of the Qumran community was probably relatively inconsequential as well, especially since it was viewed as a temporary rather than a permanent replacement for the Jerusalem temple. The Samaritan temple, on the other hand, proved potent enough that it posed a threat to, and was therefore destroyed by, one of the Hasmoneans, the new political and religious leaders of the country, who because of the shakiness of their claim to rule and to the high priesthood would have been extremely sensitive to rivals.

Notwithstanding these differences, these three communities also show some striking similarities. First, the formation of each community was prompted by specific incidents perpetrated by those in positions of religious and/or political power in Jerusalem. The deep misgivings resulting from these situations led ultimately to a

departure from the city and the establishment of an alternative temple. The exclusion of the Samaritans from the sanctuary in Jerusalem created a need for a central religious establishment in which the peoples of the north could fully participate. While the construction of the Samaritan temple certainly filled this requirement in a religious sense, it also proved to be a potent political symbol for the emerging Samaritan community, further dissolving the ties that had previously bound the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel. In his account of the founding of the Oniad temple, Josephus explicitly ascribes political and religious motivations to Onias' act of founding a temple to rival that in Jerusalem. This seems quite plausible, for if the construction of Onias' temple occurred in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, any political ambitions on the part of Onias were probably intertwined with a religious desire to see the worship of God continue in an unsullied sanctuary. Similarly, those at Qumran wished to see the continuation of a pure temple cult, and they established their community in response to the perceived illicit behavior of the Jerusalem priesthood, with the political hostilities between the Wicked Priest and those at Qumran serving to intensify the sharp religious divide that separated the two. To varying degrees, then, political and religious motivations acted in tandem as catalysts for the formation of the dissenting communities.

Moreover, appeal to the authority of Scripture greatly aided these communities in their dispute with the caretakers of the temple in Jerusalem. Whether this appeal to Scripture occurred prior to the establishment of a new temple or *ex post facto* is largely immaterial. The Samaritan appeal to the Pentateuch to substantiate their claims for the sanctity of Mount Gerizim, Onias IV's dependence upon Isaiah 19.18-20, and the

Qumranians' interpretation of passages such as Isaiah 40, Jeremiah 31, and Proverbs 15:18, all instilled in their community a sense of legitimacy and granted justification for their dissenting actions. In addition, the appeal by Onias and the Qumran community to the prophetic corpus enhanced the potency of their respective arguments, since each could claim that the present actions of the community were a fulfillment of prophecy and a realization of God's purposes. This appeal to Scripture presumably provided a powerful stimulus, aiding and abetting these three communities in their efforts to establish an alternative locale in which YHWH could be worshipped and atonement effected.

In addition, the construction of each of these temples was accompanied by, and legitimated through, the presence of members of the Jerusalem priestly elite, who took part in establishing the new community. In the case of the institution of the Samaritan and Oniad temples, a member of the high priestly family was directly involved, while at Qumran members of the Zadokite line played an important role. Schwartz has noted that, prior to the emergence of the Christian movement, Exodus 19:6 and its notion of a "kingdom of priests" was not, so far as we know, exploited in the Second Temple period, at least in terms of differentiating between different groups within Israel.²⁴² Various rationales may be given for this omission, but it seems plausible that the Exodus passage was not exploited because there was no need to do so. The vast majority of Second Temple Jews remained loyal to the priesthood and participated in the temple where it

²⁴² Daniel R. Schwartz, "'Kingdom of Priests' - a Pharisaic Slogan?," in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992), 57-66. In the few cases when this verse is cited, the "kingdom of priests" refers to the nation of Israel as a whole, not a small dissident group within.

presided. For those who did not, the hereditary principle remained strong, as each of the alternative temples gained some semblance of legitimacy due to the presence in its midst of priests holding a proper priestly pedigree. Democratizing the notion of priesthood, on the other hand, would have undermined the potency of having legitimate priests officiating within one's community.

Chapter 5: The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity

The present chapter explores the idea of the Christian community as a new, eschatological temple, an understanding deeply ingrained in the earliest Christian traditions and found across a wide spectrum of early Christian literature. The strong conceptual and linguistic links to the idea of the community-as-temple at Qumran indicate that the early Christians were not unique in developing such a communal self-identity; moreover, these connections suggest a need to look beyond these early Christian writings in order to ascertain the origin and significance of the Christian use of community-as-temple language. In the previous chapter, I argued that the impulse in several streams of Second Temple Judaism to construct alternative temples was forged on the anvil of conflict with the Jerusalem religious establishment. It now remains to be seen whether or not this general pattern also applies to the early Christian movement. In what follows I will argue that the early Christian appropriation of temple terminology is best understood through a comparison with both contemporary Jewish critiques of the temple and priesthood and the creation of alternative Jewish temples in the Second Temple period.

Accordingly, I will need to discern whether an event, or a series of events, acted as a catalyst for this particular mode of self-identity. In other words, I will first examine Jesus' attitude toward the temple and the high priesthood. I will then explore the evidence of increasing antagonism between the early Jewish-Christians and the Jerusalem priestly elite. Following this, I will survey the temple imagery found in early Christian literature and determine its breadth, scope, and impact upon the formation of Christian

identity. Lastly, I will argue that any discussion of the “templization” of the nascent Christian community must be framed against the backdrop of conflict with Jerusalem’s religious establishment and the construction of temples alternative to Jerusalem at Mount Gerizim, Leontopolis, and Qumran.

5.1 A Note on the Use of the Gospels and Acts as Historical Sources

My intent in this chapter is to reconstruct the views which Jesus and his early followers held of the Jerusalem temple and the chief priests. In order to do so, I am heavily reliant on a few of the narratives found in the Gospels and Acts. The historical reliability of these sources, however, has been questioned. The publication of William Wrede’s landmark work, “The Messianic Secret,” presented a formidable challenge to those who thought that Mark, and by implication all of the Gospels, could be used as a source for recovering information about the historical Jesus.¹ Wrede insisted that both the framework of Mark’s Gospel and the themes present within it were products of the later church’s theological reflections on the life of Jesus and not a straightforward account of Jesus’ words and actions. As a result, though we can learn a great deal about Mark’s views on Jesus from this gospel, we can be less sure of using the Gospel of Mark in reconstructing the life of the historical Jesus.

¹ William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1971).

Form critics such as Dibelius and Bultmann cast further doubt upon using the Gospels as sources for the historical Jesus.² They argued that the individual pericopes had been altered and elaborated upon over time, most likely during an amorphous and lengthy period of oral transmission. As a result, these form critics exhibited a very dim view of being able to get back to the original Jesus material. More recently, proponents of redaction criticism have argued that the the evangelists were not simply compilers of material, as many form critics had assumed. Rather, redaction critics have helped reveal the creative impulses of the Evangelists and the manner in which each gospel writer transformed the material in order to present a distinctive picture of the figure of Jesus.³ The net effect has been a general sense of pessimism in regard to using the Gospels as sources for the historical Jesus.

At the same time, other scholars have reasoned that the Gospels need to be taken more seriously as historical sources. One of the main arguments in defense of the Gospels as historically reliable documents has been the persistent observation that these documents were composed within the first or second Christian generation, and that the presence in Christianity of eyewitnesses to Jesus' life provided a check on both the alterations to individual pericopes as well as the extent to which the evangelists were at liberty to create new material. This position, first argued by Vincent Taylor, has been

² Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. Bertram Lee Woolf; Greenwood, SC: Attic, 1971); Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972).

³ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-1997); Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 2000); Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (trans. James E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

reiterated more recently by Martin Hengel and Richard Bauckham and, to some extent, James Dunn.⁴

Though a bit more skeptical than Bauckham about the ability to argue that the presence of eyewitnesses ensures that the Gospels present authentic Jesus traditions, I also tend to view the Gospels and Acts as presenting a broadly reliable outline of historical events. The Evangelists were theologians, but they were not so theologically creative that they deliberately obscured or radically altered the course of events that they and their communities valued highly. Rather, they presented matters as they understood them to be, while also choosing to highlight those elements which they found most edifying for themselves and their respective communities. While it is naïve to think that every detail is a record of “what actually happened,” the broad outline found in the Gospels is largely credible.

I have less confidence, however, in the historicity of the book of Acts. While some scholars have pointed to Luke’s use of sources in constructing his narrative and argued that his style of writing is similar to other ancient historians,⁵ other scholars have noted that Luke has freely composed many of the speeches in Acts and that his account of Paul’s missionary endeavors in the latter half of Acts is sometimes at odds with what

⁴ Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1933); Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000); James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

⁵ E.g. Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of the Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998).

Paul himself affirms in his letters.⁶ Whenever this occurs John Knox's observation still stands: in every case where Paul and Acts disagree we should prefer Paul's first-hand account to Acts' second-hand account.⁷ Yet if Luke is not as trustworthy of a historian in places where we have independent information, what are we to make of the sections in Luke for which we have relatively little outside corroboration? Below I will argue that Luke's narration of events when the early followers of Jesus are still in Jerusalem is historically probable in its general outline, since it is clear from both Paul and Josephus that many early Christians remained in Jerusalem. Moreover, I will argue that their continued presence in the city would have likely brought them into frequent contact with members of the Jerusalem priesthood, the religious leadership who had played a pivotal role in Jesus' death, and that the level of hostility described in Acts between the early Christians and the chief priests is historically likely.

Still, the question of the historicity of Acts is a complicated issue, and one cannot be certain that events occurred exactly as Luke records. Though I use Acts as one of my primary sources for determining the relationship between the early Christians and chief priests in Jerusalem, my position is not dependent solely on this book or its narrative outline. Indeed, for my larger argument I do not need to argue for the historicity of any *specific* events in these opening chapters. Rather, I need only show that Luke's overall

⁶ E.g. Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956); Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. Bernard Noble et al.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971); Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994).

⁷ John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 17-28.

portrayal of hostility between the early Christians and the Jerusalem chief priests has a high degree of historical likelihood.

In what follows, I have chosen to discuss several passages from the Gospels whose historicity I believe can be defended on standard historical-critical grounds and one passage from Acts that appears an entirely plausible occurrence. Rarely can a scholar state with full assurance that a specific event or statement rests on historical bedrock. Rather, the most one can usually offer is a probable reconstruction of events. This is what I have tried to do. On a case-by-case basis, I will argue that the Gospel's presentation of animosity between Jesus and the chief priests in Jerusalem rests on solid historical ground, and that hostilities between the early Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and these same chief priests continued in the years following Jesus' death. Further, I will argue that this animus is what lay behind the formation of the early Christian idea of the community-as-a-temple.

5.2 Jesus' View of the Temple and Jerusalem Priesthood

That the Jerusalem priestly aristocracy and the leadership of the early Christian movement were at odds with one another is clear from both the book of Acts (e.g. 4:1-22; 5:17-40) and Josephus (*Ant.* 20.200).⁸ But when did this conflict begin, and what role if any did Jesus play in the development of this tension? More to the point, can any anti-

⁸ For more on this, see sections 5.3., 5.3.1, and 5.3.2.

temple or, more specifically, anti-priestly sentiments be detected in the words and deeds of Jesus?

The Gospels answer this question in the negative with respect to the greater part of Jesus' life.⁹ He is said to have frequented the temple in the Gospel of John (e.g. 2:13; 5:1, 7:10; 11:55), and his lament in Matthew and Luke—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings" (Mt 23:37-39/Lk 13:34-35)—suggests that he visited Jerusalem more frequently than the Synoptics elsewhere seem to imply.

In addition, on several occasions the Jesus of the Gospels speaks positively regarding the temple and its presiding priesthood.¹⁰ After healing a leper, Jesus urges the man to show himself to the priest and to offer the appropriate sacrifice (Mk 1:40-44), and his teaching on the need to be reconciled before offering a gift at the temple assumes that his followers are participating in the temple cult (Mt 5:23-24). Furthermore, Jesus' declaration that the one who swears by the sanctuary swears by it and by the one who dwells within it reveals his belief that God's presence currently resides in the temple (Mt 23:21). In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is also portrayed as celebrating the Passover meal

⁹ Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 37; E. P. Sanders, "Jerusalem and its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. Lee Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 90-93; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 3.499-500; R. T. France, "Matthew and Jerusalem," in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 110; Daniel M. Gurtner, "Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the 'Parting of the Ways'," in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 130, 151-53.

¹⁰ Sanders, "Jerusalem and Its Temple," 90-92; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 37-38; Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 203-6; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 3.500-501; cf. Klawans, *Purity*, 218.

with a lamb ritually slain according to the temple's regulations, with no recorded objections. Since the Gospels were likely composed in the years following the destruction of the temple,¹¹ it is unlikely that their authors would have ascribed such positive attitudes toward the temple to Jesus or would have portrayed him as urging his followers to participate in its cult were it not the case that he had done so.

One would expect to find such acceptance of the temple and its presiding priesthood in a first-century C.E. Jew, since many Jews during this time appear to have viewed the temple as the religious and political center of Judaism and held the sanctuary and its priests in high esteem.¹² Moreover, it stands to reason that Jesus, a Galilean Jew, would have made pilgrimage as often as reasonably possible.¹³ None of this is explicitly spelled out in the Gospel accounts, but it is fair to assume that if they came up to Jerusalem, Jesus and his disciples participated in the temple cult alongside their fellow Jews. As Fredriksen has noted, a lack of participation in the temple's sacred rites would have been cause for notice, not his involvement in it.¹⁴ On the whole, then, it is likely that Jesus viewed the priesthood and temple in a positive manner, participated in the temple cult, and expected his followers to do likewise. Indeed, it is difficult to explain

¹¹ Mark is the possible exception, with scholars about evenly split over whether Mark was composed before or after the Temple's destruction in 70 C.E. See Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 37-39.

¹² See Chapter Two.

¹³ For the presence of Jews in Jerusalem and at the temple during the festivals, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 112-18, 125-45.

¹⁴ Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 203-6.

the early Church's continued participation in the temple and its service if Jesus had not held the sanctuary and cult in high regard.¹⁵

According to the Synoptic chronology, however, this positive attitude toward the temple and priesthood was eclipsed by the events of Jesus' last week. All three Synoptic Gospels portray these days as Jesus' first adult visit to Jerusalem and the temple and point to his confrontation with the Jewish religious leaders as the catalyst for his crucifixion. Indeed, they indicate that during these final days Jesus thought that the temple's destruction was imminent and that the chief priests were unworthy of their post. It is likely, however, that the Synoptics have compressed a longer period of public ministry into a more rapid narrative framework, with the events of this last week taking on a disproportionate weight. Taking their cue from John's Gospel, D. Moody Smith and others have argued that Jesus' ministry likely occurred over a period of several years and involved periodic trips to Jerusalem.¹⁶ If so, his encounters with the chief priests in this fateful last week did not constitute his initial interactions with them. Moreover, the hostility directed toward Jesus during his final week in Jerusalem makes more sense if the chief priests had some previous knowledge of him and had already formed their own initial opinions.

¹⁵ For a lengthier discussion on the early Christian participation in the temple and cult, see section 5.3.

¹⁶ D. Moody Smith, "Jesus Tradition in the Gospel of John," in *The Fourth Gospel in Four Dimensions: Judaism and Jesus, the Gospels and Scripture* (ed. D. Moody Smith; Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2008), 84-85; cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966), 1-1i; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1.403-6; Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 238-41.

For a discussion of Jesus' views of the temple and priesthood, I now turn to an examination of his demonstration in the Temple, his statements regarding the future fate of the temple, and his Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants.

5.2.1 Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple

The account of Jesus' demonstration in the temple, often referred to as the "cleansing" of the temple, appears in all four Gospel accounts (Matt 21:12-13; Mark 11:15-17; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:14-17). Mark contains the most detailed description: upon entering the temple Jesus drives out all those who are selling and buying, overturns the tables of the moneychangers and the seats of those selling doves, and keeps those present from carrying anything through the temple. Directly following these actions, Jesus declares: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations, but you have made it a den of robbers," a mixed citation drawn from Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11. To varying degrees, Matthew and Luke abbreviate this description. Both agree, however, in insisting that Jesus drove out those selling merchandise and that his citation of Isaiah 56:7 did not include the phrase "for all the nations." John's account differs more dramatically, as Jesus fashions a whip of cords and rids the temple of the merchants and their goods, including sheep and oxen. Moreover, in place of Isaiah 56 and Jeremiah 7, Jesus alludes instead to Zechariah 14:21: "Take these things out of here! Stop making my Father's house a marketplace!"

Though much about Jesus' actions in the temple is debated, here I offer some general observations. First, nearly all interpreters agree on the historicity of the event

described in the Gospel accounts, with even members of the Jesus Seminar expressing confidence that Jesus performed some anti-temple act and spoke a prophetic word during this event.¹⁷ Second, Jesus' actions did not lead to intervention on the part of Roman soldiers or Jewish temple guards, indicating that the action was both brief and confined to a small area of the temple.¹⁸ Third, most view Jesus' demonstration in the temple as symbolic and in the tradition of signs performed by Israel's prophets.¹⁹ Less clear, however, is what Jesus intended to accomplish through this symbolic action. Below I offer the two most plausible interpretations.

E. P. Sanders has argued that Jesus' overturning of the merchants' tables in the temple was intended to enact the destruction of the current temple symbolically.²⁰ Indeed, Sanders' asserts that in such a highly charged environment (the temple on the eve of Passover), all observing would have understood this event for what it was, a symbolic action, and that "the turning over of even one table points toward destruction."²¹ This

¹⁷ Robert W. Funk and the Jesus Seminar, eds., *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), 121-22, 231-32, 338-39, 373-74. For an argument in favor of Jesus' action from a comparative social perspective, see Gerd Theissen, "Die Tempelweissagung Jesu: Prophetie in Spannungsfeld von Stadt und Land," *TZ* 32 (1976): 144-58.

¹⁸ This is in contrast to other occasions in which turmoil erupted in the temple confines (e.g. Lk 13:1-3; Acts 4:1-4; 21:30-36; *J.W.* 2.223-27). On this, see Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 69-70; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 424-25.

¹⁹ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 70; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 237-70, esp. 249; Wright, *Victory of God*, 415; Scot McKnight, "Jesus and Prophetic Actions," *BBR* 10.2 (2000): 197-232; Klawans, *Purity*, 225.

²⁰ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61-76; cf. John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 357-60; Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 207-10, 225-34; Wright, *Victory of God*, 413-28.

²¹ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 70.

desolation, however, was not predicated upon Jesus' belief that the current temple was in any way defiled, the presiding priests corrupt, or that trade should not be carried out in the temple courts. Rather, Jesus seems to have thought that the temple had fulfilled its purpose, and, as a result, had now become redundant.²² Accordingly, the destruction of the temple would pave the way for the imminent arrival of the kingdom of God, which, Sanders urges, would be accompanied by a new temple built by God himself.²³

In all that he affirms, Sanders' observations seem correct. Jesus' actions do seem to point toward the destruction of the temple, and this demonstration coheres remarkably well with other occasions on which Jesus either predicts or threatens the destruction of the temple.²⁴ Taken together, this combination of threat and deed directed against the temple provides a plausible reason for Jesus' death, as these actions surely would have provoked the ire of the priestly aristocracy charged with oversight of the temple. Furthermore, the view that a new, purified temple would one day replace the current one did indeed have some traction in the worldview of some Jews of this period (e.g. *1 Enoch* 90:28-29, 11Q19 29.7-10; *4 Ezra* 10:25-54; *2 Bar.* 4:2-7; 6:7-9).

²² E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (New York: Penguin, 1993), 262.

²³ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 75, 77-90; *ibid.*, *Historical Figure*, 261-62; cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1.457-58; Jostein Ådna, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel: die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 25-89.

²⁴ See section 5.2.2; cf. Wright, *Victory of God*, 416-17.

Others, however, have found it significant that Jesus' actions in the temple are not restricted to the overturning of tables.²⁵ Rather, his energies appear to be directed principally against the moneychangers and those engaged in the selling of sacrificial animals in and around the temple precincts.²⁶ This, it is argued, implies not only that Jesus' activities in the temple were predicated on his disapproval of these economic practices and forms of commercialism present in the temple,²⁷ but also that they were principally directed against the chief priests who had sanctioned the vendors' presence and encouraged their activities. Jesus' words support this idea. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus pointedly denounces the temple administrators for allowing the temple to become a

²⁵ See Evans, "Jesus' Action: Cleansing," 237-70; *ibid.*, "Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-Century Temple," in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 319-44; cf. Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 72-79; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 3.133-37; David Flusser, *Jesus* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998), 135-41; Klawans, *Purity*, 236-41.

²⁶ This is not to say that Jesus was opposed to the sacrificial system itself. In any ancient religion animals were required for sacrifices, and those selling animals in the temple courts, as well as the money changers, were providing a necessary and important service. For most pilgrims, the convenience provided by the lenders far outweighed the fees which were assessed for this service. See Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61-65; Paula Fredriksen, "Did Jesus Oppose the Purity Laws?," *BRev* 11 (1995): 20-25, 42-47; Ådna, *Jesu Stellung*, 429.

²⁷ It is difficult to discern the exact parameters of this financial impropriety. It is possible that Jesus' viewed the chief priests of his day as guilty of profiteering and/or extortion. Some rabbinic traditions suggest that this was a problem (see *m. Ker.* 1:7; *Seqal.* 5:4), as does the *T. Moses* 7:3-10 and Josephus (*Ant.* 20.181, 206). More recently, Bauckham ("Jesus' Demonstration," 75-77) and Klawans (*Purity*, 236-41) have suggested that Jesus was particularly exercised over the possible exclusion of the poor from the sacrifices, as the nominal fees charged by the vendors may have precluded their participation. Both focus specifically on Jesus' actions against the moneychangers and those selling doves, the two vendors whose business would have directly involved the poorest pilgrims. This seems a plausible suggestion. Alternatively, Jesus' actions in the temple may have been directed against specific forms of commercialism present in the temple. If we could be more certain of the authenticity of the the Scriptural citation in the Synoptics ("but you have made it a den of robbers"), then the evidence would lean toward charges of thievery. The significant difficulties with attributing this statement to Jesus, however, make it more likely that Jesus was particularly concerned with specific incidents/abuses occurring in the temple, which may well have taken the form of the exclusion of the poor from the sacrificial system or more general discontent with the commercialism present in the temple. In the end, it is probably best to leave the charges unspecified. For this reason, I will often use the phrase "financial improprieties," or something akin to this, to note Jesus' economic critique of the chief priests of his day in his demonstration in the temple.

“den of robbers” rather than the “house of prayer” it was intended to be. Similarly, the Johannine Jesus condemns the illicit economic activity occurring in the temple: “Stop making my father’s house a marketplace.” Assuming the independence of John,²⁸ we have here further evidence that Jesus’ actions revealed some level of dissatisfaction with ongoing financial improprieties in the temple.²⁹

This economic interpretation of Jesus’ actions has merit. It incorporates the entirety of the evidence into an account of Jesus’ actions and focuses on those against whom these actions were directed. Since the economic transactions that Jesus attacked could only have occurred with the express sanction of the priestly authorities who controlled the temple, it is likely that Jesus’ actions were aimed specifically at the chief priests. The differing Old Testament citations in the Synoptics and John further confirm that the priestly leadership was the primary target of Jesus’ actions.³⁰ These citations not only suggest that the fault for allowing the temple to become a “den of robbers” falls squarely upon the shoulders of those who have sanctioned the economic activities of the traders; they also imply some level of shady dealings or thievery on the part of the high priestly establishment.

²⁸ See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.134. For John’s independence of the Synoptics more generally, see D. Moody Smith, *John Among the Gospels* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 195-241.

²⁹ See Joel Marcus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 111 (1992): 441-62449 n. 39; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.134-35.

³⁰ See below for a discussion of the historicity of these Old Testament citations.

Though Sanders would disagree,³¹ the above two interpretations—that Jesus’ actions were a symbolic enactment of the future destruction of the temple, or that they were intended as a dramatic protest against specific practices and personalities current in the temple—are not mutually exclusive.³² In deciphering Jesus’ intentions in the temple, it seems important to note not only *what* Jesus is said to have done in the temple courts, but also *whom* his actions implicitly criticize. The overturning of tables in the temple may well point towards destruction, but it is equally significant that these tables belonged to vendors in the temple whose very presence had been sanctioned by the chief priests. Any announcement of impending destruction may have been predicated upon some illicit activity occurring in the temple itself.

Though both views are likely correct, can we determine whether one of these views was primary for Jesus? If the citation of Isaiah and Jeremiah belongs to the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, then one could argue that the curbing of abuses in the temple and the concomitant critique of the presiding priesthood was of primary importance to him. Indeed, Sanders admits as much, remarking: “If the saying in Mark 11:17 and parr. were Jesus’ own comment on why he ‘cleansed’ the temple . . . we would have to accept that it was indeed trade and sacrifice which bothered him, possibly because dishonesty

³¹ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 89-90.

³² For examples of various ways in which these two ideas are combined, see Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 48-49; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.135-37; Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16* (AB 27A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 782-83; cf. C. K. Barrett, "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Templum Amicitiae* (ed. William Horbury; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 362; Gurtner, "Matthew's Theology," 130.

was involved.”³³ So, can a case be made that this composite citation goes back to the historical Jesus?

Strong arguments have been made to the contrary. Sanders has reasoned that the biblical citations at the conclusion of Jesus’ action in the temple are probably secondary.³⁴ For evidence one need look no farther than the differing scriptural citations in the Synoptics and John. In addition, Marcus has argued for the Markan provenance of the composite citation in the Synoptics, showing that references to both the *λησται* of Jeremiah 7 and the Isaianic “house of prayer for all nations” may well reflect the events of the Jewish revolt against Rome in the late 60’s C.E.³⁵ These arguments are persuasive. It is unlikely that we will ever know Jesus’ exact pronouncements while in the Jerusalem temple.

This inability to get back to Jesus’ exact words does not, however, mean that Jesus said nothing at all while in the temple courts. Indeed, two converging lines of argumentation suggest not only that Jesus said something while there, but also that the content of this pronouncement was directly tied to forms of commercialism sanctioned by the priestly overseers of the temple that he found particularly repugnant.

³³ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 66.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 66-67; cf. Étienne Trocmé, "L'Expulsion des Marchands du Temple," *NTS* 15 (1968): 1-22; Jürgen Roloff, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 91-93; Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 209-10; A. E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 132.

³⁵ Marcus, "Jewish War," 450-51; cf. G. W. Buchanan, "Mark 11.15-19. Brigands in the Temple," *HUCA* 30 (1959): 169-77; Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (ed. Howard C. Kee and Douglas A. Knight; SBLDS 31; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 132-33; Schwier, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung*, 119-20.

First, the account of Jesus' demonstration in the temple is doubly attested in the Synoptics and John. On the one hand, the many differences between Mark and John, including the use of differing Old Testament citations, render any Johannine dependence upon Mark extremely unlikely.³⁶ On the other hand, Davies and Allison have pointed out that the common vocabulary (Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἱερόν, πωλέω, περιστερά, ἐκβάλλω, κολλυβιστής, τράπεζα, ἀνα/καταστρέφω, οἶκος) and plotline (notice of Jesus' arrival in the temple, his overturning of the tables of the money-changers and driving out of the dove-sellers, and a word of explanation followed by Mark's citation of Isa 56:7/Jer 7:11 and John's use of Zech 14:21 and Ps 69:10) in Mark and John suggest that both accounts are reliant on a pre-Markan tradition.³⁷ This observation seems correct, and for our purposes, highly significant. Since the differing Old Testament citations in Mark and John both turn on an accusation of financial impropriety, it is highly probable that the common tradition behind both Mark and John contained a denunciation of the chief priests' economic malfeasance. The likely presence of an accusation against the temple establishment in the pre-Markan tradition is one argument in support of the idea that Jesus was primarily intent on curbing economic abuses in the temple.

Second, several contemporaneous Jewish sources also criticize the ethical mores of the Jerusalem chief priests on financial grounds, granting further credibility to Jesus'

³⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.134; Brown, *John*, 119.

³⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.134-35; cf. Brown, *John*, 119.

indictment of the temple overseers.³⁸ As we have seen in Chapters Three and Four, criticism of the leading priests in Jerusalem persisted throughout the Second Temple period, often including charges of sexual immorality, halakhic impurity, and corruption and greed.³⁹ Of those texts which discuss the first century C.E. Jerusalem priesthood, allegations of greed and financial misconduct take precedence.⁴⁰

The strongest evidence for this misconduct comes from Josephus, who provides specific examples of first-century corruption, greed, and violence on the part of some within the priestly aristocracy. On two separate occasions in the decade leading up to the Jewish revolt, dissension between some of these leading families resulted in the presiding high priest sending his servants to various threshing floors in order to collect the tithes due other priests.⁴¹ Those resisting, Josephus tells us, were treated violently and beaten (*Ant.* 20.181, 206). We are also told that during this period the high priest Ananias was

³⁸ See Shmuel Safrai, "The Temple and the Divine Service," in *The World History of the Jewish People: The Herodian Period* vol. 7 (ed. Michael Avi-Yonah and Zvi Baras; New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975), 286; Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 79-86; Evans, "Jesus' Action: Cleansing," 256-269; Flusser, *Jesus*, 138-41; cf. the discussion in Klawans, *Purity*, 225-29.

³⁹ E.g. CD 4.15-18; 1QpHab 8.10-9.5, 12.8-10; *Ps. Sol.* 8:11; *T. Levi* 14:2-15:1; *T. Mos.* 7:1-8. Cf. Stern, "Aspects of Jewish Society," 600-12; Randall Buth and Brian Kvasnica, "Temple Authorities and Tithes-Evasion: The Linguistic Background and Impact of the Parable of *the Vineyard, the Tenants and the Son*," in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels - Volume One* (ed. R. Steven Notley et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 65-73.

⁴⁰ Sanders (*Jesus and Judaism*, 89) asserts that no critique of this kind against the chief priests is present in the gospel accounts. While I agree that the halakhic practices and sexual mores of the priests are not at issue in the New Testament, allegations of greed and corruption do seem to be present in both the New Testament as well as contemporaneous first century C.E. Jewish sources.

⁴¹ These anecdotes stem from the years 59-65 C.E. and are found principally in *Ant.* 20.180-214; see also Mendels, *Rise and Fall*, 300-305; Sanders, *Judaism*, 323-24.

not above the payment of bribes to advance his position (*Ant.* 20.205, 213), and that another high priest, Ananus, felt free to receive them (*Life*, 193-96).

In the *Testament of Moses*, which dates to the first third of the first century C.E., wealthy individuals with concerns particularly appropriate to the priesthood are castigated for their greed and corruption (*T. Moses* 7:1-10).⁴² Admittedly, these accusations are rather vague and the identification less than certain. Yet seen in the light of the litany of similar allegations directed against the Jerusalem priesthood throughout the second and first centuries B.C.E., this excoriation most likely targets the high priestly aristocracy.⁴³

In addition, rabbinic accounts of the first century C.E. high priesthood also paint an unflattering picture. The complaint in *t. Menahot* 13.21 is particularly revelatory:⁴⁴

Woe is me because of the house of Boethus; woe is me because of their lances!
Woe is me because of the house of Qadros [=Kantheras], woe is me because of their pen!
Woe is me because of the house of Elhanan [=Annas], woe is me because of their whisperings!
Woe is me because of the house of Elisha, woe is me because of their fists!

⁴² Namely, it is said that the “hands and minds” of these individuals “will deal with impurities” and that they say “in addition to all this: ‘Keep off, do not touch me, lest you pollute me.’” See further the discussion of the *Testament of Moses* in Chapter Three. Though the date of the original composition is debated, it is generally agreed that chapters 6-7 stem from the first quarter of the first-century C.E, as chapter 6 clearly speaks of events in the reign of Herod.

⁴³ See Chapter Three. See also Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 80; Evans, "Jesus' Action and Evidence," 340-41; R. H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1897), 23-28. In contrast, Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature*, 213) asserts that the charges are too stereotypical to be identifiable.

⁴⁴ Cf. *b. Pesah* 57a, which appears to have smoothed out the account by removing the unknown house of Elisha as well as by making explicit that the concluding lines refer to all of the high priestly families and not just the house of Ishmael ben Phiabi. Cf. *m. Ker.* 1:7; *m. Seq.* 1:4; *t. Menah.* 13:18-22; *t. Zebah.* 11:16; *b. Yoma* 8b; *b. Pesah* 57a; *Sipre, Piska* 105; *Lev. Rab.* 21.9; *y. Yoma* 1.1 (Talmud Yerushalmi [Hebrew Language Academy], 2001]: col. 562, lines 10-28; *Pesiq. Rab.* 47:4. See also *Ant.* 20.180-81, 205-207.

Woe is me because of the house of Ishmael the son of Phiabi!
For they are High Priests and their sons are [Temple] treasurers
and their sons-in-law are supervisors
and their servants beat the people with sticks.

According to this rabbinic account, violence, intrigue, and oppression marked these families throughout the first century.⁴⁵ More specifically, the concluding lines reveal that the high priests kept the chief financial offices of the temple “in-house,”⁴⁶ with the clear implication that the high priestly families owed their wealth to their supervision over the temple’s economic functions.⁴⁷ In addition, the charge that these priests “beat the people with sticks” suggests that the prosperity of these high priestly families was due, at least in part, to extortionary practices. The ensuing lines of *t. Menahot* continue this denunciation of the high priestly families by explicitly attributing the demise of the Second Temple to the greed of these high priests: “Why did they go into exile? Because they loved money and hated each other” (13:22).

To this list I would add the Gospels’ depiction of Jesus’ actions in the temple courts and his attack against both the vendors in the temple courts and those who had sanctioned this practice. Taking all of the evidence together, it is clear that the chief

⁴⁵ See E. Mary Smallwood, “High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine,” *JTS* 13 (1962): 14-34; Levine, *Jerusalem*, 352-55. Both have pointed out that these families (with the exception of the house of Elisha) held a virtual stranglehold on the office of high priest from the reign of Herod the Great to the revolt in 66 C.E. That these rabbinic accounts correctly name the principal priestly families suggests that the accusations leveled against each may also have some historical credence. Indeed, Daniel R. Schwartz (“KATA TOYTON TON KAIRON: Josephus’ Source on Agrippa II,” *JQR* 72 [1982]: 241-68, 262-68) has shown that Josephus and the rabbis are often critical of the same first-century priests.

⁴⁶ Schürer, *HJP*, 2.281-83. Schürer notes that the *גזברים* are usually reckoned among the holders of the higher temple posts, probably in charge of the receipt and custody of the temple’s treasures, whereas the *אמורביין* were probably officers of the treasury, in charge of the distribution of priestly dues among the priests.

⁴⁷ Bauckham, “Jesus’ Demonstration,” 80.

priests of the first century C.E. were often condemned for their arrogance, greed, and sanction of inappropriate financial dealings.

To be sure, none of these sources come from impartial observers of the first century C.E. Jerusalem priesthood, and each of them may have had specific reason to portray the temple aristocracy in a negative light.⁴⁸ Josephus and the Gospel writers, for example, both wished to paint a positive portrait of Judaism and Jesus, respectively, vis-à-vis the Roman Empire. In so doing, they seem at times to have highlighted the negative role of the chief priests in their desire to downplay Roman culpability for the destruction of the temple and the crucifixion of Jesus.⁴⁹ Moreover, since the relationship between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who largely controlled the first century C.E. high priesthood, was rather strained, it is no surprise that the rabbis, the likely successors to the Pharisees,⁵⁰ would have also held the Sadducean high-priestly families in contempt.

⁴⁸ Not enough is known about the *Testament of Moses* to say anything of value about its tendencies, other than to note that its author had little admiration for contemporary priestly leaders.

⁴⁹ As E. P. Sanders ("Judaism and the Grand "Christian" Abstractions: Love, Mercy, and Grace," *Int* 39 [1985]: 357-72, esp. 358-60) has pointed out, these priests were the most natural targets, for by virtue of their position, they had the means to affect the course of events.

⁵⁰ The relationship between the Pharisees and Rabbis is complex. While it is clear that the Pharisees cannot simply be equated with the Rabbis, there does appear to be a close relationship between these two groups. For an overview of the issues involved, see Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 60-62; Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh," 36-53. Cohen has argued that although the rabbis never claim to be Pharisees or descendants of Pharisees, Josephus and the New Testament provide the identifying link between these two groups. According to Cohen, though many Pharisees presumably became part of the rabbinic movement, this movement was more inclusive and was not restricted to the Pharisees and their descendants. Cohen's cautious argumentation seems correct. While a tight correlation between the Pharisees and rabbis cannot be drawn, enough overlap exists to posit some type of continuity between these two groups.

Still, there is good reason to think that this portrayal of priestly rapacity and corruption in these sources is founded on solid historical grounds.⁵¹ Josephus, for one, places the blame for the Jewish revolt and subsequent destruction of the temple squarely on the shoulders of the *ληισταί*, and not on the priests. Indeed, though he himself was not a member of the high-priestly aristocracy, it is worth remembering that he took great pride in the eminence of his own priestly family, the first of the twenty-four courses (*Life* 1-2), and that he was quite adept at discerning between those priests he deemed praiseworthy (e.g. *Ant.* 14.65-67) and those he did not (e.g. *Ant.* 20.180-214). That he spoke negatively of the priests at all is significant.⁵² Although the rabbis, moreover, often denigrated contemporary priests along with those of former times as unlearned and inferior in other ways, their charges against the first-century C.E. Jerusalem priesthood are the distinctive ones of greed and corruption.⁵³

Similarly, while the Gospel writers on occasion emphasize the culpability of the chief priests, they are equal opportunity polemicists, condemning other segments of Jewish society as well. In the case of the Pharisees, we know that much of this language is hyperbolic, and this may well have been the situation with the chief priests as well.⁵⁴

In the Synoptics the Pharisees drop out as Jesus' primary opponents in the passion

⁵¹ Even Sanders, *Judaism*, 323, one of the most forthright defenders of the Jerusalem priesthood, admits that some of the high priests in the first-century C.E. were corrupt.

⁵² Sanders, "Judaism and the Grand "Christian" Abstractions," 363-64, 67-68.

⁵³ For sources and discussion, see Stuart A. Cohen, *The Three Crowns: Structures of Communal Politics in Early Rabbinic Jewry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 167-71.

⁵⁴ For the use of hyperbolic language in Jewish intramural debate, see Luke Timothy Johnson, "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic," *JBL* 108 (1989): 419-41.

narratives, and the chief priests take their place. But this change is likely rooted in reality, for due to their position and relationship with the Romans, the chief priests were the only ones in Jewish society who had the political clout to initiate crucifixion. In short, while each of the above sources may have reasons to portray the Jerusalem priestly leadership in a negative light, they do not consistently do so. The reticence to blacklist the priests completely speaks not only to a respect of the high priestly office, but also to an ability to differentiate between worthy and unworthy priests. Especially in Josephus and the New Testament one finds positive portrayals and criticisms of the priests side by side.⁵⁵

Furthermore, the degree to which these disparate sources overlap in their polemic against the chief priests is impressive, especially since there is no evidence that any of the four sources relied upon one another. As noted above, attacks on the Jerusalem priesthood in preceding centuries often revolved around accusations of illicit sexual transgressions and halakhic impurity. By the first century C.E., indictments along these lines had largely given way to charges of priestly financial mismanagement or outright thievery. While some of this critique, such as that found in the *Testament of Moses*, may be stereotypical, the specific and independent remembrances contained within the Gospels, Josephus, and some rabbinic accounts alert us to the substantive nature of these charges. Even allowing for bias in all these sources against the chief priests, it is

⁵⁵ Though negative depictions predominate, in Mark 1:40-44 and *Ant.* 14.65-67 the Jerusalem priesthood is seen in a more positive light.

noteworthy that all of them indict the Jerusalem priesthood for economic malfeasance and robbery.

In sum, though I do not claim that the citation of Jeremiah 7:11 in Mark 11:17 or the allusion to Zechariah 14:21 in John 2:16 are Jesus' *ipsissima verba*, it seems highly plausible that his actions in the temple were intended as a critique of the temple overseers. The likelihood of Mark's and John's reliance on a pre-Markan tradition that contained criticism of the chief priests, and indictments of the Jerusalem chief priests in independent sources depicting the first century C.E. priesthood, makes it highly probable that any condemnation of the chief priests in Jesus' day, including Jesus' own critique, would have included accusations of financial impropriety related to the temple. That Jesus intended to symbolically enact the destruction of the temple is also likely, but this does not appear to be the primary motivation for his actions in the temple. In what follows, I will show that his challenge to the chief priests of his day in this demonstration in the temple was not an isolated event.

5.2.2 Sayings Regarding the Future Destruction of the Temple

One of the most assured results of historical Jesus research has been the contention that Jesus predicted/threatened the destruction of the temple. This is due, in large part, to Jesus' multiple declarations regarding the future devastation of the temple (Mark 13:1-2 pars.; 14:58 pars.; 15:29 pars.; John 2:19; Acts 6:14; *Gos. Thom.* 71). The first prediction of the temple's demise appears in Mark 13:1-2:

And as he came out of the temple, one of his disciples said to him, “Look, Teacher, what large stones and what large buildings!” Then Jesus asked him, “Do you see these great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down (καταλυθῆ).”

Predictions of the temple’s destruction were not unprecedented. As early as the time of Jeremiah we see dissatisfaction with the overseers of the temple and a prediction of its ruin (Jer 7:11-14; 26:6-23; cf. 2 Chron 36:17-21), and evidence of this type of prophetic critique is found throughout the entirety of the Second Temple period.⁵⁶ Indeed, Josephus provides a close analogue to Jesus of Nazareth’s predictions of destruction, as he recalls that Jesus son of Ananias continually announced the imminent devastation of Jerusalem and its temple in the years leading up to 70 C.E.⁵⁷ These predictions of the temple’s destruction were, by and large, predicated upon the understanding that God would be the principle agent in bringing devastation upon it. This is evident in Mark 13:1-2, as the use of the divine passive (καταλυθῆ) indicates that the God of Israel will be the primary actor in this scene.

In the Markan and Matthean accounts of Jesus’ trial, however, Jesus is remembered as *threatening* the destruction of the temple rather than merely uttering a prediction about its future. According to Mark 14:57-58:

Some stood up and gave false witness against him, saying, “We heard him say, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three day I will build another, not made with hands.’”

⁵⁶ For examples, see Chapter Three.

⁵⁷ *J.W.* 6.300-309; see also Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.539-40; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 871-73. First-century C.E. portents of the temple’s destruction are also described in rabbinic traditions. See, e.g., *y. Yoma* 6:3; *b. Yoma* 39b.

As Sanders has remarked, it is “notoriously difficult” to confirm what was said at Jesus’ interrogation before the Jewish leaders.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, here I offer several observations regarding the attribution of this accusation to Jesus. First, it is difficult to imagine an early Christian inventing this accusation, as the charge is eventually dropped on the basis of the conflicting testimony of the two witnesses against Jesus.⁵⁹ Why would an early Christian make up an accusation, attribute it to false witnesses, and then dismiss it when it turns out to be false? That the accusation goes nowhere provides evidence for its authenticity.

Second, the idea that Jesus himself threatened to destroy and rebuild the temple is deeply embedded in the tradition. According to the Synoptics, at Jesus’ crucifixion those passing by hurl similar taunts at Jesus, claiming that he has said he would destroy the temple and build it again in three days (Mk 15:29; Mt 27:40). In a slightly different form, false witnesses accuse Stephen of speaking words against the temple and declaring that “Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place.”⁶⁰ The same idea is also seen in the Gospel of John, as Jesus here asserts: “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise

⁵⁸ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 71-72.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 72. Mark places this accusation on the lips of false witnesses, though the reason for its falseness is not entirely clear. Matthew mitigates Mark on this point (Matt 26:60-61). Though Luke also understands this testimony to be false, he omits the false witnesses and temple threat from Jesus’ interrogation scene and assigns them instead to the trial of Stephen in Acts 6:14. For a discussion of the falsity of the statement, see McKelvey, *New Temple*, 68-71; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 71-76; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.444-54.

⁶⁰ As (Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 72) notes, this claim occurs after Jesus’ ascension. If the testimony of the false witnesses is to be believed, Stephen must have thought that Jesus would return from heaven to destroy the temple. While it is conceivable that Stephen did think this would occur, it more likely hints at the idea that Luke has moved the Temple saying from the gospel, where it fits, to Acts, where it does not quite fit.

it up.” John’s version of the saying *ipso facto* reveals how deeply ingrained was the memory of Jesus’ threat against the temple, since instead of omitting the statement, he chooses to reinterpret it, placing the task of destroying the temple on the shoulders of others and assuring his reader that the temple was actually Jesus’ own body.⁶¹

Third, in Mark Jesus draws a distinction between the sanctuary made with hands (χειροποίητον) and another built without the agency of hands (ἀχειροποίητον). This contrast is not reiterated in Mark 15:29, nor is it found in the other Gospels, though Acts 7:48 reveals that Luke is aware of it. While the term ἀχειροποίητος is relatively rare, appearing only twice in the rest of the New Testament (2 Cor 5:1; Col 2:11) and not at all in the LXX or other contemporary Jewish literature, χειροποίητος is used regularly in the LXX to describe idols and idolatrous behavior (e.g. Lev 26:1; Isa 16:12; 31:7; Jdt 8:18).⁶² To describe the Jerusalem temple in such a manner goes beyond anything that we have seen of Jesus prior to this point, for though he is understood to have spoken of the temple’s demise on multiple occasions, in no other instance does he link this destruction with an accusation of idolatry.

⁶¹ Oscar Cullman, "L'Opposition Contre le Temple de Jérusalem, Motif Commun de la Théologie Johannique et du Monde Ambient," *NTS* 5 (1958-59): 157-73, esp. 170-73; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 118-20; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 72-73.

⁶² It is interesting that Philo, who praises the Jerusalem temple on other occasions, also refers to it as χειρόκτητος (*Spec.* 1.66-67), and to the Mosaic tabernacle as χειροποίητος (*Mos.* 2.88). Philo’s description of the tabernacle and temple as “made by human hands” alerts us that specific words such as χειροποιήτος are not necessarily fraught with negative baggage. This adjective could also be used to merely describe the temple’s humble origins.

For this reason, it is likely that this distinction between “made with hands/not made with hands” belongs to Mark himself.⁶³ Indeed, Brown has noted some of the difficulties with attributing the Markan form of the saying to Jesus, including the difficulty of retroverting this Greek construction back into Hebrew or Aramaic and the absence of the negative adjective ἀχειροποίητος in the LXX or contemporary Jewish literature.⁶⁴

To attribute these opposing adjectives to Mark, however, does not mean that Jesus said nothing at all on the subject. Rather, Mark 14:58, 15:29, and John 2:19 all suggest that Jesus believed and taught that a new temple would replace the current one upon its destruction. Moreover, Jesus was likely familiar with a particular strand of restoration eschatology which expected that God would raise up a future, glorious, and physical temple, independent of any human agency (e.g. *1 Enoch* 90:28-29, 11Q19 29.7-10; *4 Ezra* 10:25-54; *2 Bar.* 4:2-7; 6:7-9).⁶⁵ It is probable, therefore, that if Jesus spoke of a future temple of which God would be the architect and builder, most people listening to him would have understood him to be referring to a physical and earthly temple, in concert with others who envisioned God’s institution of a new temple. If so, to be sure, it is remarkable that no early Christian text looks forward to the emergence of a new, earthly, *physical* temple. But this can be explained on the supposition that many early

⁶³ For a treatment of these two adjectives, see Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 144-57.

⁶⁴ Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.439-40.

⁶⁵ See especially the results of Chapter Three, as well as Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77-90; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 50; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.441-43.

followers of Jesus came to see *themselves* as the eschatological temple, as I will discuss at length below.

Jesus, then, spoke of the imminent destruction of the temple. It seems clear from the Gospel accounts that his words predicting this destruction were remembered as a threat.⁶⁶ In addition, it is possible that he spoke of the creation of a new and more glorious temple, built by God himself. Presumably, the more threatening of these two ideas would have been his statements regarding the temple's demise, as any mention of its destruction would not only have raised the religious ire of the chief priests and other pious Jews but would also likely have been seen by these same priests as an attack on the source of their power and influence.⁶⁷ This connection is drawn explicitly in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants.

5.2.3 Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants

In the Synoptic tradition, the Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants falls directly between Jesus' demonstration in the temple and his prediction of its destruction, and it closely follows the Jewish leaders' demand for Jesus to justify his authority (Mk 12:1-11; Mt 21:33-44; Lk 20:9-18). In this parable, a man plants a vineyard, digs a pit for a winepress, and leases the vineyard to some tenants before

⁶⁶ In the end, Sanders, *Historical Figure*, 257, settles on the phrase "threateningly predicted" to describe Jesus' words against the temple.

⁶⁷ That this is the case may be seen in the events following the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. Though the priests appear to have held on to some of their influence within Judaism between 70 and 135 C.E., the loss of the temple proved an insurmountable barrier to regaining their former influence. On this, see Goodblatt, "The Title *Nasi*," 113-32.

leaving town.⁶⁸ At harvest time, messengers sent to collect his share are summarily dismissed through insults, beatings, and death, with the owner's son meeting death as well. As a result, the vineyard is handed over to new tenants, with the wicked tenants receiving the same end they apportioned to the owner's son. The parable concludes with a quotation of Psalm 118:22-23: "The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone. This was the Lord's doing, and it is amazing in our eyes."

Many scholars have challenged the integrity of this parable, assuming that its allegorical elements, as well as the quotation of Psalm 118 (Mk 12:10-11), are secondary accretions and not original to Jesus' words or intent.⁶⁹ Therefore, before proceeding to a discussion of the parable, I will first offer several arguments for its fundamental unity.

First, in studies devoted to the parabolic teaching of Jesus and the rabbis, it has become clear that the *mashal*, or parable proper, was often followed by a *nimshal*, or Scripture citation, which lent greater authority to the parable's conclusion.⁷⁰ This form-critical observation suggests that the scriptural citation should not be viewed as a

⁶⁸ Since Mark usually is understood to have composed his gospel prior to Matthew and Luke, here we follow Mark's version of the parable.

⁶⁹ See C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), 124-32; Joachim Jeremias, *Rediscovering the Parables of Jesus* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), 57-63. Earlier, Adolf Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [2 vols.; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899], 2.385-406) argued that an original form of the parable could not be recovered at all, since the original was buried, as it were, under the weight of the allegorizing tendencies of the Evangelists and the early church.

⁷⁰ For the prominence of a scriptural *nimshal* in rabbinic parables, see Harvey K. McArthur and Robert M. Johnston, *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1990), 145-56; David Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 16-19, 68-71. That the scriptural closing was an integral part of the parable was observed already by Paul Fiebig, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu: Im Lichte der Rabbinischen Gleichnisse des Neutestamentlichen Zeitalters* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1912), 78, 86-87, 239.

secondary accretion but as an integral component of the parable, for parables often had scriptural conclusions.⁷¹ Intriguingly, Psalm 118:22-23 also forms the conclusion to this parable in the *Gospel of Thomas* (65-66), which is a “circumstance that definitely complicates the issue” for those who both presume that the *Gospel of Thomas* is an independent and primitive gospel and view the scriptural citations as editorial additions.⁷²

Second, the parable and the Scripture citation are tightly joined through a Hebrew and/or Aramaic wordplay involving the son (בן) and the stone (בן־אבן), a pun also preserved in the Targumic and Talmudic literature.⁷³ Since this wordplay does not work in Greek, but only in Hebrew and Aramaic,⁷⁴ it is difficult to see how the later Greek-speaking church could have created this paronomasia.⁷⁵ While this in itself does not mean that the parable comes from Jesus, it does mean that the parable and scriptural citation had to have appeared together from a very early time.

⁷¹ Stern, *Parables in Midrash*, 16-19, 68-71; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 810.

⁷² Johannes C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-2: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants," *JSJ* 29 (1998): 63-80, esp. 64; cf. Buth and Kvasnica, "Temple Authorities," 63.

⁷³ Klyne Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation* (WUNT 27; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983), 63-65, 113-18; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 228-30. For other verbal and thematic connections between 12:1-9 and 12:10-11, see Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 111.

⁷⁴ Interestingly, Josephus preserves this Semitic word play in relating that when the Romans catapulted large stones into the city, the watchmen would shout “in their native tongue” that “the son is coming,” whereupon the defenders would lie down so as to avoid the stone coming into the city (*J.W.* 5.272). According to Josephus, the residents of the city certainly seem to have understood the son/stone wordplay! On this, see Snodgrass, *Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, 115.

⁷⁵ Evans, *Mark*, 229; cf. George J. Brooke, "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," *DSD* 2 (1995): 268-94, 287-89.

Third, the juxtaposition of Israel's identification as a vineyard (the allegorical elements of the parable) with the image of a cornerstone (the Scripture citation) has historical precedent. In the *Rule of the Community*, the *yahad* at Qumran is variously described as an "eternal planting" and a "precious cornerstone" which cannot be shaken (1QS 8:4-10).⁷⁶

In light of the *mashal/nimshal* structure, the Semitic wordplay, and the parallel in the Qumran literature in which the community is both a plant and a cornerstone, it is highly likely that the vineyard imagery and the citation of Psalm 118 are integral to Jesus' telling of the parable.⁷⁷ Moreover, the verbal and thematic links between the parable proper (12:1-9) and the scriptural citation (12:10-11) make it likely that the characters in each are to be identified with each other.⁷⁸ Consequently, the wicked tenants are linked with the builders who reject the stone, the son with the stone, and the "lord of the vineyard" with God. Having argued for the integrity of the parable and the likelihood that it derives from Jesus, I now turn to a discussion of the parable itself.

The parable proper opens with a description of a vineyard, a metaphor commonly used to describe Israel (e.g. Ps 80:8-18; Isa 5:1-7; 27:2-5; Jer 2:21; 5:10; 12:10; Ezek

⁷⁶ Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 810.

⁷⁷ The continued popularity of Psalm 118:22 in the early Christian movement provides additional support for the idea that this parable and its scriptural conclusion goes back to Jesus, for if Jesus was understood to have quoted from this Psalm, then it logically follows that his disciples would likely have done the same. For the use of Psalm 118:22 in nascent Christianity, see section 5.3.2.

⁷⁸ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 111. He notes the parallels between the rejection of the stone and the rejection of the servants and son, as well as the conceptual links between the vindication of the stone and the actions of the Lord of the vineyard in 12:9. In addition, verbal correspondences exist between the builders (οἰκοδομοῦντες) and head (κεφαλῆ) in 12:10 and the building (ὠκοδόμησεν) of the tower and wounding of one of the servants in the head (ἐκεφαλίσσεν) in 12:1 and 4.

15:1-8; 19:10-14, cf. *L.A.B.* 12:8-9; 4 *Ezra* 5:23), with several verbal and conceptual links making it clear that Isaiah 5:1-7 provides the specific background here.⁷⁹ In the Isaianic passage, God is portrayed as planting Israel, his chosen people, as a choice vine. Despite his tender care and provision, however, the vine yields only wild grapes, resulting in the vineyard's destruction. In Isaiah, then, Israel's moral turpitude leads to its downfall.

In the latter Second Temple period, the Song of the Vineyard in Isaiah 5 provided fodder for interpretative speculation. *Targum Isaiah*, for example, understands Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard as a parable (מִתְּוִיִּל) and reads Jerusalem and the temple into the opening lines of Isaiah 5.⁸⁰ In addition, a "lofty mountain" (i.e. the Temple Mount) is introduced as the inheritance (אֲחֻזָּה) given to Israel.⁸¹ Similarly, the watchtower is interpreted as the sanctuary, and the wine vat as the altar for atoning sacrifices.⁸² Tellingly, the tendency to read Jerusalem and the temple into Isaiah 5 is found also in the writings of Qumran, revealing the currency of this interpretative tradition in the first century C.E. (4Q 500 1; cf. *t. Sukk* 3.15; *t. Me'il* 1.16). One consequence of this reinterpretation of the parable in terms of temple and cult is that the divine judgment of

⁷⁹ Roger David Aus, *The Wicked Tenants and Gethsemane: Isaiah in the Wicked Tenants' Vineyard, and Moses and the High Priest in Gethsemane: Judaic Traditions in Mark 12:1-9 and 14:32-42* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 3-7; Evans, *Mark*, 224-25; Klyne Snodgrass, *Stories With Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 287-88.

⁸⁰ For text and translation of the *Targum Isaiah*, see J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949), 16-17.

⁸¹ Craig A. Evans, "God's Vineyard and its Caretakers," in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 398-401.

⁸² See Joseph M. Baumgarten, "4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord's Vineyard," *JJS* 40 (1989): 1-6; Brooke, "4Q500," 268-79; Evans, "God's Vineyard," 397-405.

Isaiah 5:1-7, formerly directed toward the entirety of Israel, is now subtly shifted to focus more specifically on those charged with oversight of the temple.⁸³

It is likely that Jesus was familiar with these traditions, as he also opens his parable with imagery drawn from the vineyard in Isaiah 5, as well as introducing the concept of inheritance (κληρονομία) into the passage.⁸⁴ Moreover, the tendency to read the temple and cult into Isaiah 5 renders the setting of this parable—the temple confines, with the temple leadership in attendance—entirely plausible, for only in this setting would the full force of the parable and its scriptural *nimshal* be felt.⁸⁵ Little would be gained in telling the parable outside of Jerusalem itself.

Following closely after Jesus' demonstration in the temple and condemnation of priestly corruption, Jesus' parable further condemns the temple aristocracy by highlighting the infidelity of the tenants (i.e., chief priests) to the owner of the vineyard (i.e., the God of Israel). This is openly spelled out in the citation of Psalm 118, as the murderous intentions of the tenants, which are directed toward the vineyard owner's son, are now understood to be explicitly at odds with the purposes of the God of Israel. This rejection of the son on the part of the tenants/builders will, Jesus says, come back upon

⁸³ Evans, "God's Vineyard," 401; de Moor, "Targumic Background," 73-74; cf. Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 137; Wesley Olmstead, G., *Matthew's Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations and the Reader in Matthew 21.28-22.14* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 109-18.

⁸⁴ Evans, "God's Vineyard," 401.

⁸⁵ It would not have been unusual for this Psalm to be alluded to on the occasion of Passover, since according to the *Mishnah*, the *hallel* psalms were recited on the occasion of major festivals, including at the Passover sacrifice (*m. Pes* 5:7) and meal associated with it (*m. Pes* 10:5-7; cf. *t. Pes.* 10.8-9; Mark 14:26//Matt 26:30). See J. Ross Wagner, "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 160-61.

them, since the exaltation of the son/stone will result in God's rejection of these tenants/builders. Indeed, care of the vineyard has now been given to "others" (12:9),⁸⁶ and the citation of Psalm 118:22-23 makes it clear that the elevation of the rejected stone to the head of the corner, and the concomitant removal of the Jewish religious leadership, has been God's intention all along. In contradistinction to Isaiah 5, in Jesus' parable the vineyard remains. It is the tenants who are disinherited and destroyed.⁸⁷ The reaction of the religious leaders at the conclusion of the scriptural citation reveals that they correctly read themselves into the narrative: as both the vineyard tenants in the parable and the builders in the scriptural citation, they lose out.⁸⁸

This, at least, is how Mark intends for his readers to hear the parable. One of the fruits of form criticism, however, has been the understanding that the particular setting of a pericope is often secondary, as the Evangelists have often created what they deemed to be appropriate settings for a given saying or parable.⁸⁹ In this case, however, the setting

⁸⁶ Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 813-14.

⁸⁷ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991), 308-9; Randall Buth and Brian Kvasnica, "Critical Notes on the VTS," in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels - Volume One* (ed. R. Steven Notley et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 297. Buth and Kvasnica ("Temple Authorities," 65-73) argue that this rejection is based, at least partially, on the Jerusalem priesthood's refusal to properly tithe. If they are correct, this would provide further evidence of greed and corruption on the part of the chief priests.

⁸⁸ Buth and Kvasnica, "Temple Authorities," 65; cf. Evans, "God's Vineyard," 396, 401; de Moor, "Targumic Background," 8, 73-74, 79; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 805.

⁸⁹ See, e.g., E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989) 174-75, 188-89. As an example, they cite the Parable of the Lost Sheep, which is directed towards Jesus' followers in Matthew (18:1, 12-14), but against the Pharisees in Luke (15:1-7).

of the parable has an air of authenticity to it.⁹⁰ The clear links between the Song of the Vineyard and the Jerusalem temple in Second Temple thought (4Q 500 1; cf. *t. Sukk* 3.15; *t. Me'il* 1.16; *Targum Isaiah* 5:1-7) make it extremely likely that this parable was originally told in Jerusalem with the temple as its backdrop. Additionally, in light of the role of the chief priests in Jesus' ensuing death, it is altogether probable that they had some prior knowledge of him that shaped their decidedly negative opinions. As a result, one would expect to find some instances of conflict between Jesus and the chief priests of his generation, and these same priests' hostile reaction at the conclusion of this hostile parable is exactly the sort of confrontation that may have precipitated his execution. Conflict between Jesus and the religious leadership certainly existed, and the pointed conclusion to the parable renders it likely that Jesus' target audience was near at hand when he prophesied their doom.

5.2.4 Concluding Observations on Jesus' View of the Temple and Priesthood

From the above discussion of Jesus' view of the temple and its presiding priesthood, we can be reasonably certain of a few things. First, as is clear from several incidents recorded in the Gospels, Jesus seems to have held views toward the temple and the priesthood that were similar to those of many Jews worldwide: the temple was the locus of God's special presence among his people and the symbol of God's choosing of

⁹⁰ Snodgrass, *Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, 45-46; cf. Martin Hengel, "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12,1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse," *ZNW* 59 (1968): 1-39, esp. 38; J. A. T. Robinson, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: A Test of the Synoptic Relationships," *NTS* 21 (1975): 443-61, esp. 444-45.

the Jewish people as his own, and the priests were the official representatives mediating God's presence to the people.⁹¹

Second, in the Gospel incidents that take place toward the end of Jesus' life, we see a more negative evaluation of the current temple and priesthood that manifests itself both in Jesus' words and in his deeds.⁹² From Jesus' demonstration in the temple, it seems that this disapproval was based upon specific financial improprieties occurring in the temple. Further, the parable of the Vineyard and Wicked Tenants reveals that he took issue with the arrogance of these same chief priests. Indeed, the combination of his demonstration in the temple, his statements regarding its destruction, and his utterance of the parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants, all of which I have argued find a plausible *Sitz im Leben* in his life, collectively point toward a confrontation with the chief priests and a belief that the current temple will soon be destroyed and a new one emerge.

Third, Jesus' critique seems to have focused more specifically on the chief priests in Jerusalem than on the temple itself. This criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood seems to have differed from prior negative appraisals of the priesthood in the Second Temple period, centered as they were on priestly illegitimacy due to improper lineage, sexual misconduct and charges of arrogance and rapacity.⁹³ While the Gospels preserve little in

⁹¹ For examples, see Chapter Two.

⁹² Though in general I follow John's gospel in positing a multi-year ministry for Jesus, here the Synoptic narrative framework of a sharp increase in hostilities between Jesus and the chief priests immediately prior to his death is intrinsically likely, for some incident must have pushed the chief priests to begin to press for his removal. If so, then the accusatory tone of the Parable of the Vineyard and Wicked Tenants is exactly the type of confrontation that one would expect to find.

⁹³ For details, see Chapter Three.

regard to the first two charges, the third charge of priestly greed and arrogance does seem to underlie some of Jesus' actions. His demonstration in the temple was likely directed more against those who had authorized and condoned the economic transactions that took place there than against the vendors themselves. This action, together with the accompanying scriptural citations in the Synoptics and John, reveals that Jesus held the priests of his day to be guilty of some form of financial impropriety. The specifics of this impropriety are difficult to state, with the possibilities ranging from his disapproval of the forms of commercialism present in the temple to specific charges of profiteering.⁹⁴ In addition, in the Parable of the Vineyard the tenants/chief priests are condemned for their mismanagement of the vineyard/Israel, arrogance in assuming that the Lord of the vineyard will do nothing to stop them, and greed in wishing to keep the produce of the vineyard to themselves. Indeed, Jesus' indictment of the Jewish religious leadership in this parable suggests that he thought the priestly leadership had overstepped its role and usurped the place of God on account of its failure to listen to the voice of God through his messengers. Jesus' negative appraisal of the chief priests of his time rests on accusations of financial improprieties and arrogance.⁹⁵

Fourth, Jesus' negative assessment of the chief priests of his day likely colored his view of the temple. In no instance does Jesus connect his belief that the current temple was in danger of imminent destruction with an understanding that the temple was

⁹⁴ See above, footnote 27.

⁹⁵ This appraisal of the chief priests, however, is clearly not as serious as that found at Qumran (see, e.g., 4Q162 2.6-7, 10). Jesus does not seem to have boycotted the temple and its sacrifices, nor are his followers portrayed as doing so.

deficient or defiled. Yet if we take seriously the parallel from Qumran, where the sectarians' denunciation of the Jerusalem priesthood clearly colored their view of the continuing validity of the temple, it is likely that Jesus' assessment of the chief priests also influenced his views on the temple itself. Even so, his views toward the Jerusalem temple cannot have been as negative as that found at Qumran, since it is difficult to explain his followers continued participation in the temple and its cult if Jesus had spoken of it in strongly disapproving terms.

Fifth, the similarities and differences between Jesus' critique of the Jerusalem priesthood and those voiced prior to him in the Second Temple period were probably inconsequential to the temple authorities. To them, Jesus' negative evaluation of themselves fit well into the long line of dissent from temple and priesthood discussed in Chapters Three and Four. Jesus presented a threat, both in word and in deed. His castigation of the religious leadership, along with his predictions of the temple's destruction, were more than enough to arouse the displeasure of the chief priests, and ultimately led to his death. This displeasure, when combined with the energy of the crowds at Passover, the intense religious and emotional fervor that accompanied this festival, and the pressure from the Romans to maintain order, made Jesus' eventual death inevitable.⁹⁶ In such an atmosphere, the momentum towards crucifixion, which likely had its origins in Jesus' views on the imminent destruction of the temple and his critique of its presiding priesthood, proved impossible to stop.

⁹⁶ On Passover, see Chapter Two, section 2.1.1.

5.3 The First Followers of Jesus, Acts, and the Temple

In the previous section I argued that Jesus thought that the temple's destruction was imminent and that the chief priests were unworthy of their post, most likely on the grounds of their greed and arrogance. What remains to be seen is whether the early Christians followed Jesus in these beliefs, and what repercussions Jesus' views on the temple and priesthood would have had for those who believed in him. Below I will argue that these repercussions were significant, and that many in the early Christian movement continued Jesus' negative assessment of the priestly aristocracy, though in a more subtle and variegated manner. This heterogeneous response was likely the result of several overlapping influences, including, but not limited to, the death of Jesus at the instigation of the chief priests, the desire to remain faithful to Jesus' mostly positive statements regarding the temple, the influx of Gentiles into the nascent Christian movement, and a difference of opinion as to how best understand Jesus' various words and deeds directed toward the ruling priesthood in his last days.⁹⁷ Below, I will detail the various ways in which many in the early Christian movement continued to hold the temple in high regard while concomitantly viewing the priestly overseers in a negative, and perhaps hostile, light.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ The difficulties that modern scholars face in determining Jesus' view of the temple and the Jerusalem priesthood are probably indicative of the struggle within the early Christian movement to understand the meaning and intentions behind Jesus' words and deeds regarding the temple and its cult in his day. Jesus' views were likely the subject of dispute between his followers, just as they were between the Jews who believed in him and those who did not. On this, see Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1.449.

⁹⁸ Cf. J. P. M. Sweet, "A House Not Made with Hands," in *Templum Amicitiae* (ed. William Horbury; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 388; Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 196-97.

The collective action of many in the early Christian movement speaks loudly, as it is well documented that the movement commenced and flourished in Jerusalem, the same city in which its founder was crucified. Luke clearly portrays the Jerusalem origins of the earliest church (Acts 1-7), and both Paul (Gal 1:18; 2:1; Rom 15:25-31) and Josephus (*Ant.* 20.200) offer independent confirmation of these beginnings.⁹⁹ Though the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. hastened the decline of Jerusalem as an important Christian center, the city was of major importance in the first decades of the early Christian movement.

The very presence of these early believers in Jesus in Jerusalem suggests their continued participation in the temple and its cult.¹⁰⁰ Luke does nothing to quell this notion, noting how often the early Christians gathered in the temple and its courts (Luke 24:53; Acts 2:46; 3:11; 5:12, 42). More specifically, Luke states that the early followers of Jesus observed the traditional hours of prayer (Acts 3:1; cf. 5:21), which in some cases were also the hours of sacrifice,¹⁰¹ and explains how the Jewish Christian leaders in Jerusalem urged Paul to undergo the appropriate purificatory rites on his return to Jerusalem (Acts 21:26). On the one hand, it is clear that Luke has shaped his narrative in

⁹⁹ On the historicity of the *Testimonium Flavianum*, see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1.59-69. On the origins of the Jerusalem church, see also Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg 1972), 19-39.

¹⁰⁰ This may also directly confirm that Jesus' critique was directed more toward the temple overseers than the temple itself. Why else would his followers continue to take part in the temple and its sacrifices?

¹⁰¹ That the ninth hour was the hour of sacrifice is evident from Josephus, *Ant.* 14.65; cf. Schürer, *HJP*, 2.302-7; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 58.

such a way as to emphasize the temple.¹⁰² On the other hand, it is unlikely that Luke has invented out of whole cloth the idea that the early Jerusalem Christians frequented the temple. Indeed, Christian presence in Jerusalem assumes some participation in the temple and cult. Sanders seems correct in remarking: “The notion that the temple should serve some function other than sacrifice would seem to be extremely remote from the thinking of a first-century Jew.”¹⁰³ Since Jerusalem was largely reliant on the temple for its status and continued existence, the decision on the part of the early Christians to remain in the city emphasized their continued fidelity to the sanctuary and desire to partake in its services.¹⁰⁴

The decision to remain in Jerusalem, however, is also somewhat curious, for this was the very city in which their leader’s crucifixion had been sanctioned by the chief priests and the rest of the ruling aristocracy. The rationale provided by Luke for staying in the city is that the disciples were to wait for the gift of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:4-8). Other eschatological expectations were also likely in play—in particular a strand of restoration eschatology that focused on Jerusalem and the restoration of the

¹⁰² See J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 47-85; Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 6-7.

¹⁰³ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 64.

¹⁰⁴ Horbury, "New Wine," 39; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 58; Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 94-96, 106, 147, 204; Sanders, "Jerusalem and Its Temple," 91; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 195-97; Klawans, *Purity*, 217-18.

kingdom to Israel (see Acts 1:6; cf. Isa 2:2-3; 49:5-7; 56:1-8; 60:3-7; 66:18-24; Jer 3:17; Micah 4:1-2; Zech 8:20-23; *I Enoch* 90:30-33).¹⁰⁵

The disciples' continued presence in the city proved less than irenic. Acts, our only source of information on the early Jewish Christian community in Jerusalem,¹⁰⁶ specifies that the high priest and/or chief priests were invariably involved in every persecution of major Christian figures in the decades following the death of Jesus.¹⁰⁷ In 4:1-22, Peter and John are arrested by the "chief priests, the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees." After an inquiry, the "rulers, elders and scribes . . . and Annas the high priest, Caiaphas, John, and Alexander, and all who were of the high priestly family," threaten these two apostles before releasing them. Similarly, in 5:17-41 the apostles are arrested, interrogated, and beaten on the orders of "the high priest . . . and all who were with him."

This antagonism toward the early Christian movement takes on a more serious dimension in Acts 7 with the death of Stephen at the hands of a council presided over by

¹⁰⁵ See McKelvey, *New Temple*, 9-24; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77-87, 93-95; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 58.

¹⁰⁶ For reasons cited earlier in this section, I see little reason to question the Jerusalem origins of the earliest Christianity. Even allowing for some exaggeration on Luke's part, the conflicts that exist in the book of Acts between the early Christian leaders and the chief priests are intrinsically likely in the aftermath of Jesus' recent crucifixion.

¹⁰⁷ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 284-86; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 16-20; Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 36-37, 190-91; Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 75-77.

the high priest (Acts 7:1).¹⁰⁸ In the aftermath of Stephen's martyrdom, the church in Jerusalem experiences a "severe persecution" in which many Christians are forced to flee the city (8:1-3).¹⁰⁹ Indeed, Saul's persecution of the members of "the Way" in Jerusalem, and his intention to do the same in Damascus, receives official sanction from the high priest in Jerusalem (9:1-2; cf. Gal 1:13). Shortly thereafter, James, the brother of John, is killed, as Herod "laid violent hands upon some who belonged to the church" (Acts 12:1-11; cf. 1 Thes 2:14-16). Seeing that this "pleased the Jews," Herod also arrests Peter, who miraculously escapes and is forced to flee Jerusalem (12:17). As Hill observes, the only Jews that Agrippa would have cared about pleasing were those of the ruling class, comprised largely of the high priestly families.¹¹⁰ Additionally, after Paul's arrest and imprisonment in Jerusalem and Caesarea at the hands of the Romans, it is the high priest Ananias who is presented as his chief opponent (23:2, 12-15; 24:1; 25:2-3).

Several lines of evidence suggest that Luke's broad portrayal of recurring hostilities between the chief priests and early Christians in Jerusalem is historically credible.¹¹¹ First, as I argued above, it is clear that many early Christians remained in

¹⁰⁸ In Acts, Stephen is presented as holding a distinctively negative view of the chief priests and the Jerusalem temple. Luke, however, has clearly had a hand in shaping the speeches in Acts. The inability to say anything of consequence about the historical Stephen's views of the temple and Jerusalem priesthood, as distinct from Luke's own viewpoint, places the person and speech of Stephen outside the purview of this study. For further discussion on the speeches in Acts, see section 5.3.2.

¹⁰⁹ On this, see Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (ed. Richard Bauckham; vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, ed. Bruce Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 428-29.

¹¹⁰ Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 36; cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I* (TSAJ 23; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990), 124 n. 70.

¹¹¹ I am not claiming that all of the details are exactly as Luke has sketched them, only that the persistent antagonism between the Jerusalem priesthood and the Christians in the city is intrinsically likely.

Jerusalem in the years following Jesus' execution. One of the principle reasons for doing so would have been to remain in close proximity to the temple, which would have had the effect of bringing these early Christians into frequent contact with the chief priests who presided over it.¹¹²

Second, Josephus independently corroborates Luke's portrayal of the chief priests' hostile attitude toward the early Christian leadership, as he tells us that the high priest Ananus had James, the brother of Jesus and the leader of the Jerusalem church, executed on charges of transgression against the law (*Ant.* 20.200). Moreover, 1 Thessalonians reveals that some of the Jewish-Christians in Judea had suffered at the hands of "the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets."¹¹³ While the exact situation to which Paul is referring in 1 Thessalonians is unclear, it does reveal a

¹¹² For more on why this close proximity proved problematic, see section 5.3.1.

¹¹³ Some scholars have argued that 1 Thessalonians 2:13-16 is a non-Pauline interpolation. E.g., see F. C. Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine* (trans. Allen Menzies; 2 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1875-1876), 2.87-88; Birger A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," *HTR* 64 (1971): 79-94; Daryl Schmidt, "1 Thess 2:13-16: Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation," *JBL* 102 (1983): 269-79. The two principal challenges to Pauline authorship are 1) that these verses interrupt the structure of the letter, and 2) that the anti-Jewish nature of verses 14-16 are inconsistent with what Paul says elsewhere about the Jews, most notably in Romans 9-11. Both of these objections can be countered, and here I follow the view of those who argue that these verses are Pauline. First, it is correct to see that a transition occurs in 2:13, but this does not necessitate the view of an interpolation. Rather, 2:13 most likely begins a second thanksgiving section. Though a second thanksgiving may be unusual, it is no less so than Galatians not having a thanksgiving section at all. Both may be explained through contextual arguments: whereas Paul appears especially thankful for the Thessalonians, he is upset with the Galatian believers. Second, although in 2:14-16 Paul condemns "the Jews" for their persecution of Christians in Judea, this harsh tone does not automatically exclude these verses from being authentic to Paul. Not only do 1:6-9a and 2:13-16 appear to flow together rhetorically (note how the themes of imitation and affliction in 1:6-9a seem to be taken up and expanded in 2:13-16), but elsewhere Paul is also not beyond using harsh language when speaking of his fellow Jews: in Rom 9:22 Paul implies that the Jews are the "objects of wrath that are made for destruction" and in 11:3 he notes Elijah's condemnation of Israel because they "have killed the prophets." In both instances, nearly identical language is used to describe the Jews (ὀργή, προφήτης, ἀποκτείνω). For two recent formulations of these arguments, see Todd D. Still, *Conflict at Thessalonica: A Pauline Church and its Neighbours* (JSNTSup 183; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 24-45; Karl Paul Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 195-208.

heightened level of animosity between at least some non-Christian Jews and Jewish Christians in Judea.

Third, I argued in Chapter Four that the construction of Jewish temples alternative to that in Jerusalem was predicated upon conflict with its priesthood. As I will argue below, it is likely that the formation of a Christian communal temple identity is dependent upon similar conflict with the Jerusalem priesthood.

These converging lines of evidence all reveal the uneasy relationship between the chief priests and the early Christians in Jerusalem. For my purposes, the particulars in Luke's portrayal of early Christian conflict with the chief priests need not be argued. It is enough to note that Luke, in broad terms, has presented a historically plausible account of the chief priests' antipathy toward these Christians.

5.3.1 Evidence of Early Christian Criticism of the Chief Priests

This sustained animosity and sporadic violence against the early Christian leadership raises certain questions. Perhaps most importantly, why do Acts, 1 Thessalonians (2:14-15), and Josephus (*Ant.* 20.200), all reveal a lingering hostility against the principal figures of the early Jerusalem Christians on the part of the Jewish religious leadership?¹¹⁴ Many have suggested that this was due, in part, to the Christians'

¹¹⁴ Intriguingly, high priestly opposition to the early Christians appears to have derived almost exclusively from the high priestly family of Ananus. From 18 to 36 C.E., Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Ananus, held the position of high priest. As such, he bore primary responsibility for the trial and subsequent crucifixion of Jesus, arrest, imprisonment, and flogging of Peter and John, trial and martyrdom of Stephen, and the concomitant persecution which broke out against the church immediately following his stoning. In addition, James, the son of Zebedee, was put to death by the order of Agrippa I while Matthias, the son of Ananus, was high priest (see Acts 12:1-19; *Ant.* 19.313-16), and it was during the brief tenure of Ananus,

sustained loyalty to a figure whom they believed to have been exalted to the right hand of God, but who had been found objectionable and discredited by the Jewish religious leadership.¹¹⁵ This idea seems correct as far as it goes, as the declaration of Jesus' exalted status certainly would have been unwelcome to those who had collaborated with the Romans in engineering his death. But is it possible to be more precise about this?

In what follows I will contend not only that we can be much more specific about the roots of the chief priests' animosity, but also that this animus was a two-way street. In the wake of Jesus' crucifixion in Jerusalem and the chief priests' complicity in his death, it is overwhelmingly likely that early Christian antipathy toward these priests percolated under the surface, and that Jesus' disciples ruminated over his statements concerning the temple and/or chief priests, with these views taking on a greater significance after his death.

The narrative of Acts reveals that open devaluation of the temple and critique of the Jerusalem priests on the part of the early Christians was a rare occurrence. Stephen provides the lone example, and, judging from the book of Acts, he ended poorly. But was this hostility on the part of the chief priests reciprocated in other ways? In the

the son of Ananus and brother-in-law of Caiaphas, that James, the brother of Jesus, was put to death (Ant. 20.197-200). From this we see that the persecution of the early Christians stemmed largely from one high priestly family in Jerusalem. When Paul is arrested and his life subsequently threatened on several occasions, however, it is Ananias, not of the family of Ananus, who is his chief opponent (Acts 23:2, 12-15; 24:1; 25:2-3). The rivalry that existed between Ananias and Ananus son of Ananus reveals that the persecution of the Christians did not solely derive from this one priestly family. On this, see Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews*, 190-91; John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998), 508-9; cf. Dan Barag and David Flusser, "The Ossuary of Yehohanah Granddaughter of the High Priest Theophilus," *IEJ* 36 (1986): 39-44; Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 143-46.

¹¹⁵ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 286; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 177-206; Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," 76.

following pages I will discuss the subtle ways in which these chief priests were *continuously opposed* by adherents of “the Way” in Jerusalem. While the seeds of this simmering displeasure may be seen in the early Christian use of Psalm 118 and other stone testimonia, a primary way in which dissatisfaction with the current priests manifested itself was in the transfer of temple terminology to the Christian community.

5.3.2 The Use of Psalm 118:22

In the discussion of the Parable of the Vineyard and the Wicked Tenants, I noted the likelihood that the quotation of Psalm 118:22 in Mark 12—“the stone that the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone”—is authentic to Jesus.¹¹⁶ It is now important to point out that others in the early Christian movement made use of this verse (Acts 4:11; 1 Pet 2:7; *Barn.* 6:4) and that on occasion it was combined through the principle of *gēzērāh šāwāh* with Isaiah 8:14-15 and 28:16 (and sometimes Dan 2:34) in order to create stone testimonia in the early Christian movement.¹¹⁷ While the initial interest in Psalm 118:22, as well as related texts in Isaiah, may be attributed to Jesus’ indictment of the religious leaders through his citation of this Psalm, as recorded in Mark 12:10, these

¹¹⁶ See also Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 182-83.

¹¹⁷ See Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), 169-86; Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 213-29; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 182-83. For the continued use of stone imagery in early Christian writings, see Justin, *Dial.* 34:2; 36:1; 76:1; 86:2f; 90:5; 100:4; 113:6; 114:2, 4; 126:1; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3:7; Cyprian, *Test.* 2:16-18; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 1.148, 225, 265 on John 1:1; Aphrahat, *Dem.* 1.3-8.

stone passages took on an increasing and variegated significance in nascent Christianity.¹¹⁸

Though usually dated to the post-70 C.E. period,¹¹⁹ 1 Peter illustrates the way in which these stone texts could be used in promoting the edification and unity of the community (2:4-8).¹²⁰ In this passage, the exhortation to build Christian community and the exaltation of the person of Christ are both grounded in these stone testimonia, as the author cites, in order, Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 118:22, and Isaiah 8:14-15.¹²¹ Directly following a discussion of the Christian community as living stones being built into a spiritual temple, these Old Testament texts provide a further witness to this new reality. Those who believe in Jesus, the precious and chosen cornerstone of Isaiah 28:16, will never be put to shame. But for those who do not believe, he has become the rejected stone and the cause of stumbling (Psa 118:22 and Isa 8:14-15 respectively). In this context polemics against adversaries take a back seat to Christian formation, with these

¹¹⁸ For the importance of Psalm 118 more generally in the early Christian movement, see C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), 99-100; Wagner, "Psalm 118," passim; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple," in *James the Just and Christian Origins* (ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 238-49.

¹¹⁹ Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 47-50; John H. Elliott, *1 Peter* (AB 37B; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 136-38.

¹²⁰ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 428-34. For a similar understanding in Ephesians, see Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990), 155.

¹²¹ The use of these "stone" testimonia in IQS 8.4-10 and 1 Peter 2:4-8 suggests that both drew on a common Jewish exegetical tradition. The two documents, however, develop these stone texts in different ways. Whereas the sectarians at Qumran read these passages through a communal lens, the early Christians combine this communal reading with a decidedly Christological understanding of these texts. On this, see McKelvey, *New Temple*, 125-32; Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 188-90; Matthew Black, "Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" *NTS* 18 (1971): 1-14, esp. 11-14; Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," 41-44; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 151-52.

stone testimonia highlighting the difference between believers and non-believers in Jesus. The following verses reveal that those who believe in Jesus, this precious cornerstone, have now become the people of God (1 Pet 2:9-10).

Acts, however, reveals that the early Christians may well have used Psalm 118:22 in a manner very similar to Jesus' use of Psalm 118:22-23 in the conclusion to the Parable of the Vineyard: as an offensive weapon in their struggle against opponents in Jerusalem. Psalm 118:22 and Isaiah 8:14-15 both contain a polemic against a certain group of people who have rejected, or stumbled over, the stone. While in some cases this stumbling refers to all of the Jewish people who do not believe in Jesus (see Rom 9:32-33), in Acts 4:11 this Psalm is aimed specifically and polemically at the Jewish religious leadership in Jerusalem.¹²² Peter and John are portrayed as responding to a high priestly inquiry by boldly proclaiming the vindication of Jesus of Nazareth. These two apostles then anchor this claim in Psalm 118:22, making associations between text and context that are nearly identical to those made by Jesus in Mark 12, though with a greater degree

¹²² Sanders (*Jews in Luke-Acts*, 51) suggests that Peter's mention of "all the people of Israel" in Acts 4:10 indicates that more people are present than just the Jewish religious leaders. This is a possibility, for in other places in Acts (2:36; 5:30; 7:51-53), Luke appears to have a penchant for lumping the people and their leaders together. In Acts 4:10, however, this reading is difficult to accept, as the high priest and others of his family are specifically mentioned, Peter addresses the rulers and elders of the people, and there is no mention of a Jewish crowd in the entire proceedings. Cf. Joachim Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (SANT 3; Munich: Kösel, 1961), 139; Walter Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (ZBK NT 3,2; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982), 49-50. In addition, Joseph B. Tyson (*Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* [Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992], 104) has noted that the speeches in the first half of Acts display a lack of contentiousness when the Jewish people are specifically in mind. There is an understanding that the early believers in Jesus and their respective Jewish audiences share a common heritage, an observation heightened by the use of the word "brothers" in 2:29 and 3:17. What Tyson does not explicitly say, but what seems to hold true, is that the remarks are much more cutting when the Sanhedrin or non-Pharisaic religious leaders are in view; see 4:10; 5:29-32; 7:51-53.

of specificity.¹²³ Whereas the identity of the builders as the Jewish religious leadership remains the same,¹²⁴ the earlier stone-equals-son insinuation in the Synoptic parable has now been strengthened, as the clarifying οὗτος at the outset of Peter and John's speech makes it unambiguously clear that the stone is equal to the crucified and risen Jesus. Moreover, in Acts 4:11 we see a more forthright accusation of the chief priests' responsibility through the addition of ὑφ' ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων in the citation of Psalm 118:22, which both sharpens the Psalmist's "stone that the builders rejected" into "he is the stone rejected by you, the builders," and accents the guilt of the Jerusalem religious leadership.¹²⁵ Here we catch an intriguing glimpse into the ways in which this passage could be used in polemical settings, pitting the early followers of Jesus directly against the cultic authorities. What these religious leaders had rejected, God had vindicated.

Although there is no way to know whether this particular scene occurred exactly as Luke presents it,¹²⁶ two lines of evidence make this type of early Christian use of

¹²³ Wagner, "Psalm 118," 173-74.

¹²⁴ In *Antiquities* 15.390 and 421, Josephus notes that the Herodian temple had been built by priests. In this instance it is likely that Josephus meant that the priests oversaw the construction of the project, not that they themselves performed the manual labor. If so, then the "builders (of the temple)" might naturally be identified with the priests.

¹²⁵ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992), 77-78; Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 301.

¹²⁶ While it is undeniable that Luke was not an eyewitness to these events and that he has intentionally crafted the narrative and speeches in Acts, it is also clear that Luke was reliant on several sources in constructing this literary work. The character of these sources and the extent to which Luke used them, however, is unclear (Gerhard Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT 5; Freiburg: Herder, 1980), 1.82-89; Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 80-88). On the one hand, Dibelius (*Studies*, 1-25, 102-8, 138-85) argued that Luke's theological interests have trumped any historical concerns, that the speeches are largely Lukan creations, and that Acts has little historical value as a record of the early church's activities. Cf. Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles*; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg et al.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987). On the speeches in particular, see Soards, *Speeches in Acts*. On the other hand, another group of scholars has a much higher view of Luke as an ancient historian. They argue, *inter*

Psalm 118:22 intrinsically plausible. First, I have argued above that the citation of Psalm 118:22-23 in Mark 12 is authentic to Jesus. This observation, coupled with the use of Psalm 118:22 and other “stone” texts in several different streams of early Christian thought (Rom 9:32-33; 1 Pet 2:6-8; Acts 4:11; *Barn.* 6:2-4), makes it highly probable that reflection upon Psalm 118:22 had a formative influence within the nascent Christian movement. Second, we have already seen how conflict could and did occur in Jerusalem between the chief priests and the early Christians. This intersection of early Christian reflection upon both Psalm 118:22 and the other “stone” texts on the one hand, and conflict with the Jerusalem priesthood on the other hand, suggests that the polemical edge to Psalm 118:22 may well have been an important tool in the early Christian arsenal of self-definition. In Acts 4:11 we are given an example of the way in which this Psalm was likely used in the early Christian movement.

Reflection on Psalm 118 and the other stone texts also appears to have played a significant role in the emerging idea of the Christian community as a temple.¹²⁷ The seeds of this communal interpretation likely lie in the collective use of the first person singular pronoun in the original Psalm. As Marcus has pointed out, the shift from

alia, that Luke’s theological interests do not impede his work as a historian, and that the speeches are based upon traditions which Luke was concerned to convey. On this see Hengel, *Acts and the History*, 35-68; I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 34-42; Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 27-46; Johnson, *Acts*, 3-7; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 12-16. My own view is that Luke has had a free hand in composing these speeches, and as a result it is nearly impossible to argue for their authenticity. In the case of Acts 4:11, I do not argue that this specific confrontation or speech actually occurred, since no independent witness can corroborate this event. What I do argue is that *this is the type of confrontation that we would expect to have occurred*, due to 1) Jesus’ use of Psalm 118 and subsequent nascent Christian reflection upon Psalm 118 and other “stone” texts and 2) other instances of conflict between the early Christians and the chief priests, as seen in Acts and Josephus.

¹²⁷ For examples, see the following section.

“Israel” and the “house of Aaron” in verses 1-4 to the “I” of verses 5-21 suggests that Israel is to be understood as the speaker in this Psalm.¹²⁸ Moreover, the mention of gates, the house of the Lord, and the horns of the altar (118:19-20, 26, and 27, respectively) makes clear that the rejected-stone-turned-cornerstone should be understood in the context of the temple.¹²⁹ Later ruminations upon this passage retained these collective and temple associations, as the sectarians at Qumran and the early Christians developed parallel ideas regarding their respective community as temples (for Qumran, see 1QS 8:7-8; 1QH 6:25-29; 7:8-9).¹³⁰

5.4 The Community as a Temple in Earliest Christianity

In what follows I will argue that the early Christian construction of a communal temple identity also played a significant role in the deteriorating relationship between their community and the chief priests. Admittedly, the New Testament texts that speak of the community as a temple do not explicitly indict the chief priests. But in Chapter Four I argued that the construction of any alternative Jewish temple reflected above all a dissatisfaction with and resentment toward the Jerusalem priesthood of the day. In this section I will trace the development of this communal temple language and the ways in which it shaped the early Christian community, then turn to the issue of whether this

¹²⁸ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 115, 122. Note also the plural second and third person pronouns in 118:23-27.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 119-20, 122-23.

¹³⁰ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," esp. 174; Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 120.

transference of symbols is best explained as part of a simmering disagreement with the governing priests in Jerusalem.

That early Christians used cultic terminology to describe their community is readily apparent in the earliest Christian literature. In a move similar to that already begun in the Old Testament,¹³¹ and continued at Qumran,¹³² many of the early Christians borrowed sacrificial language and applied it to their community, seeing prayer, obedience, and a life devoted to God as efficacious in a way formerly reserved for the animal sacrifices in the temple.¹³³ The example *par excellence* of this tendency is Paul, as the ideology and language of sacrifice and cult provided him with important terminology with which to describe the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and the resultant community of believers in Jesus (Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 5:7; Rom 12:1).¹³⁴

Leaving aside the issue of sacrifice, here I will focus more narrowly on the transference of temple terminology to the Christian community and the ways in which this move is instructive for understanding early Christian self-expression and identity. As we will see below, the application of temple language to the early Christian movement exhibited a remarkable degree of fluidity. For the earliest Christians, the principal

¹³¹ E.g. 1 Sam 15:22; Pss 40:6; 50:13-14, 23; 51:16-17; 69:30-31; 141:2; Isa 1:11-17; Jer 6:20, 7:21-23; Hos 6:6; 9:4; Amos 5:21-24; Mic 6:6-8.

¹³² See 1QS 9:3-5, 10:6; 4QFlor 1.6-7; 1QS 8.2-6. See also the discussion of these passages in Chapter Four.

¹³³ See Acts 10:4; Rom 12:1, 15:16; Phil 2:17, 4:18; 2 Tim 4:6; Heb 13:15-16; Rev 8:3-4.

¹³⁴ On this, see Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 52-116; Lanci, *New Temple for Corinth*, 7-19, 115-34; Finlan, *Background and Content*, 123-92.

referent of the temple metaphor was the Christian community.¹³⁵ Galatians 2, First Corinthians 3, Second Corinthians 6, Ephesians 2, First Peter 2, and Revelation 3 all clearly delineate the link between the nascent church and the image of the temple. This understanding was not monolithic, however, as some early Christian documents understand either individual members of the Christian community (1 Cor 6) or Jesus himself (John 2) as the temple.

Amidst this diversity of expression we find a remarkable consistency. In speaking of the church as a temple, early Christian texts consistently use the word *ναός*, as opposed to *ἱερόν*. Traditionally, *ναός* described the place where the deity dwelt, the temple proper, while *ἱερόν* is a more elastic term that encapsulates the temple precincts as well as the sanctuary itself. Though the two terms had become somewhat interchangeable in the Greek of the first century C.E., the Septuagint's retention of the earlier distinctions appears to have influenced the New Testament writers.¹³⁶ In describing themselves as the *ναός* of God, the early Christians were claiming that their community now served as the distinct dwelling place of the God of Israel.

¹³⁵ Hebrews (esp. chapters 11-12) and, to a lesser extent, Revelation (11:19) assert that the real temple is in heaven, and that the earthly sanctuary is a mere shadow of the reality above. For similar conceptions of the temple in Jewish texts from the Second Temple period, see Chapter Three. On this, see Chance, *Jerusalem*, 26-28; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 222-24.

¹³⁶ See Otto Michel, "Naos," in *TDNT* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 4.880-90; Newton, *Concept of Purity*, 54; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 146.

5.4.1 Galatians 2 and Revelation 3

Paul's heated defense of his apostolic ministry in Galatians 2 is the earliest depiction of the Christian community using temple imagery. In his account of his calling by divine revelation and his independence from the Jerusalem apostles, Paul states that the leaders of the Jerusalem church, James, Cephas, and John, were those "reputed to be pillars" (οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι).¹³⁷ The referent of the pillar image in Galatians 2:9 is not specified; however, three main alternatives have been proposed. First, based on similar metaphors in Greco-Roman literature, it has been argued that the idea of individuals as pillars denotes their importance in the community.¹³⁸ According to this line of thinking the description of the three apostles as pillars refers to their eminent position in the early Christian community rather than to any function in a metaphorical or eschatological temple. Second, attention has been drawn to Jewish sources which describe the three patriarchs as pillars that uphold the world. On this reading, the three apostles mentioned in Galatians take the place of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in upholding the world through their righteousness.¹³⁹ A third and more likely view is that the primary

¹³⁷ Cf. *1 Clem.* 5:2-4, where Peter and Paul are referred to as pillars, and *Herm. Vis.* 3.8.2, in which seven women representing Christian virtues are described as supporting the tower "by the Lord's command."

¹³⁸ See Euripedes, *Iph. taur.* 57; Pindar, *Olymp.* 2.81-82; Lycophron, *Alex.* 281; Philo, *QE* 1.21, *Migr.* 124; cf. David E. Aune, *Revelation 1-5* (WBC 52a; Dallas: Word, 1997), 241-42.

¹³⁹ See Roger David Aus, "Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Galatians 2:9," *ZNW* 70 (1979): 252-61; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990), 56-58.

referent is to pillars in the new, eschatological temple now comprised of the early Christians.¹⁴⁰

Several lines of evidence point to this conclusion. First, Qumran provides a significant parallel to the idea of the Christian leaders as pillars, as several of the scrolls describe the leadership of the community as significant structural components of both the temple and the New Jerusalem.¹⁴¹ Second, Paul's discomfort with the term being applied to the apostles, which is seen in his use of the term *δοκοῦντες*, suggests that this was a well-known appellation in pre-Pauline Christianity and did not originate with him.¹⁴² Rather, he found himself in the difficult position of trying to assert his own independence while still acknowledging the pre-eminent position of these three leaders of the Jerusalem church.¹⁴³ Third, the prevalence of communal temple imagery in both Pauline and non-Pauline portions of the New Testament implies that the understanding of the Christian community as a temple was pervasive in the early Christian movement and not relegated

¹⁴⁰ Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK 7, 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 45; C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis De Zwann Septuagenarii* (ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik; Haarlem: Bohn, 1953), 10-19; Ulrich Wilckens, "Stulos," in *TDNT* vol. 7 (ed. Gerhard Freidrich; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 734-35; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 122-23; Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," 441-50; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 205.

¹⁴¹ See Chapter Four, section 4.3.7. 4Q171 3.15-16 is especially pertinent here, as God is depicted choosing the Teacher of Righteousness "as a pillar" (לְעִמּוּד) and establishing him "to build the congregation" (לְבִנְיַת לִי עֵדָה). 1QS 8.5-9 also describes members of the community with language derived from the temple building, whereas 4Q164 depicts these individuals as essential structural elements of the New Jerusalem. Cf. 1QS 7:17; 1QSa 1:12.

¹⁴² For our purposes, it makes little difference whether Paul is using *δοκεῖν* in an ironic or sarcastic fashion. What is important is that this term was so well-known that Paul could not deny it, even if he had wished to do so.

¹⁴³ Barrett, "'Pillar' Apostles," 16-19.

to a single tradition. As a result, it is to be expected that at least some of the early Christian leaders would have held a position of prominence, which could be described through an image such as that of pillars, through their work of sustaining and supporting this “new temple” community. Ephesians 2:20 provides ancillary evidence that this is so, for here the apostles are specifically depicted as providing the foundations for a “holy temple.”¹⁴⁴

The pre-Pauline nature of this designation, the attribution of “pillar” status to the leaders of the Jerusalem church in Galatians 2:9, and the preponderance of the idea of the community as an eschatological temple in many layers of early Christianity all suggest that this image arose in Jerusalem very early in the nascent Christian movement.¹⁴⁵ How early is uncertain. With its reference to these three apostles as pillars, the letter to Galatia, dated by some to 48-49 C.E., provides a *terminus ad quem*.¹⁴⁶ Paul, however, makes it very clear that the description of the Jerusalem leaders as pillars was already well-known in the early Christian movement.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 12-13. The special position of the apostle is also apparent in Rev 21:14, as the names of the twelve apostles are inscribed upon the twelve foundations of the city walls. Even though there is no temple in Revelation’s conception of the New Jerusalem, the city itself is described as being temple-like.

¹⁴⁵ Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 204-5; Bauckham, “Parting of the Ways,” 143-48; cf. David Flusser, “The Isaiah Peshet and the Notion of Twelve Apostles in the Early Church,” in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Volume I: Qumran and Apocalypticism* (trans. Azzan Yadin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 311-14.

¹⁴⁶ This dating depends, of course, on the position one takes in the “north” versus “south” Galatian argument. For reasons enumerated by Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxxiii-lxxxviii, and Paul Barnett, *The Birth of Christianity: The First Twenty Years* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 206-10, we follow the south Galatia hypothesis, which would place the writing of the letter in the late 40’s C.E. But our conclusions are not dramatically affected even if one holds to the north Galatia theory, as Galatians 2 would still be one of the earliest examples of Christian attribution of temple terminology to the community.

That James here heads the list of pillars may be significant. From Galatians 1:18-19 we know that sometime in the mid-30s C.E. Paul went up to Jerusalem to confer with Peter, and that while there he also met with the apostle James.¹⁴⁷ Moreover, according to Hengel and Bauckham, it is likely that James replaced Peter as the head of the Jerusalem church during the reign of Agrippa I, circa 43/44 C.E., as this is the occasion of Peter's withdrawal from the city as well as the first specific mention of James in Acts (12:17).¹⁴⁸ James' prominence in the Jerusalem Christian community from its earliest days, coupled with Paul's indication that the Jerusalem leadership was widely known as pillars, makes it probable that this title derives from a very early date in the emerging Jerusalem church. While certainty on this cannot be achieved, it is likely that this occurred at some point in the first decade following Jesus' crucifixion.

Further evidence that early Christian pillar language referred specifically to pillars in the temple may be found amidst the rich tapestry of temple images and motifs found in the book of Revelation.¹⁴⁹ Of particular interest for this study is the letter to the church in Philadelphia (3:7-13), which concludes with the words: "If you conquer, I will make you a pillar (στῦλον) in the temple (ναῶ) of my God, and you will never go out of it. I will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new

¹⁴⁷ That Paul calls him an apostle is high praise, for Paul vigorously defended his own apostleship. See also 1 Cor 15:7, where Paul depicts James as having seen the risen Lord before himself.

¹⁴⁸ Martin Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1983), 155 n. 150; Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," 439-41. Indeed, Luke informs his readers that on the occasion of Peter's departure from the city, James needed to be told about the events that had transpired.

¹⁴⁹ Robert A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 45-110; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 215-306; Beale, *Temple*, 313-34. It is generally agreed that Revelation was written in the late first-century C.E.

Jerusalem that comes down from my God out of heaven, and my own new name” (3:12). Though the source of this pillar imagery is disputed,¹⁵⁰ the intention is less debatable. Through belief in Jesus and faithful adherence to his claims, all believers, and not just certain apostles, have unmediated access to God as integral parts of the eschatological temple.¹⁵¹ The language of Rev 3:12 implies that the Christian community constitutes (or will in the eschaton constitute) a new and real temple.¹⁵² Indeed, those who remain faithful are now pillars in the temple and will one day become constitutive members of the New Jerusalem, the city-temple that will descend from heaven and be firmly established on earth.

5.4.2 1 Corinthians 3 and 2 Corinthians 6

Specific references to the embryonic Christian community as a temple appear also in the Pauline corpus (see 1 Cor 3:16-17, 1 Cor 6:19, and Eph 2:22). Contrary to what we have seen at Qumran, where the transference of temple language to the community was a corollary of the community’s understanding that the Jerusalem temple was defiled

¹⁵⁰ Many possibilities exist. For a review of the various theories and fuller discussion, see Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 241-44; Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery*, 67-74; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 244-51; Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 196-97; Beale, *Temple*, 328-30.

¹⁵¹ This new and unmediated access to God is a thread running throughout the book, culminating in the mention of faithful ones who will worship God and will have His name written on their foreheads in the New Jerusalem (Rev 22:3-4). This new city, now functioning as a temple due to the immanence of the presence of God and the Lamb, is the place in which the faithful ones will continually serve their God. See Jürgen Roloff, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984), 61; Adela Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), 86; Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 242; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 241-42, 50-51; Osborne, *Revelation*, 197.

¹⁵² Klinzing, *Umdeutung des Kultus*, 201; Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis*, 67.

and that spiritual sacrifices were now necessary to atone for sins, Paul's transference of temple language to the community does not seem to be based upon any denigration of the Jerusalem temple or its priests, or on a highly developed notion of expiation or atonement within the community. Rather, at the theological center of Paul's use of this terminology is the belief that the Holy Spirit now resides in the midst of the community in the same way that the presence of God was understood to dwell in the Jerusalem temple.¹⁵³ Moreover, this imagery is intended to draw attention to the distinctive manner in which the Christian community is now to live out its existence in the light of Christ's salvific work: the Christians are to be holy.¹⁵⁴

Paul's first identification of the Christian community as a temple occurs in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17: Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἳτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς. Within the space of these two verses the second person plural is used three times, making the communal nature of this temple metaphor abundantly clear. In addition, this section opens with the construct οὐκ οἴδατε, the first of ten times in this letter that this phrase is used.¹⁵⁵ While some scholars have suggested that Paul is here reminding the Corinthians of something that he has previously told

¹⁵³ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," esp. 171. She has also noted that this idea is at some remove from the similar transference of temple terminology at Qumran, for at Qumran the spirit of God is not connected to the notion of temple. Rather, God's presence in the community takes the form of the presence of holy angels. Cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 147; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 57.

¹⁵⁴ See 1 Cor 3:17; cf. Lev 11:44-45; 19:2; 20:26; 21:8.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. 1 Cor 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19, 9:13, 24.

them,¹⁵⁶ the repeated use of this phrase in 1 Corinthians also may suggest that it is a rhetorical device used to alert the Corinthians that this teaching is something that should be self-evident and of integral importance to his purposes in writing the letter.¹⁵⁷ That this is patently not self-evident to the Corinthians is clear from Paul's description of their behavior, which is unbecoming of any organization, let alone a temple of God (cf. 1 Cor 5:1).

Though Paul talks explicitly of the temple of God in 3:16-17, this idea has been implicit in the previous verses (1 Cor 3:9b-15). Paul, the master-builder, has laid a foundation, Jesus Christ, upon which the building is to be erected. Paul now warns those coming after him that the way in which they build upon this foundation is important, since the day of the Lord will bring it to light. If they have been building with gold, silver, or precious stones (i.e. properly), eschatological reward will be theirs. However, if they are negligent builders (building with wood, hay or straw), they are endangering the very work of God in themselves and in Corinth. Only in 3:16-17 does Paul clarify his use of architectural imagery, noting that the building founded upon Jesus Christ is actually the temple of God. This identification of the community with God's temple, Paul avers, has considerable implications, for as much as the imagery highlights for the Corinthians the significance of the church and its unity, it also functions as a warning against those

¹⁵⁶ Johannes Wiess, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 84; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 57; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 100.

¹⁵⁷ Fee, *First Epistle*, 146; Lanci, *New Temple for Corinth*, 119-20.

who would seek to sow disunity.¹⁵⁸ For Paul division in the church appears tantamount to building with inferior materials; both will result in ruin. Paul has no patience for people who sow such division, warning: “if anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy that person” (3:17).

A similar understanding of the church as a temple is found in 2 Cor 6:16-18, as the declaration, “We are the temple of the living God,” caps a series of rhetorical questions posed by Paul.¹⁵⁹ The relationship between righteousness and lawlessness,

¹⁵⁸ Cf. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 183.

¹⁵⁹ There is a great deal of debate over whether Paul is responsible for 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. It is generally agreed that the pericope sits uncomfortably in its present location, as it appears to interrupt Paul’s line of thinking in 6:13 and 7:2 (“open wide your hearts”—“make room in your hearts for us). What is unclear, however, is whether 1) Paul is responsible for these verses and their placement in 2 Cor, 2) Paul took over an existing tract or similar piece of writing and introduced it into its present context, 3) a later editor inserted a Pauline fragment into 2 Cor 6, or 4) whether a redactor interpolated a non-Pauline fragment into the text. Those who argue that this fragment did not originate with Paul often point to the seemingly non-Pauline vocabulary (a number of *hapax legomena*) and style (the passage appears to have a greater affinity to certain elements found at Qumran—sharp dualistic expressions, temple and purity motifs, methods of Old Testament citation—than with what is found in other Pauline letters). In defense of Pauline authenticity, others contend that too much has been made of the supposed abrupt shift in reasoning in 6:14-7:1, it is not unusual to find some *hapax legomena* in all of Paul’s letters (2 Corinthians as a whole contains fifty), and that the sharp dualism, temple metaphor, and manner of Old Testament citation in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is also present in other Pauline texts (for dualism, see Rom 13:12; 2 Cor 2:15-16; 1 Th 5:5; for the temple motif, see 1 Cor 3:16-17; for the scriptural citations, see Rom 3:10-18; 9:25-26, 33; 11:8, 26-27, 34-35; 1 Cor 15:54-55). No consensus has been reached, and none is likely. Though acknowledging the strong affinities to the thought of the Qumran community, here we follow those who posit that Paul is responsible for this pericope. Along with the above factors arguing for his stamp on these verses, we note three further considerations. First, there is no manuscript evidence which would suggest that this pericope was ever missing or misplaced. Second, no adequate explanation has been given for why a later editor would have inserted this particular passage in this particular context. Stephen Hultgren (“2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians,” *NTS* 49 [2003]: 39-56) is one of the most recent scholars to argue for interpolation, but in the end he cannot give a reason for its appearance, only an argument for what circles might have been responsible for the appearance of this passage. Third, although this is the strongest call in the letter for separation from unbelievers, a distinction between believers and unbelievers is present in various sections of this letter (in 2:15-16 the believers who are being saved are contrasted with those who are perishing, in 4:4 unbelievers are blind to the gospel, and in 4:3-6 more generally, believers are compared with light, with the implication that unbelievers are of the darkness). Thus, though 6:14-7:1 may be the strongest formulation of the antithesis between believers and unbelievers, it is not the only place in this letter in which sharp distinctions are drawn. For a review of the various issues involved, see Gordon D. Fee, “II Corinthians vi.14 - vii.1 and Food Offered to Idols,” *NTS* 23 (1977): 140-61; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 371-83;

light and darkness, Christ and Beliar, believer and unbeliever, concludes with the question of the proper relationship between idolatry and the temple of God. That Paul desires none is clear from the preceding pairs of opposites, and this insistence on separation provides Paul with an opening to speak of the church as a temple.

Paul's argument takes two primary forms. First, he seems to be playing off of standard Jewish polemic against idolatry,¹⁶⁰ which also played an integral role in his proclamation of the gospel (1 Thess 1:9; 1 Cor 6:9-10; Gal 5:19-20; Rom 1:22-25). In this admonition to stay clear of idols, Paul seems particularly concerned to warn his converts that any continuing involvement with idol worship is incongruous with their new identity as the people of God and members of his temple.¹⁶¹

Second, his argument draws upon a catena of passages culled from the Old Testament, suggesting that if any of his readers questioned the idea of the community as a temple, there was ample scriptural evidence to support this claim.¹⁶² The choice of passages is significant, as all focus on the presence of YHWH in the midst of his people (Lev 26:11-12; Exod 25:8; Ezek 37:27). Indeed, the opening lines of Paul's composite citation in 2 Cor 6:16: "I will live in them (ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς) and walk among them (ἐμπεριπατήσω), and I will be their God, and they shall be my people," appear to be an

Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco, TX: Word, 1986), xxxviii-xliv; Margaret E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 1.25-36.

¹⁶⁰ E.g. LXX Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; Jdt 8:18; *Jos. Asen.* 8-13; Wis 13-15; *Sib. Or.* 3:604-6, 720-23; 4:27-30; Acts 15:19; *t. 'Abod. Zar.* 8:4.

¹⁶¹ Cf. 1QS 2.11 and the admonition to those entering the covenant to stay away from "idols which the heart reveres." See Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 50-52; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 363.

¹⁶² Newton, *Concept of Purity*, 55.

interpretation of Lev 26:11-12, where God is said to place his dwelling among the people and to walk in their midst.¹⁶³ Paul, however, has altered the text from Leviticus in two significant ways.¹⁶⁴ First, Paul's emendation of the second-person ("in you") to the third-person ("in them") suggests that he is reading Lev 26:12 through the lens of Ezekiel 37:27 and its vision of God's eschatological dwelling with Israel in a new sanctuary. More importantly, Paul has clarified the verb "walk among" through the addition of the phrase "I will live in them," a phrase which does not occur anywhere else in the Old Testament.¹⁶⁵ As a result, it is clear that Paul is not content with the idea of God once again filling an earthly sanctuary with his presence, nor with the thought that God will again dwell with his people after the exile. Rather, in lieu of God dwelling *with* his people in a temple that they have built for him, God now dwells *in* his people and *they* are his temple.¹⁶⁶ Beginning in this manner amplifies Paul's argument that the Christian community has become the dwelling place of God.¹⁶⁷

This reality of God's presence in the Christian community has consequences.

Paul traces these through another collection of Old Testament passages, this time drawing on Isaiah 52:11, 2 Samuel 7:14 and Isaiah 43:6 as directives to the Corinthian Christian

¹⁶³ This combination of Leviticus 26:12 and Ezekiel 37:27 appears also in the prediction of a new temple in *Jubilees* 1:17. In addition, Philo (*Dreams*, 1.148-49) applies Lev 26:12 to the divine indwelling of a person's mind, alternately describing it as a "house of God," "holy temple," and "most beautiful abiding place." Cf. Philo, *Dreams*, 2.248; *Rewards*, 123.

¹⁶⁴ See McKelvey, *New Temple*, 94-95; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 374.

¹⁶⁵ As McKelvey, *New Temple*, 95, notes, ἐνοικεῖν is never used of God in the LXX.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁶⁷ Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 52-54; Hans Dieter Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?," *JBL* 92 (1973): 88-108, esp. 93-94; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 374.

community: “Come out from them, and be separate from them, says the Lord, and touch nothing unclean; then I will welcome you, and I will be your father, and you shall be my sons and daughters.” Through these citations, Paul clarifies some of the implications of channeling temple language and ideology into the community.¹⁶⁸ First, the call for a sharp division between the Christian community and the surrounding Corinthian culture is here given scriptural warrant, continuing the line of thought found in the series of rhetorical questions in 2 Cor 6:14-16. Second, these particular passages all have an eschatological bent, infusing the early Christian understanding of the community as a temple with eschatological significance. Third, these scriptural injunctions also move toward a democratization of the promises given to David in 2 Samuel 7, as both male and female (“sons *and daughters*”) are now inheritors of the promises of God and members of equal standing in God’s temple. Fourth, just as the tabernacle and temple, the dwelling places of God in Israel’s history, demanded purity from the people of Israel, so now, Paul asserts, holiness is demanded of this community of believers in Jesus. As in 1 Cor 3:16-17, the focal point of the image is the holiness of the temple and the necessity for the members of the church of God to live a life commensurate with the holiness of God. The declaration, “We are the temple of the living God,” is Paul’s reply to the rhetorical question of the relationship between idolatry and the temple of God. If God is truly to dwell in this human temple, then its membership must be set apart from sin. The members of the new temple community must be holy.

¹⁶⁸ Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 353-54.

5.4.3 Ephesians 2:19-22 and 1 Peter 2:4-10

The tendency toward “templization” in the Christian community appears also in Ephesians 2:19-22 and 1 Peter 2:4-10, two passages displaying a remarkable similarity to terminology applied to the Qumran community: temple, building, stone, cornerstone.¹⁶⁹ In addition, the temple imagery and ideology in both sets of texts display some development beyond that found in the Corinthian correspondence.

First, whereas in 1 Corinthians 3 it is the apostles and prophets who lay the foundation of the temple, in Ephesians 2:20 these apostles and prophets have now become the very foundation upon which the building/temple resides.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, the construction of this temple is described in both past and present tenses. While the divine passive in 2:20 (ἐποικοδομηθέντες) indicates that the edifice has already been built and assumes God to be the architect of this temple, the present tense of 2:21 (αὕξει) suggests that this sacred building is in a state of organic growth.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ 1 Peter in particular displays a remarkable likeness to Qumran, as both draw their respective terminology from reflection upon Isaiah 28:16. Whereas the Qumranians read Isaiah 28:16 as pertaining to the community, 1 Peter interprets the passage christologically. This reliance upon Isaiah 28:16 and Psalm 118:22 aids the author of 1 Peter in distinguishing between those who do and do not belong to the “spiritual house,” for the precious cornerstone of 2:6 is also the stone that was rejected and causes stumbling. See Schüssler Fiorenza, “Cultic Language,” 174; Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 120.

¹⁷⁰ Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 152-53. Following Lincoln, it seems that the genitive construction τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν should be taken as appositional, i.e. that the apostles and prophets constitute a foundation, and not as a subjective genitive, i.e. that the apostles and prophets laid the foundation. As Lincoln notes, taking this as a subjective genitive introduces unnecessary confusion, for Christ would then be both the foundation and the keystone.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 152; Ernest Best, *Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 279-80. The personification of the temple structure is also seen in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, where “all the foundations of the holy of holies, the supporting columns of the most exalted dwelling, and all the corners of his building” are commanded to sing praises to the God of Israel (4Q403 1.1.41).

Second, implicit in Ephesians is the concept that those who believe in Jesus constitute the building blocks of the temple, an idea which will become much more explicit in 1 Peter. Here, the addressees of Ephesians are twice said to comprise a temple built upon the solid foundation of the apostles and prophets and to constitute the dwelling place of God (2:19, 22). The relationship of Christ to the church is predicated upon this image, for Christ is said to be the ἀκρογωνιαίος of this new building. Though its exact meaning is disputed,¹⁷² it is clear that this ἀκρογωνιαίος serves as the principal unifying element which ties together this growing edifice. The point of this description of the community as a temple is explicitly laid out in 2:22: it is in this human temple that God now resides.

This image of the community as a temple is fleshed out in its own way in 1 Peter 2:4-10. Here Jesus is understood to be a living stone (λίθον ζῶντα), a designation which anticipates the combined citation of Isaiah 28:16 and LXX Psalm 117:22 in 1 Peter 2:6-8. Naming Jesus' followers as living stones (λίθοι ζῶντες) establishes a close connection

¹⁷² Scholars have traditionally seen in this term a reference to a cornerstone, the essential stone located toward the bottom of the structure which provides strength and integrity to the building. That this was a common understanding in early Christian interpretation is evident from Mark 12:10 and 1 Peter 2:6-8, both of which are influenced by Isaiah 28:16 and its clear reference to a foundation. If interpreted this way, Eph 2:20 describes Christ as the cornerstone of the building and an integral component of the foundation. One difficulty in seeing Christ as the cornerstone in Eph 2:20, however, is that the apostles and prophets are already said to comprise the foundation of the building, which potentially detracts from the essential role reserved for Christ by the author of Ephesians. Due to this and other considerations, other scholars have taken the ἀκρογωνιαίος to be the top stone of the edifice, the capstone placed into an arch allowing for the structure to stand. On this, see esp. Joachim Jeremias, "Der Eckstein," *Angelos* 1 (1925): 65-70; cf. *Test. Sol.* 22:7; Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 190-94. For our purposes it is not essential to decide between these two views, though it is worth pointing out that these two views could coincide; when Luke speaks of the κεφαλὴν γωνίας of Psalm 117:22 LXX, a term closely related to the ἀκρογωνιαίος of Isaiah 28:16, he refers to it both as a stone that a person might fall upon, as well as a stone that might fall upon a person (see Luke 20:18). For discussions of the issue, see McKelvey, *New Temple*, 195-204; Markus Barth, *Ephesians 1-3* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 317-19; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 154-56; Best, *Ephesians*, 284-86; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 808-9.

between Christ and the early Christians, for they share both his identity (λίθοι) and his life (ζῶντες).¹⁷³ These living stones are described in turn as being built up (οἰκοδομῆσθε) into a spiritual house (οἶκος πνευματικός).

The meaning of this last phrase has been the subject of some dispute, as the noun οἶκος may be variously translated.¹⁷⁴ Elliott has argued that the structure of this passage and the communal emphasis in the book as a whole necessitates understanding the οἶκος πνευματικός of 1 Peter 2:5 as “household.”¹⁷⁵ In addition, he notes that the term οἶκος never refers to the temple in the New Testament outside of Old Testament quotations, allusions, or context, and that the preferred word to describe the early Christians as a temple in the New Testament is ναός, not οἶκος. While Achtemeier agrees that the idea of the Christian community as a household is important in 1 Peter, he argues that it is very difficult not to find references to the temple in 1 Peter 2:5.¹⁷⁶ In defending this position, he points out that whenever the verb οἰκοδομέω is used in the LXX for the building of the temple, the accompanying noun is usually οἶκος, and that Jesus uses the term οἶκος when referring to the temple in John 2:17.¹⁷⁷ Indeed, as we have seen in Chapter Two, the

¹⁷³ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 413. A description of Christians as stones is also found in Ign. *Eph.* 9.1; *Herm. Vis.* 3.5-8; *Sim.* 9.

¹⁷⁴ Much like the Hebrew בית, the polyvalent οἶκος can mean household, family/dynastic line, or physical building; see BDAG, 698-99.

¹⁷⁵ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 414-18

¹⁷⁶ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 159. Cf. Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 72-79; McKelvey, *New Temple*, 128.

word οἶκος is often used in the Old Testament and at Qumran to describe the Jerusalem temple.¹⁷⁸

Moreover, the immediate context of 1 Peter 2:5 suggests that the author has a temple in mind, for the remainder of the verse suggests that this spiritual house is to be the locale in which spiritual sacrifices will be offered to God by a holy priesthood. As Michaels puts it: “it is difficult to imagine a house intended for priesthood as being anything other than a temple of some sort.”¹⁷⁹ In designating the early Christians as a “holy priesthood,” 1 Peter 2 goes beyond what we have seen at Qumran and the rest of the New Testament, for it transfers to the Christian community not only the temple and sacrifices associated with Israel’s cult but also the priesthood.¹⁸⁰ Although the immediate result of this move is that the metaphor becomes mixed, with the Christian community now described as both a spiritual house and a body of priests, the overall effect is quite clear: it is within this new temple that a holy priesthood may now offer acceptable spiritual sacrifices to God through Jesus Christ (2:5).¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁷ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 156-59.

¹⁷⁸ See Chapter Two, section 2.1.1.

¹⁷⁹ J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter* (WBC 49; Waco: Word, 1988), 100.

¹⁸⁰ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," 174. This fascinating development lies outside the purview of this study, but it is interesting to note that the two passages in the NT that do make this move, 1 Peter and Revelation, both interpret Exodus 19:6 in a manner not found in other Second Temple texts. Flusser ("The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," 42) also insightfully notes that in the covenanters' vision of the community as a temple in 1QS 8:5-6, the mention of a "holy house for Israel" and a "holy of holies for Aaron" underscores the continued separation of laity and priest in the sectarian mindset. In contrast, this division is collapsed in 1 Peter 2, for now priest and laity are both understood as encompassing a "holy priesthood."

¹⁸¹ Cf. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 156.

A significant and potentially explosive implication of the “templization” of the community is the declaration that the Gentiles are to become equal partners in it.¹⁸² Paul is a bit circumspect about this in the Corinthian correspondence, as the only real suggestion of this new reality is the largely Gentile make-up of the Corinthian church. 1 Peter is a bit more direct, for in addition to having a mixed audience of both Jews and Gentiles,¹⁸³ the contrasting statements in 2:10—“once you were not a people, but now you are the people of God”—also indicates that Gentiles, as well as Jews, now belong to the people of God (cf. Rom 9:25-26). As this assertion follows closely on the heels of the claim that this new people is a royal priesthood and living stones being built into a spiritual house, the inclusion of Gentiles appears to be directly dependent upon this imagery of a communal temple and a new priesthood. Ephesians, however, contains the boldest statement, as the unification of Jews and Gentiles into a new people is understood to be a specific result of Christ’s actions on the cross, involving the breaking down of the dividing wall of hostility (τὸ μεσότοιχον) which had formerly separated these two groups (2:14). In light of the contour of the argument in Ephesians 2, which concludes with a depiction of the community as an eschatological temple, it is likely that this μεσότοιχον is to be understood as a reference to the balustrade separating Jew from Gentile in the

¹⁸² Cf. Paula Fredriksen, "Paul, Purity, and the Ekklesia of the Gentiles," in *The Beginnings of Christianity: A Collection of Articles* (ed. Jack Pastor and Menachem Mor; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005), 205-17.

¹⁸³ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 50-51; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 94-97.

Jerusalem temple.¹⁸⁴ With the tearing down of this barrier, the unification of these two peoples achieves its final *telos*.

5.4.4 A Shift in Emphasis: Individual Believers as Temples

In 1 Corinthians 6:19 Paul slightly modifies his understanding of the Christian community as a temple, asserting instead that each Corinthian believer is a “temple of the Holy Spirit” (cf. Ign. *Phld.* 7:2; 2 *Clem.* 9:3). Though the use of the second person plural hints at the corporate element of this claim (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν), the surrounding context makes clear that Paul is here referring specifically to individual believers.¹⁸⁵ In 1 Cor 6:15, Paul speaks of τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν (“your bodies”) as members of Christ, with the plural noun and pronoun making it clear that his address is aimed at individuals within the Corinthian church. That individuals are in view is also underscored in 6:18, where Paul declares ὁ δὲ πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει (“the immoral man sins against *his own* body”). Turner, moreover, has argued that the “body” in verse 19 (τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν) should be read as a distributive singular, where “something belonging to

¹⁸⁴ For a discussion of the various interpretations of τὸ μεσότοιχον, see, e.g. Barth, *Ephesians*, 283-87; Best, *Ephesians*, 253-58.

¹⁸⁵ See Eduard Schweizer, “Soma,” in *TDNT* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 7.1064-65, 1070; Robert H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 73-78; Fee, *First Epistle*, 263-64; cf. Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 174-79.

each person in a group of people is placed in the singular.”¹⁸⁶ Thus it is evident that Paul is concerned with the physical body of each Corinthian believer, and that the purity of each, or lack thereof, had a profound effect on the larger body of Christ in Corinth. What each member does with his or her individual body is thus of great importance, since it affects the larger Christian community.

As with 1 Corinthians 3:17, the pronouncement of the individual as a temple in 1 Corinthians 6:19 is prefixed by οὐκ οἴδατε, indicating that the Corinthians were, or should have been, well acquainted with this statement. As Schussler Fiorenza has pointed out, this transfer of temple imagery to the body of the individual believer is remarkable, since no parallel to this idea is found at Qumran, nor should we see Paul as indebted to Hellenism on this point, since Hellenistic and Jewish-Hellenistic literature describes the human mind or soul, not the body, as a temple in which God resides (e.g. Seneca, *Ep.* 41:2; Philo, *Virt.* 188).¹⁸⁷ In contrast, Paul goes to great pains to elevate the importance of the believer’s body in 1 Corinthians 6, stating that the body is the Lord’s (6:13), that God raised Jesus from the dead in a bodily fashion (6:14, cf. ch. 15), and that the believer is to glorify God with his/her own body (6:20). Paul argues that, since the whole person has been redeemed at a great price and now belongs to the Lord, what he or she does with his or her body is of great importance, since through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit the believer is now mystically united with Christ. This union

¹⁸⁶ Nigel Turner, *Syntax* (vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*; ed. James Hope Moulton; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 23-24; Fee, *First Epistle*, 263. For other examples of σῶμα as a distributive singular, see Rom 8:23 and 2 Cor 4:10.

¹⁸⁷ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," 172; cf. Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung*, 49-87.

between the Lord and the Corinthian Christian is a binding one, gainsaying all other bonds.

This union with Christ is also what makes the particular sin Paul is dealing with in Corinth so egregious, since joining a Christian's body to a prostitute (6:16) is antithetical to the union that already exists between the Lord and all believers in Christ.¹⁸⁸ The stress Paul places on this point may be seen in the continued use of the phrase οὐκ οἴδατε in his argument that union with Christ trumped all other relationships (3:15, 16, 19). Sexual misconduct with a prostitute violates the union that has taken place in Christ, and here and elsewhere in 1 Corinthians Paul sternly warns that Christians are to remain separate from all that might corrupt them in Corinthian culture. That this transference of temple ideology to the Christian community should occur in the context of purity and sexual ethics is particularly intriguing, since sexual misconduct was a leading factor in the dissatisfaction directed toward the temple and priesthood in the Second Temple period, as I noted in Chapter Three.

As is the case with the community at large (1 Cor 3; 2 Cor 6), individual Christians are to separate themselves from anything that would bring defilement. The indwelling Spirit of God within the believer demands holiness, and it is imperative that each member of the Corinthian church distinguish him- or herself from anything that would sully the body.¹⁸⁹ This focus on individual holiness has a direct influence on the

¹⁸⁸ Paul argues for this union by citing Genesis 2:24: "The two shall become one flesh." Cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 259-66; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 103-9.

¹⁸⁹ Fee, *First Epistle*, 263-65; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 106.

aggregate holiness of the community, for the joining together of lives lived in holiness results in a holy community, one in which the spirit of God may reside.¹⁹⁰ In this way, the concept of the individual as a temple in 1 Cor 6:19 is not that far removed from the communal temple idea present in other parts of 1-2 Corinthians.

5.4.5 Jesus as the Temple

Temple identity is transferred to yet another referent in the Johannine literature, where the resurrected Jesus becomes the new temple. John 1:14 provides the first hint of this, as the Word-made-flesh which tented (ἐσκήνωσεν) among his people is understood to be a manifestation of God's glory. This idea of God tenting/dwelling with his people likely resonated with those familiar with the Old Testament, for the promise of God coming to dwell with his people is a recurrent theme in the Prophets (e.g., Joel 3:17; Zech 2:10; Ezek 43:7; cf. Lev 26:11-12), and harkens back to the habitation of God with his people in the wilderness tabernacle (σκηνή) together with the glory that accompanied God's presence in it (see Exod 40:34-38). By connecting the Word-made-flesh with the glorious presence of God in the earthly tabernacle in his Prologue, John lays the groundwork for Jesus' replacement of the temple in the rest of his Gospel.¹⁹¹

Jesus, for example, declares to the Samaritan woman that a time is coming "when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (4:21), and in the following verses he asserts that true worshippers of the Father will worship him in spirit

¹⁹⁰ Newton, *Concept of Purity*, 57-58; cf. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 107.

¹⁹¹ Brown, *John*, 32-35; Chance, *Jerusalem*, 25.

and truth, moving the conversation from the location of worship to the manner of worship.¹⁹² However one takes the reference to worship in “spirit and truth,” it is apparent that this type of worship is not tied directly to the Jerusalem temple,¹⁹³ and the closing acknowledgement of Jesus as Messiah (4:25-26) directs the readers’ attention to Jesus himself as the probable locus of this worship.

The strongest statement of Jesus’ replacement of the temple, however, is found in John 2:19-22. In the aftermath of Jesus’ clearing of the temple, an event moved to the beginning of the Gospel in order to heighten the tension between Jesus and the temple authorities, the Johannine Jesus states: “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (2:19). Though “the Jews” understand Jesus to be referring to the earthly temple, John does not want his readers to make the same mistake. In order to ensure a correct interpretation, John explains that Jesus was speaking of the temple of his body (2:21), leaving no doubt that for him, Jesus is the temple.

The Gospel of John, however, contains hints that this equation of Jesus with the temple may be too narrow. Though Jesus is clearly represented as the temple, a main plotline in the narrative is the way in which those who believe in Jesus become an integral part of his ministry. Time and again this idea recurs in John. As the Father sent the Son, so the Son sends his disciples (17:18; 20:21). As the Father worked in and through the Son, so the Son, through the Paraclete, works in and through his followers

¹⁹² Brown, *John*, 180; Jürgen Zangenberg, *Frühes Christentum in Samarien: Topographische und traditions-geschichtliche Studien zu den Samaritentexten im Johannesevangelium* (TANZ 27; Tübingen: Francke, 1998), 148-54.

¹⁹³ Brown, *John*, 181; Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment*, 140-41.

(5:19; 16:12-15). As vines united to the branch, the disciples now carry on the work of Christ in this world. All of this implies that the earthly temple is no longer restricted to the resurrected Jesus, but rather includes those who follow him.¹⁹⁴ John, then, would likely have agreed with other New Testament texts which saw the Christian community as the new temple (see 1 Cor 3, 2 Cor 6, Eph 2, 1 Peter 2).

5.4.6 Summary

In this section I have argued that the early Christians reinterpreted the significance of the temple in the light of Jesus' death and resurrection, choosing to envision their community as a metaphorical and eschatological temple. Some summary observations are now in order.

First, for the most part, the temple language and ideology channeled into the early Christian movement had the community as a whole in view. At times, individual members of the community could be referred to as specific components of the temple (e.g. pillars, stones), or specific personalities within the community were understood as such (see 2 Cor 6; John 2). These more individualistic interpretations, however, all contained within them the seeds of a broader, corporate application. Either directly or indirectly, the emerging Christian community was understood to constitute this new temple.

¹⁹⁴ Mark Kinzer, "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* (37; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998), 460.

Second, the transference of temple terminology to the Christian community occurred very early in the nascent Christian movement. Already by the end of the 40's C.E., Paul refers to the leaders of the Jerusalem church as pillars of the eschatological temple, and as I argued above, it is likely that this designation developed in the first decade following Jesus' death. Thus, Galatians provides evidence that the community-as-temple tradition developed very early in Jerusalem prior to the Christian message moving outward from this city. In addition, the presence of this communal temple tradition in the Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine streams of early Christian tradition provides further evidence that the idea of the community as a temple likely developed very early amongst the first followers of Jesus.¹⁹⁵

Third, identifying the community of believers as a temple brought into sharp focus the importance of the holiness of the community. Paul's appeal to the Corinthians emphasizes this precise point, as he exhorts them through reference to Old Testament passages to live holy and pure lives, and not to pollute themselves or associate themselves with any form of idolatry or sexual misconduct. Indeed, Ephesians accentuates the importance of holy living, since God, who cannot and will not co-exist with impurity, is explicitly said to dwell in the midst of this human temple. As a consequence of their incorporation into this eschatological temple, the members of the

¹⁹⁵ In addition to the New Testament texts cited above, see also Ign. *Eph.* 9:1; 15:3; *Magn.* 7:2; *Trall.* 7:2; *Phld.* 7:2; *Barn.* 4:11; 6:15; 16:6-10; *Herm. Vis.* 3; *Sim.* 9; Origen, *Hom. Exod.* 9 n. 3-4 (PG 12:363-69). Cf. Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington, III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 165-67.

Christian community found themselves required to practice individual and corporate holiness.

Fourth, this understanding of the community as a temple is both decidedly Christological and infused with a belief in the work of the Holy Spirit. The association between Christ and the Christian community is underscored in several passages, where Jesus is declared to be the foundation or cornerstone of this temple, upon which the remainder of the building is dependent (1 Cor 3:10-11; Eph 2:20). Moreover, the understanding that God's Spirit will reside in God's temple appears to have been so self-evident to the early Christian authors that the link is assumed rather than argued. For these (mostly) Jewish-Christian authors, the original referent for the temple imagery was undoubtedly the Jerusalem temple, the center of Jewish religious experience. This temple, however, was by no means the only temple in the world. Indeed, the multiplicity of temples beyond the borders of Palestine helps explain why the early Christian understanding of the community as a temple, which was so pointed and polemical in its Jewish context (see below), remained a vital part of early Christian self-understanding and was retained in the Christian repertoire long after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. In short, the metaphor did not lose its potency when divorced from its original context, since Gentiles who had converted to Christianity were also displaced from their local temples.¹⁹⁶ For Paul and other early Christians, depicting the early Christian community as a temple became a distinctive way to express the reality of the presence of God's Spirit dwelling within that community.

¹⁹⁶ Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 179.

Fifth, this temple ideology was anchored in eschatological expectation. In declaring themselves a new temple, the early Christians were proclaiming that the hope of God's presence residing in and with his people was now being fulfilled. This eschatological nuance meant that the early Christian appropriation of temple imagery did not merely function analogously, as a way of saying that the Christian community was like a temple insofar as the presence of God was now understood to dwell in the midst of them. Rather, the consistent use of this temple language reveals that the early Christians actually saw themselves as a temple, as the eschatological place of God's presence, and that this understanding entailed a reshaping of communal and individual identity. A significant part of this new reality in early Christianity was the startling claim that Gentiles *qua* Gentiles could now enter this new community and become integral components of the true temple of the God of Israel.

5.5 Conclusions: Jesus and the Christian Community as a Temple

In this chapter I have sketched a picture of the early Christian movement as one that appropriated certain aspects of the temple and its cult, choosing to describe and conceptualize itself in temple terminology. But how far back does this idea go? Several scholars have argued that the idea of the community as a temple should be attributed to Jesus, and that in speaking of an eschatological temple brought into being by God himself (e.g. Mark 14:58; Matt 16:18), he envisioned not a physical building, but the community

of those who believed in him.¹⁹⁷ According to these scholars, the early conception of the temple as an eschatological community is to be explained through Jesus' teaching of this idea to his followers. While this is possible, it seems more likely that Jesus' vision of eschatological restoration for Israel would have been understood, at least initially, as a hope for a future, glorious, *physical* temple, an expectation that was certainly current in first-century Judaism.¹⁹⁸ The seeds of the later development of the idea of the Christian communal temple conception, however, may be implicit in Jesus' teaching, as his followers may well have based their understanding of the Christian community as a temple upon both his declaration of a new temple in Mark 14:58 and in his insistence in Mark 12:1-12 that he was the cornerstone.

If so, it is unlikely that the idea of the community as an eschatological temple arose during the lifetime of the historical Jesus. While the early Christians appear to have largely followed Jesus with regard to his views on the Jerusalem temple and the priesthood, the move to see the Christian community as a new temple appears to have developed only after Jesus' death. Indeed, this idea was likely born out of early Christian

¹⁹⁷ E.g., Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1979) 192-97; *ibid.*, *Christus Faber: The Master Builder and the House of God* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1992), 259-72; Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 294-96; Sweet, "A House Not Made with Hands," 398-90; Howard C. Kee, "After the Crucifixion - Christianity Through Paul," in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development* (ed. Hershel Shanks; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 121-22; cf. Bruce Chilton (*The Temple of Jesus: His Sacrificial Program Within a Cultural History of Sacrifice* [University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992], 150-54) who argues that Jesus set up an alternative cult, replacing the temple sacrifices with wine and bread.

¹⁹⁸ See, e.g., Tob 14:5; *Jub.* 1:15-17, 29; *1 En.* 90:28-29; 91:13; 11Q19 29:2-10; *T. Benj.* 9:2; *Sib. Or.* 3.294; *4 Ezra* 10:25-54; *2 Bar.* 4:2-7; 6:7-9. See also the earlier discussion in this chapter and in Chapter Three, as well as Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77-87; Ådna, *Jesu Stellung*, 25-89. Interestingly, Ådna (142-53) proceeds to argue that Jesus envisioned a physical eschatological temple on Mount Zion that he himself would help bring into existence.

reflection upon the Hebrew Scriptures and Jesus' teachings and deeds. The designation of James, Peter, and John as pillars in this new eschatological temple is the earliest evidence for this communal temple imagery, and within two decades of Jesus' death we find the Christian community already explicitly referred to as a temple. Along with the New Testament texts surveyed above, Matthew, Mark, and John also seem to have leaned in this direction, transferring the functions and prerogatives of the Jerusalem temple to the Christian community and/or Jesus himself.¹⁹⁹ In the end, it seems highly probable that the early Jerusalem Christians were responsible for envisioning their community as an eschatological temple, and they began to reconstitute themselves in such a manner following the end of Jesus' ministry on earth.

In addition, I have argued that the transference of temple language to the community carried profound implications for those belonging to the early Christian movement. But I also contend that the decision to appropriate temple language and ideology to the Christian community, and to construct a metaphorical temple that presented an alternative to that on the Temple Mount, was a move that held potentially explosive socio-political consequences above and beyond those summarized above. It was not just another way of saying that the Spirit of God now resided in the Christian community, though it did mean this. It was not just another way of speaking of Gentile inclusion into the Christian community, though again it did mean this. It was not just another way of emphasizing the need for personal and corporate holiness, though it also

¹⁹⁹ E.g. the χειροποίητος/ἀχειροποίητος of Mark 14:58; Matthew 16:17-19; John 1:14; cf. Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 144-57; Chance, *Jerusalem*, 19-21, 24-26; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2.627-29; 3.336.

meant this. Beyond and prior to all this, the “templization” of the early Christian had a polemical edge, and what gave this metaphor such potency in its original Jewish context was the particular way in which it helped form the social identity of the early Christians. As we saw above in Chapter Four, in the centuries prior to the advent of Christianity, the most drastic step a group could take to register dispute and disagreement with the religious leadership in Jerusalem was to construct an alternative temple. Some—the founders of the Samaritan and Oniad temples—built physical temples, whereas others—the sectarian covenanters at Qumran—erected a metaphorical temple. In each case we saw that the Jerusalem temple itself was not the main divisive issue. Rather, at issue was the legitimacy and worthiness of the priesthood charged with that temple’s oversight. While it is likely that attitudes toward the Jerusalem priesthood colored their views of the temple, in each case it is the religious leadership which is condemned. This seems to have been the case with the early Christians as well since as we have seen, the early Christians do not appear to have been as critical of the temple itself as they were of its priestly overseers. Their continued presence in the temple suggests that they did not view the temple as in any way defiled. Rather, it was the presiding priesthood that was deemed questionable and which proved to be antagonistic towards these early Jerusalem Christians (see the Gospels, Acts, Josephus [Ant. 20.200], cf. 1 Thess 2:14-16).

In light of this, the early Christian construction of a temple that could be an alternative to that in Jerusalem was likely a bold and calculated statement that would have held a particular cultural currency in the Judaism of its day. It was a recognizable way of registering dissent. This, I argue, was the likely catalyst for the “templization” of

the Christian community on the part of the early Christians. It is true, to be sure, that the texts containing the idea of the Christian community as a temple are not, at least for the most part, rhetorically polemical, and this raises the question of whether this temple terminology was really directed against the priestly aristocracy. Yet if we take Qumran as an example, we see that the “templization” of the community in the sectarian literature also occurs in contexts that are not polemically driven. These texts from Qumran are largely self-referential, interested in promoting the sect’s internal identity. Indeed, it is only from other passages that we gain the impression that this imagery developed out of conflict with the Jerusalem priesthood. The situation in early Christianity is similar. The specific passages which refer to the community as a temple are not polemically directed against the Jerusalem chief priests. Instead, the passages focus on developing Christian unity and identity. It is only from other contexts (again, the Gospels, Acts, Josephus [Ant. 20.200]; 1 Thess 2:14-16) that we become aware of early Christian conflict with the presiding priests.

If this is correct, then the channeling of the idea of the temple into the Christian community may help explain the continued hostility of the chief priests toward the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. As noted above, the proclamation as Messiah of a personality the chief priests had handed over to be crucified was an important contributing factor. But this, combined with the usurpation of the idea of the temple and the polemical use of temple-related texts such as Psalm 118:22, attests to the fact that the Christians continued pressing the chief priests on multiple levels, and that in the tense relationship described in Acts between the early Christians and the chief priests, the early

Christians may have given as much hostility as they received. Presumably adding insult to injury, these Jerusalem Christians remained strongly attached to the temple and involved in the cult even as they began to proclaim the existence of a new eschatological temple. Although cognizant of Jesus' prophecies regarding the impending destruction of the temple, these Christians, with the possible exception of Stephen, believed that the temple, while it still stood, remained the divinely sanctioned place of God's presence and cult.²⁰⁰

The exact parameters of this controversy are now somewhat concealed from our eyes, as we peer backward over the span of several millennia. But in placing the "templization" of the Christian community alongside the construction of alternative temples in Samaria, Leontopolis, and Qumran, we are able better to see that the nascent Christian appropriation of temple terminology carried with it a polemical edge, since the construction of prior alternative temples had all been born out of opposition to the Jerusalem's religious leadership. Naming a community a new temple held a particular and powerful resonance, no matter the century.

²⁰⁰ Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," 60.

Chapter 6: Concluding Reflections and Implications

Religiously, economically, and socio-politically, the Jerusalem temple stood at the center of Jewish life and faith and grew in significance throughout the Second Temple period. Beyond its official functions, the temple also provided Second Temple Jews with a national ethno-religious identity and came to symbolize all that they shared in common, namely, election, Torah, and covenant. Concomitant with the rise of the temple's importance was the elevation in status of the high priest and the priesthood as a whole. In various ways throughout its history the office of the high priest carried enormous weight in all spheres of Israel's national life.

Not all in the Second Temple period, however, were pleased with the current state of affairs in the temple, or with the qualifications and conduct of the Jerusalem priesthood. As a result, numerous groups regularly criticized the religious center in Jerusalem, with the sharpest criticism reserved for the temple's overseers. Indeed, the increasing influence of the Jerusalem priestly oligarchy was matched only by the rise in vitriol directed against it. Intriguingly, the documents that were surveyed in Chapters Two and Three reveal that literature composed in the Diaspora tended to view the temple positively, while the preponderance of texts written in and around the city of Jerusalem viewed the temple in a negative fashion. For some, proximity bred contempt.

In the discussion of temples alternatives to the Jerusalem temple, we saw a few examples of whole communities which separated from the Jerusalem temple and founded their own communities. In each case the driving force behind the construction of the

Samaritan and Oniad temples, as well as the “templization” of the community at Qumran, came from dispute with those in positions of religious authority in Jerusalem.

I have argued that the development of a nascent Christian understanding of the Christian community as a temple was predicated upon similar stimuli. While the acrimonious relationship between the Jerusalem chief priests and the early Christian movement in Jerusalem was likely dependent, at least in part, upon the residual effects of Jesus’ views of the chief priests of his day, persecution of the early Christian leadership by these religious leaders soon personalized this hostility for the first generation of Christians in Jerusalem. The early Christian appropriation of temple terminology was one reaction to this hostility. It was a recognizable way of showing dissent.

What remains for the present study is to situate the early Christian “templization” of the community more concretely into the broader historical picture. On the one hand, by bringing the early Christian idea of the community as a temple into conversation with 1) the Samaritans, who constructed their temple in the sixth century B.C.E., 2) those at Leontopolis, who erected their temple in the 160s B.C.E., and 3) the Qumran community, who established their communal temple ideology in the mid-to-late second century B.C.E., we encounter a significant chronological gap. Much can and did change over the course of several centuries, which would certainly have impacted how each group viewed the temple and the presiding priesthood, and it may seem questionable to treat these communities and their motivations together. On the other hand, the motivations that lay behind the establishment of each alternative temple have enough in common that it is possible to speak of a pattern of alternative temple formation, for a continuity emerges

that is independent of time. The most important element of this pattern is the consistent critique of and disagreement with the religious establishment in Jerusalem. Though the particular circumstances varied, the action taken was the same—the creation of an alternative temple to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Recognition of this pattern of dissent allows for a reevaluation of the early Christian construction of a communal temple identity and leads to the following conclusions.

First, the creation of any new or alternative temple presented an implicit challenge to the existing temple, for the construction of an alternative temple necessarily entailed the question of the continuing vitality of the original one. The implications of the early church's decision to appropriate temple imagery to itself may best be seen through a comparison with the three other alternative temples discussed in Chapter Four. In all four communities, the construction of an alternative temple brought with it the expectation that God would do a new work within the community. The retention of the symbol of the temple amidst the formation of new realities occasioned the belief that the God of Israel was now present in the community in the same way that he was in the temple in Jerusalem. As a consequence, the question of the "real" location of God's presence would have been brought into sharp focus. On the one hand, it is clear from our discussion in Chapter Two that many Jews believed the Jerusalem temple to be the institution chosen by God and favored with his presence, and in Chapter Four we saw how Josephus and some rabbinic traditions preserve specific memories of the ways in which the legitimacy of these alternative temples was questioned.¹ On the other hand,

¹ E.g. *Ant.* 11.302-47; 13:62-73; *Massekhet Kutim* 2:8; *m. Menah* 13:10.

polemic was a two-way street, with the sectarians at Qumran insinuating that the Jerusalem temple was the one that was illegitimate, even if only for the time being. To be sure, charges of illegitimacy are not seen in the case of the early Christian understanding of the Christian community as an eschatological temple. The animosity shown by the chief priests toward the early Christian movement, however, confirms that these types of allegations probably circulated, and from both sides. It is clear, then, that the communities involved in the founding of alternative temples presented a challenge to the singular claim of the Jerusalem temple.

Second, we can now situate the early Christians more concretely in this period. In his discussion of Jewish sectarianism, Shaye Cohen argued that the major parties within Second Temple Judaism, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, all arose in reaction to specific incidents involving the temple and Jerusalem priesthood.² The early Christians also appear to have derived their identity, at least in part, from their views of the temple and the chief priests of their day. To some extent, the early Christians were interlopers, as the three major parties had all been in existence for a couple of centuries. Nevertheless, I suggest that early Christian views of the temple helped to situate the early church within the world of Second Temple Jerusalem and Jewish society in the first century C.E., and that the tension between the Jerusalem Christians and the (likely Sadducean) chief priests was another instance of the tension that was known to exist from time to time between the differing Jewish parties. In short, the Christians' views on the temple and their opposition to the chief priests also fit into a known category and

² Cohen, *From the Maccabees*, 131-32.

probably helped them become a recognizable and distinct group within Jerusalem and its environs.

Third, though the particulars varied in each case, the establishment of alternative Jewish temples was primarily based upon an indictment of the current Jerusalem leadership and religious establishment. In Chapter Five I argued that a similar set of circumstances obtained in the early Christian community in Jerusalem. On the one hand, the Christians' sustained presence in Jerusalem and continued participation in the temple and cult spoke volumes, predicated as it was upon a reverence for the temple and an enduring belief that God could still be worshipped in this locale. On the other hand, the relationship between the chief priests and the early Christian leadership in Jerusalem was often hostile. Though the early Christian proclamation of a figure discredited and handed over to death by the chief priests certainly played a role in the fracturing of the relationship, the early Christian belief in an alternative and eschatological temple was itself a significant contributing factor. Indeed, the formation of any alternative sanctuary was tantamount to saying that a particular community was so dissatisfied with the current state of affairs that it thought it better to construct an alternative temple with a separate priesthood than to remain aligned with the current priestly aristocracy in the Jerusalem temple. To put it another way, the establishment of an alternative temple to the one in Jerusalem was likely a culturally identifiable method of registering dissent against the Jerusalem priesthood, not disgust with the Jerusalem sanctuary. Though certainty on this question cannot be achieved, the early Christians' continued presence in the temple suggests that this impulse was slightly weaker in the Christian movement than in these

other communities who consciously separated themselves from city and temple in constructing their respective temples.

This leads to the fourth conclusion: that the early Christian views were both less and more radical than those involved in the formation of other alternative temples. Bauckham has discussed some of the differences between the Qumran and early Christian communities,³ but his points mostly hold true for the Samaritan and Oniad temples as well. On the one hand, the early Christians did not completely reject the Jerusalem temple. Whereas the communities behind the establishment of temples at Mount Gerizim, Leontopolis, and Qumran physically separated themselves from Jerusalem and the temple, the evidence from the New Testament points toward continued Christian involvement in the worship of the God of Israel in the Jerusalem temple. Indeed, the initial formation of an early Christian temple identity appears to have taken place in Jerusalem, in the shadow of the temple itself. In remaining invested, at least to some degree, in the Jerusalem temple and its cult, the early Christians in Jerusalem took a much less radical view of the temple than did those who constructed other temples alternative to the one in Jerusalem. On the other hand, the early Christians appear to have held the view that the Jerusalem temple was a doomed institution whose importance would soon diminish. While those at Qumran seem to have thought that the current defilement in Jerusalem would come to an end and looked forward to the day in which they would once again participate in offering pure sacrifices in the unblemished sanctuary, the early Christian view left no room for such a future temple. Not enough is

³ Bauckham, "Parting of the Ways," 144-45.

known of the views of the communities behind the construction of the Samaritan and Oniad temples to say whether they also saw the Jerusalem temple as a doomed institution, though the very construction of alternative physical temples assumes some degree of separation and ill-will toward that from which they separated. Consequently, the early Christians appear to have been situated somewhere between the groups found in Chapter Three, whose criticism of the Jerusalem priesthood coincided (as far as we know) with continued participation in the temple cult, and the three communities discussed in Chapter Four who separated completely from the Jerusalem sanctuary and created their own temples.

Fifth, in a bold and unprecedented step, the early Christian community-as-temple idea included both Jews and Gentiles. In Chapter Four I showed that the development of pre-Christian alternative temples in Judaism was predicated upon several similar stimuli, foremost of which was a hostile relationship with the priests overseeing the temple. In Chapter Five I argued that the early Christian communal temple conception appears to have developed along similar lines. Nonetheless, the early Christian community-as-temple idea went well beyond the alternative temples that had preceded it in its inclusion of Gentiles within the Christian communal temple. There is no indication that Gentiles were ever a part of the Samaritan and Oniad communities. The same is true of the Qumran community, and the remarkable similarities in the use of temple terminology by the Qumran sectarians and the early Christians cannot mask the stark differences in the way in which each community understood itself. Whereas the Qumranites believed that their community-as-temple idea extended only to faithful Jewish sectarians, early

Christians used this same terminology to argue for the inclusion of faithful Jews *and Gentiles*. These Gentiles, along with Jewish believers in Jesus, were understood to be incorporated into the temple of God as full members. Thus, the “templization” of the community in early Christianity was part of a radical redefinition of the people of God. Now, in fulfillment of prophetic promise, the foreigner and the stranger, those not allowed in the inner confines of the Jerusalem temple, were granted full and equal status in the temple community (c.f. Isa 56:3-8). In the eyes of the early Christians, the temple community had now become the locus of the Gentiles’ salvation, since the exclusivity of the Jerusalem temple had been negated. As a result, Gentiles *qua* Gentiles were admitted into this communal temple and were understood to be constitutive parts of it, without the necessity of conversion to Judaism.

Sixth, in an equally unprecedented move, the early Christians began to transfer the idea of the priesthood to non-priestly (and, for that matter, non-Jewish) members of the Christian community (see 1 Pet 2:5, 9; Rev 1:6; 5:10). This transfer, however, proceeded at a much slower pace than did the appropriation of temple terminology, with the first explicit textual evidence usually being dated to the post 70 C.E. period.⁴ To be sure, Paul is already moving in this direction in Romans 15:16, as he speaks of his own ministry to the Gentiles in sacerdotal terms. Yet it is significant that he does not call himself a priest, only that he is engaged in the same sort of work as a priest would be. The strong Jewish influence upon earliest Christianity is likely responsible for this

⁴ For a discussion of the issue and an argument for dating 1 Peter and Revelation to the post-70 period, see Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 47-50; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 136-38; Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, lvii-lxx.

reticence, as eligibility for the priesthood was based on heredity and not on any other qualifications or desires.⁵ In addition, as we saw in Chapter Four, the presence of Zadokite priests in the Samaritan, Oniad, and Qumran communities was an essential component in the founding of each of their alternative Jewish temples, since the presence of these priests granted to each of these communities an air of respectability. Though Luke informs us that a number of priests did indeed become members of the new Christian movement (Acts 6:7), we are not told that any of them belonged to the chief priestly circles in Jerusalem, nor is it suggested that these priests held any leadership roles in the early Christian community or places of honor in the newly emerging eschatological Christian temple.

Given enough time, the early Christians may likely have begun to appropriate specific priestly terminology into the community, but two important developments hastened this importation. First, the movement of early Christianity outside of Palestinian Judaism and into the Gentile world meant that many of the more traditional Jewish and Jewish-Christian understandings, including the hereditary principle of the priesthood, probably began to lose their hold on the early Christian psyche. Second, in the years following the destruction of the temple and the consequent removal of the chief priests from their place of influence, the early Christians explicitly transferred priestly terminology to the community, now asserting that all believers in Jesus were priests. That this did not occur until several decades after the Christians first applied temple

⁵ For further discussion, see Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language," 174-77; Schwartz, "Kingdom of Priests," 57-70; Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, passim.

terminology to their community, and that it waited until the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, reveals the strong hold that the Jewish-Christian worldview of the Jerusalem church still maintained over the emerging Christian movement.

Of the four alternative temples constructed in opposition to the Jerusalem temple in the Second Temple period, only one would endure beyond the events of 70 C.E. Indeed, the image of the church as a temple survived Jewish and Jerusalem Christianity, flourishing in the Gentile world and highlighting the Christian community's special relationship with the Spirit of God and its desire to worship this God in a holy manner. This idea that the community now constituted a temple became a significant way in which the church continued to understand itself and present itself to a non-Christian world. And yet, with the inexorable movement of the early Christians into the Gentile world, the irresistible pull of the Jerusalem temple slowly disappeared from the scene. Removed from its Jewish nexus, the image of the community as a temple lost its initial explosiveness. In the end, the sharp criticism of the Jerusalem high priests was muted, and specific remembrance of the origins of this communal temple identity disappeared from view. But the idea of the Christian community as a new temple, the locus of God's enduring presence, lived on.

Bibliography

- Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Ådna, Jostein. *Jerusalem Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999.
- . *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel: die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Albertz, Rainer. *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit, Teil 2: Vom Exil bis zu den Makkabäern.* Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 8/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Jerusalem as the *Omphalos* of the World: On the History of a Geographic Concept." Pages 104-19 in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Lee Levine. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- . "The Redaction-History of *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437-56.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumrân Cave 4: 1 (4Q158-4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Anderson, Robert T. "Josephus' Accounts of Temple Building: History, Literature or Politics?" Pages 246-57 in *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies 9*. Grand Rapids: Biblical Society, 1989.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting.* Edited by John J. Collins. JSJSup 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- . *Revelation 1-5*. WBC 52a. Dallas: Word, 1997.
- Aus, Roger David. "Three Pillars and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Galatians 2:9." *ZNW* 70 (1979): 252-61.

- . *The Wicked Tenants and Gethsemane: Isaiah in the Wicked Tenants' Vineyard, and Moses and the High Priest in Gethsemane: Judaic Traditions in Mark 12:1-9 and 14:32-42*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.
- Avigad, Nahman. *Discovering Jerusalem*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Barag, Dan, and David Flusser. "The Ossuary of Yehohanah Granddaughter of the High Priest Theophilus." *IEJ* 36 (1986): 39-44.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 B.C.E. to 117 C.E.)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Birth of Christianity: The First Twenty Years*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Barrett, C. K. "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 345-67 in *Templum Amicitiae*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles." Pages 1-19 in *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis De Zwann Septuagenarii*. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- Barth, Markus. *Ephesians 1-3*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.
- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Barucq, A. "Leontopolis." Pages 5.359-72 in *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément*. Paris: Létouzey et Ané, 1957.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." Pages 63-89 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by James Davila. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)." Pages 154-84 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington, III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415-80 in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* 4. Edited by Bruce Winter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- . "James and the Jerusalem Community." Pages 55-95 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- . "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple." Pages 72-89 in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1988.
- . *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . "The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why." *ST* 47 (1993): 135-51.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration." *DSD* 4 (1997): 137-56.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord's Vineyard." *JJS* 40 (1989): 1-6.
- . "Damascus Document." Pages 166-70 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "The Essenes and the Temple - A Reappraisal." Pages 57-74 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . "The Exclusion of "Netinim" and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium." Pages 75-87 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- . "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls." Pages 39-56 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., and Daniel R. Schwartz. "Damascus Document." Pages 4-79 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.

- Baur, F. C. *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine*. Translated by Allen Menzies. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1875-1876.
- Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT 17. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2004.
- Beall, Todd S. *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. SNTSMS 58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Untersuchungen Zur Entstehungsgeschichte Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Edited by Otto Michel and Martin Hengel. AGJU 8. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Becking, Bob. *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Observations on Prophetic Characters, Prophetic Texts, Priests of Old, Persian Period Priests and Literati." Pages 19-30 in *The Priests in the Prophets*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Peshar Habbakkuk." Pages 647-50 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *JBL* 92 (1973): 88-108.
- Bickerman, Elias. "The Historical Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism." Pages 70-114 in *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*. Edited by Louis Finkelstein. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.
- . "The Historical Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism." Pages 9-45 in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth and Third Centuries B.C.E.* Edited by Michael E. Stone and David Satran. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989 (orig. 1949).
- Binder, Don. *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*. SBLDS 169. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.
- Black, Matthew. "Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament " *NTS* 18 (1971): 1-14.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1-39*. AB 19. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

- . "Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah." Pages 22-53 in *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period*. Edited by Philip R. Davies. JSOTSup 117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- , ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bohak, Gideon. "CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple." *JSJ* 26 (1995): 32-41.
- . *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "Theopolis: A Single-Temple Policy and Its Singular Ramifications." *JJS* 50 (1999): 3-16.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. HNT 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.
- Bowman, John. "Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood." *TGUOS* 16 (1955-56): 1-14.
- . *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Translated by Alfred M. Johnson, Jr. PTMS 4. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.
- Briggs, Robert A. *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Brooke, George J. "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard." *DSD* 2 (1995): 268-94.
- . *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985.
- . "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pages 117-32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

- . "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." Pages 285-301 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*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- . "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 417-34 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)*. AB 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- . *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Bruneau, Philippe. "Les Israélites de Délos et la Juiverie Délienne." *BCH* 106 (1982): 465-504.
- Brutti, Maria. *The Development of the High Priesthood During the Pre-Hasmonean Period: History, Ideology, Theology*. JSJSup 108. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Buchanan, G. W. "Mark 11.15-19. Brigands in the Temple." *HUCA* 30 (1959): 169-77.
- Büchler, Adolph. "Family Purity and Family Impurity in Jerusalem Before the Year 70 C.E." Pages 64-98 in *Studies in Jewish History: The Adolph Büchler Memorial Volume*. Edited by Israel Brodie and Joseph Rabbinowitz. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Bull, Robert J. "Er-Ras, Tell." Pages 4.1015-22 in *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Edited by Michael Avi-Yonah and Ephraim Stern. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Bülow, Siegfried. "Der Berg des Fluches." *ZDPV* 73 (1957): 100-07.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Rev. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- Bunge, G. J. "Zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Untergangs der Oniaden und des Aufstiegs der Hasmonäer." *JSJ* 6 (1975): 1-46.

- Buth, Randall, and Brian Kvasnica. "Critical Notes on the VTS." Pages 259-317 in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels - Volume One*. Edited by R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Temple Authorities and Tithe-Evasion: The Linguistic Background and Impact of the Parable of *the Vineyard, the Tenants and the Son*." Pages 53-80 in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels - Volume One*. Edited by R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Caquot, André. "La Secte de Qoumrân et le Temple." *RHPR* 72 (1992): 3-14.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Charles, R. H. *The Assumption of Moses*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1897.
- . *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad." Pages 197-224 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Chester, Greville J. "A Journey to the Biblical Sites in Lower Egypt." *PEFQS* (1880): 136-38.
- Chilton, Bruce. *The Temple of Jesus: His Sacrificial Program Within a Cultural History of Sacrifice*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Clements, Ronald E. *God and Temple*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Clines, David J., ed. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-.
- Coggins, R. J. *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- . "The Samaritans in Josephus." Pages 257-73 in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Louis H Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.
- . "Ioudaios, Iudaeus, Judaeus, Jew." Pages 69-106 in *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- . "Menstruants and the Sacred in Judaism and Christianity." Pages 273-99 in *Women's History and Ancient History*. Edited by Sarah B. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- . "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism." *HUCA* 55 (1984): 27-53.
- . "The Temple and the Synagogue." Pages 298-325 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Cohen, Stuart A. *The Three Crowns: Structures of Communal Politics in Early Rabbinic Jewry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- . "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran." Pages 231-54 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- . *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses." Pages 15-32 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- . "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans." *HTR* 73 (1980): 91-104.
- . *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period*. International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1. [Ramat Gan]: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 1998.
- . "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit." Pages 23-40 in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- . "The Origins of the Qumran Community." Pages 159-78 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Edited by Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- . "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina." *JJS* 25 (1974): 365-80.
- . "Sibylline Oracles." Pages 317-472 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- . "The Sibylline Oracles." Pages 357-81 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- . *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- . "Some Remaining Traditio-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses." Pages 38-43 in *Studies in the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- . "Testaments." Pages 325-55 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Collins, M. F. "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *JSJ* 3 (1972): 97-116.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. T. Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Cowley, A. E. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
- Cross, F. M. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times." *HTR* 59 (1966): 201-11.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1958.
- . "The Early History of the Qumran Community." Pages 63-79 in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*. Edited by David Noel Freedman and Jonas D. Greenfield. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998.

- . *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.
- Crown, Alan D. "Another Look at Samaritan Origins." Pages 133-55 in *Essays in Honor of G. D. Sixdenier: New Samaritan Studies of the Société d'études Samaritaines III & IV: Proceedings of the Congress of Oxford 1990, Yarnton Manor and Paris 1992, Collège de France: With Lectures Given at Hong Kong 1993 as Participation in the ICANAS Congress*. Edited by Alan D. Crown and Lucy Davey. University of Sydney: Mandelbaum, 1995.
- . "Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans." *JQR* 82 (1991): 17-50.
- . "The Samaritan Diaspora." Pages 195-217 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by Alan D. Crown. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- Cullman, Oscar. "L'Opposition Contre le Temple de Jérusalem, Motif Commun de la Théologie Johannique et du Monde Ambiant." *NTS* 5 (1958-59): 157-73.
- Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. JSPSup 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Davies, Philip R. *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BJS 94. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- . "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory." *CBQ* 45, no. 1 (1983): 80-89.
- . *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. JSOTSup 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- . *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-1997.
- de Jonge, Marinus. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- . *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition, and Origin*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.

- de Moor, Johannes C. "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-2: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants." *JSJ* 29 (1998): 63-80.
- Delcor, M. "Le Temple d'Onias en Égypte: Réexamen d'un vieux problème." *RB* 75 (1968): 188-203.
- . "Repas Culturels Esséniens et Thérapeutes, Thiases et Haburoth." *RevQ* 6 (1967): 401-25.
- . "Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments." *ZDPV* 78 (1962): 34-48.
- Dessau, Hermannus, ed. *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Berolini, apud Weidmannos, 1892.
- Devreesse, Robert, ed. *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste Sur Les Psaumes (I-LXXX)*. Studi E Testi 93. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand. "Der Ursprung der Samaritaner im Spiegel der frühen Quellen." Pages 67-140 in *Die Samaritaner*. Edited by Ferdinand Dexinger and Reinhard Pummer. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.
- . "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example." Pages 88-114 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition Volume 2*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1981.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. Greenwood, SC: Attic, 1971.
- . *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.
- Dimant, Devorah. "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple." Pages 165-89 in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à V. Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by André Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- . "Jerusalem and the Temple according to the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90) in the Light of the Ideology of the Dead Sea Sect." (Hebrew). *Shnaton* 5-6 (1982): 177-93.
- . "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.

- . *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Donfried, Karl Paul. *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Doran, Robert. "Pseudo-Eupolemus." Pages 873-82 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- du Mesnil du Buisson, Comte. "Compte Rendu Sommaire d'une Mission à Tell El-Yahoudiyé." *BIFAO* 29 (1929): 155-77.
- . "Le Temple D'Onias et le Camp Hyksos à Tell el-Yahoudiyé." *BIFAO* 35 (1935): 59-71.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM, 1991.
- Egger, Rita. "Josephus Flavius and the Samaritans." Pages 109-14 in *Proceedings of the First International Conference of the Société d'études Samaritaines; Tel-Aviv, April 11-13, 1988*. Edited by Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin. Tel Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, 1991.
- . *Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner: Eine Terminologische Untersuchung zur Identitätsklärung der Samaritaner*. NTOA 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Elgvin, Torleif. "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction." Pages 67-87 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism*. Translated by Philip Mairet. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.
- . *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated by William R. Trask. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1959.

- Eliav, Yaron Z. *God's Mountain: The Temple Mount in Time, Place, and Memory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Elliott, John H. *1 Peter*. AB 37B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Eshel, Hanan. "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period." Pages 102-10 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period." Pages 53-66 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "The Prayer of Joseph, a Papyrus from Masada and the Samaritan Temple on APΓAPIZIN." (Hebrew). *Zion* 56 (1991): 125-36.
- Evans, Craig A. "God's Vineyard and its Caretakers." Pages 381-406 in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-Century Temple." Pages 319-44 in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?" *CBQ* 51 (1989): 237-70.
- . "Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple." Pages 233-49 in *James the Just and Christian Origins*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC 34B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- . "II Corinthians vi.14 - vii.1 and Food Offered to Idols." *NTS* 23 (1977): 140-61.
- Feldman, Louis H. "Josephus' Attitude Toward the Samaritans: A Study in Ambivalence." Pages 23-45 in *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties: Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization held on Sunday-Monday, October 14-15, 1990*. Edited by Menachem Mor. Omaha: Creighton University Press, 1992.
- . *Josephus and Modern Scholarship*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

- . *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XVIII-XX*. LCL 9. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- . *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. JSJSup 58. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Fiebig, Paul. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu: Im Lichte der Rabbinischen Gleichnisse des Neutestamentlichen Zeitalters*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1912.
- Fine, Steven. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Finlan, Stephen. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. SBLABib 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Fischer, Thomas, and Udo Rütterswörden. "Aufruf zur Volksklage in Kanaan (Jesaja 23)." *WO* 13 (1982).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S.J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Flesher, Paul V. M. "Palestinian Synagogues before 70 C.E.: A Review of the Evidence." Pages 67-81 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Flinders Petrie, W. M. *Egypt and Israel*. New ed. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1923.
- . *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*. London: British School of Archaeology, 1906.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity." Pages 23-74 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Edited by Brad Young. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.
- . "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel." Pages 317-44 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.
- . "The Isaiah Peshet and the Notion of Twelve Apostles in the Early Church." Pages 305-26 in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *Jesus*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998.
- . "No Temple in the City." Pages 454-65 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Edited by Brad Young. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

- . "Patriarchs, Testament of the Twelve." Pages 184-86 in *EJ* Jerusalem: Keter, 1972.
- . "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers." Pages 551-77 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- . "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. vii." *IEJ* 9 (1959): 99-109.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46-69.
- France, R. T. "Matthew and Jerusalem." Pages 108-27 in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "Did Jesus Oppose the Purity Laws?" *BRev* 11 (1995): 20-25, 42-47.
- . *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.
- . "Paul, Purity, and the Ekklesia of the Gentiles." Pages 205-17 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: A Collection of Articles*. Edited by Jack Pastor and Menachem Mor. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005.
- Frennesson, Björn. *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 14. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999.
- Frey, Jörg. "Temple and Rival Temple - The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis." Pages 171-203 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*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1999.
- Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald. *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. NovTSup 119. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Funk, Robert W., and the Jesus Seminar, eds. *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins, 1998.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. AB 32A. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Gafni, Isaiah. "The Historical Background." Pages 1-31 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

- García Martínez, Florentino. "The Men of the Dead Sea." Pages 31-48 in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Julio Treballe Barrera. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect." Pages 77-96 in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Julio Treballe Barrera. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple." Pages 303-19 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*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- . "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis." *FO* 25 (1988): 113-36.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-98.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and A. S. van der Woude. "A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-41.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Geffcken, Johannes. *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1902.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. SANT 3. Munich: Kösel, 1961.
- Golan, David. "Josephus, Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem, and Modern Historiography." (in Hebrew). Pages 29-55 in *Josephus Flavius: Historian of Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. Edited by U. Rappaport. Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben Zvi, 1982.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *1 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

- . *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- . "The Testament of Moses: Its Contents, Its Origin, and Its Attestation in Josephus." Pages 44-52 in *Studies in the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Goodblatt, David. *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994.
- . "The Title *Nasi* and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt." (Hebrew). Pages 113-32 in *The Bar-Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach*. Edited by A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1984.
- Goodman, Martin. "The Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period." Pages 69-76 in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Lee Levine. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- . *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A.D.66-70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Sacred Space in Diaspora Judaism." in *Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Edited by B. Isaac and A. Oppenheimer. Te'uda 12. Tel Aviv: Ramot, 1996.
- Gophna, R., and Y. Porat. "The Land of Ephraim and Manasseh." (Hebrew). Pages 196-241 in *Judaea, Samaria and the Golan: Archaeological Survey 1967-1968*. Edited by Moshe Kochavi. Jerusalem: Carta, 1972.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society." Pages 89-108 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. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and James H. Charlesworth. Library of Second Temple Studies 47. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- . "Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration." *JBL* 106 (1987): 231-46.
- . *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

- . "A Priest is Without Honor in His Own Prophet: Priests and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets." Pages 79-97 in *The Priests in the Prophets*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX*. ICC 20. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Greenfield, Jonas D., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Gruen, Erich S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- . "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple." *Scripta Classica Israelica* XVI (1997): 47-70.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. SNTSMS 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. "Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the "Parting of the Ways"." Pages 128-53 in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Hanson, Paul D. "Israelite Religion in the Early Postexilic Period." Pages 485-508 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT." Pages 109-28 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. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978.
- Harvey, A. E. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.

- Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- Hayward, Robert. "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration." *JJS* 33 (1982): 429-43.
- . *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Heger, Paul. *Cult as the Catalyst for Division: Cult Disputes as the Motive for Schism in the Pre-70 Pluralistic Environment*. STDJ 65. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Heinemann, Joseph. "Anti-Samaritan Polemics in the Aggadah." Pages 3:57-69 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13-19 August, 1973*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship." Pages 316-29 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa." *DSD* 3 (1996): 253-69.
- . "The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT." Pages 69-84 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*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources Tradition and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Hengel, Martin. *Acts and the History of the Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- . *Between Jesus and Paul*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1983.
- . "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12,1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse." *ZNW* 59 (1968): 1-39.
- . *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.

- . *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their encounter in Palestine during the early Hellenistic period*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989.
- Herr, Moshe David. "Jerusalem, the Temple, and Its Cult-Reality and Concepts in Second Temple Times." (in Hebrew). Pages 166-77 in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Edited by A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Yitzhak Ben Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980.
- Hertz, Joseph H. *Sayings of the Fathers*. New York: Behrman House, 1945.
- Higger, Michael. *Seven Minor Treatises*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1930.
- Hill, Craig C. *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "The Book of The Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem." *Hen* 24 (2002): 131-35.
- . *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- . "Levi, Phineas, and the Problem of Intermarriage." *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1-24.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition*. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- . *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. JSOTSup 303. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Holladay, C. R. "Pseudo-Hecataeus." Pages 277-97 in *Fragments of Hellenistic Jewish Authors Volume 1: Historians*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Hollander, H. W., and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Horbury, W. "New Wine in Old Wineskins." *ExpTim* 86 (1974): 36-42.

- Horbury, W., and D. Noy. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Horsley, Richard A., and J.S. Hanson. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Hultgren, Stephen. "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians." *NTS* 49 (2003): 39-56.
- . *From the Damascus Document to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hunt, Alice. *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*. LHBOTS 452. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism: Religious Worlds of the First Judaic Millennium*. Bethesda: University of Maryland Press, 2006.
- Jaubert, Annie. *The Date of the Last Supper*. Translated by Isaac Rafferty. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965.
- . "La date de la dernière cène." *RHR* 146 (1954): 140-73.
- . "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. ses origines bibliques." *VT* 3 (1953): 250-64.
- . "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine." *VT* 7 (1957): 35-61.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Der Eckstein." *Angelos* 1 (1925): 65-70.
- . *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. London: SCM, 1969.
- . *Rediscovering the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg 1972.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SP 5. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. SP 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991.
- . "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic." *JBL* 108 (1989): 419-41.
- Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Edited by Howard C. Kee and Douglas A. Knight. SBLDS 31. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2 vols. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- Kampen, John. "The Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 11-30 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books*, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kasher, Aryeh. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*. TSAJ 7. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.
- Kee, Howard C. "After the Crucifixion - Christianity Through Paul." Pages 85-124 in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992.
- . "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 775-828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Kinzer, Mark. "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John." Pages 447-64 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* 37. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.
- Kippenberg, Hans Gerhard. *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*.

- Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 30. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Klinzing, Georg. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. "Dating Theodotos (CIJ II 1404)." *JJS* 51, no. 2 (2000): 243-80.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Rule of the Community." Pages 793-97 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era." Pages 401-16 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Knox, John. *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. Rev. ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Kraabel, A. T. "New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora has been found on Delos." *BA* 47 (1984): 44-46.
- Kruse, Heinz. "Die 'Dialektische Negation' als Semitisches Idiom." *VT* 4 (1954): 385-400.
- Kugel, James L. "The World of Ancient Biblical Interpreters." Pages 1-41 in *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch To Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "Priesthood at Qumran." Pages 93-116 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament."

Pages 169-221 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Lange, Armin. "Eschatological Wisdom in the Book of Qohelet and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 817-25 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

———. "In Discussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel." Pages 113-59 in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*. Edited by A. Schoors. BETL 136. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998.

———. "Reading the Decline of Prophecy." Pages 181-91 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Le Moyne, Jean. *Les Sadducéens*. Paris: Gabalda, 1972.

Lee, Thomas R. *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44-50*. SBLDS 75. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Lerner, M. B. "The External Tractates." Pages 1.367-403 in *The Literature of the Sages*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1987.

Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.

Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

———. *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. - 70 C.E.)*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.

———. "The Jewish-Greek Conflict in First Century Caesarea." *JJS* 25 (1974): 381-97.

———. "Second Temple Jerusalem: A Jewish City in the Greco-Roman Orbit." Pages 53-68 in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Lee Levine. New York: Continuum, 1999.

- Lightstone, J. N. *Society, the Sacred, and Scripture in Ancient Judaism: A Sociology of Knowledge*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Wicked Priest." Pages 973-76 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Macdonald, John. *The Samaritan Chronicle No. II (or: Sepher Ha-Yamim) From Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar*. BZAW 107. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Magen, Yitzhak. "Gerizim, Mount." Pages 2.484-92 in *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Edited by Ephraim Stern. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society & Carta, 1993.
- . "Gerizim, Mount." Pages 1742-48 in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Edited by Ephraim Stern⁵. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008.
- . "Jerusalem as a Center of the Stone Vessel Industry during the Second Temple Period." Pages 244-56 in *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed*. Edited by Hillel Geva. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994.
- . "Mount Gerizim - Temple City." (Hebrew). *Qadmoniot* 120 (2000): 74-118.
- . *The Stone Vessel Industry in the Second Temple Period: Excavations at Hizma and the Jerusalem Temple Mount*. Edited by Levana Tsfania. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002.

- Magen, Yitzhak, Haggai Misgav, and Levana Tsfania. *Mount Gerizim Excavations: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions (Vol. 1)*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004.
- Magen, Yitzhak, and Ephraim Stern. "Archaeological Evidence for the First Stage of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim." *IEJ* 52 (2002): 49-57.
- . "The First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mt. Gerizim - New Archaeological Evidence." (Hebrew). *Qadmoniot* 120 (2000): 119-24.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- . "Heaven on Earth: Helios and the Zodiac Cycle in Ancient Palestinian Synagogues." *Dunbarton Oaks Papers* 59 (2005): 1-52.
- Mantel, Hugo. *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark." *JBL* 111 (1992): 441-62.
- . *Mark 1-8*. AB 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *Mark 8-16*. AB 27A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- . *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Marcus, Ralph. *Josephus*. LCL VII. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- . "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics." *JBL* 73 (1954): 157-61.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. AB 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Mayes, A. D. H. *Deuteronomy*. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Mbuvi, Andrew M. *Temple, Exile and Identity in 1 Peter*. LNTS 345. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

- McArthur, Harvey K., and Robert M. Johnston. *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. Grand Rapids: Academic Books, 1990.
- McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- McKnight, Scot. "Jesus and Prophetic Actions." *BBR* 10.2 (2000): 197-232.
- McLaren, James S. *Power and Politics in Palestine*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Mendels, Doron. *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Meshorer, Ya'akov. *Ancient Jewish Coinage*. Dix Hills, NY: Amphora Books, 1982.
- . *Ancient Means of Exchange, Weights and Coins*. Edited by Ronny Reich. Haifa: A. B. Press, 1998.
- Metso, Sarianna. "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule." Pages 85-93 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*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Metzger, Bruce. "Names for the Nameless in the New Testament. A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition." Pages 1.79-99 in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann. Münster Westfalen: Verlag Aschendorff, 1970.
- Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.
- . *Christus Faber: The Master Builder and the House of God*. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1992.

- Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25B. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- . "Jerusalem and Zion after the Exile: The Evidence of First Zechariah." Pages 121-35 in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- . *Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Meyers, Eric M. "An Evaluation of Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs." Forthcoming in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . "The Persian Period and the Judean Restoration." Pages 509-21 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *1 Peter*. WBC 49. Waco: Word, 1988.
- Michel, Otto. "Naos." Pages 880-90 in *TDNT*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Michel, Otto, and Otto Betz. "Von Gott Gezeugt." Pages 1-23 in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift Für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1-2." Pages 248-63 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- . *Leviticus 1-16*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Modrzejewski, Joseph Méléze. *The Jews of Egypt: From Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Translated by Robert Cornman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995.
- Montgomery, James A. *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1907.
- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 40A. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

- Mor, Menachem. "The Persian, Hellenistic and Hasmonaean Period." Pages 1-18 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by Alan D. Crown. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- Murphy O'Connor, J. "The Translation of Damascus Document VI, 11-14." *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553-56.
- Naville, Edouard, and F. L. Griffith. *The Mound of the Jews and the City of Onias*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1890.
- Newsom, Carol. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta: Scholars, 1985.
- Newsom, Carol A., James H. Charlesworth, Brent A. Strawn, and H. W. L. Rietz. "Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400 - 4Q407, 11Q17, Mas1k)." Pages 1-15 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 4B: Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. SNTSMS 53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- . "An Antiochan Date For the Testament of Moses." Pages 33-37 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- . "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." Pages 89-156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- . "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600.
- . *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and Michael E. Stone. *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. *La Troisième Sibylle*. Paris: Mouton, 1970.
- Nolland, John. "A Misleading Statement of the Essene Attitude Toward the Temple." *RQ* 9 (1978): 555-62.
- Noy, D. "The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa." Pages 162-82 in *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*. Edited by J.W. Van Henten and P.W. Van der Horst. AGJU 21. Köln: Brill, 1994.
- Oded, Bustenay. *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979.
- Olmstead, Wesley, G. *Matthew's Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations and the Reader in Matthew 21.28-22.14*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Olyan, Saul M. "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood." *HTR* 80, no. 3 (1987): 261-86.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Parente, F. "Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis." Pages 69-98 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Proceedings of the Josephus Colloquium 1992 in San Miniato (Italy): Essays in Honor of Morton Smith*. Edited by F. Parente and J. Seivers. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Parry, Donald W., and Elisha Qimron, eds. *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): A New Edition*. STDJ 32. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Pearson, Birger A. "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation." *HTR* 64 (1971): 79-94.
- Poorthuis, Marcel, and Chana Safrai, eds. *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University 1986-1999.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Puech, Émile. *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? Histoire d'une Croyance dans le Judaïsme Ancien*. 2 vols. EBib 22. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.

- Pummer, Reinhard. "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." *HTR* 75 (1982): 177-88.
- . "Samaritan Material Remains." Pages 135-77 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by Alan D. Crown. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- . *The Samaritans*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Purvis, James D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. HSM 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- . "The Samaritans and Judaism." Pages 81-98 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V. Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Rainbow, P. A. "The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness." *JJS* 48 (1997): 30-52.
- Rappaport, Uriel. "Jewish-Pagan Relations and the Revolt against Rome in 66-70 C.E." Pages 81-95 in *Jerusalem Cathedra*. Edited by Lee Levine. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1981.
- Reif, Stefan C. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rhoads, David R. *Israel in Revolution*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Roberto, Umberto. *Ioannis Antiocheni: Fragmenta ex Historia Chronica*. TUGAL 154. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Importance of Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 273-86 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Robinson, J. A. T. "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: A Test of the Synoptic Relationships." *NTS* 21 (1975): 443-61.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- . *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984.

- Rowley, H. H. "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple." Pages 246-76 in *Men of God: Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy*. London: Thomas Nelson, 1963.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. JSOTSup 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . "The Two Calendars of the *Book of Astronomy*." Pages 128-39 in *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. JSPSup 20. Translated by William J. Short. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Safrai, Shmuel. *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- . "Jewish Self-Government." Pages 377-419 in *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Akademon, 1985.
- . "Relations Between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel." Pages 184-215 in *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern 1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . "The Synagogue." Pages 908-44 in *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- . "The Temple and the Divine Service." Pages 282-337 in vol. 7 of the *The World History of the Jewish People: The Herodian Period*. Edited by Michael Avi-Yonah and Zvi Baras. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975.
- . "The Temple and the Synagogue." (in Hebrew). Pages 31-51 in *Synagogues in Antiquity*. Edited by A. Kasher, A. Oppenheimer, and U. Rappaport. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1987.
- Samkutty, V. J. *The Samaritan Mission in Acts*. LNTS 328. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Sanders, E. P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. New York: Penguin, 1993.
- . "Jerusalem and its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice." Pages 90-103 in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Lee Levine. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- . *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

- . *Jewish Law From Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM, 1990.
- . "Judaism and the Grand "Christian" Abstractions: Love, Mercy, and Grace." *Int* 39 (1985): 357-72.
- . *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE*. London: SCM, 1992.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- Sanders, E. P., and Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM, 1989.
- Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Sauer, Georg. *Jesus Sirach / Ben Sira*. ATD Apokryphen 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Schäfer, Peter. "From Jerusalem the Great to Alexandria the Small: The Relationship between Palestine and Egypt in the Graeco-Roman Period." Pages 129-40 in *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. TSAJ 71. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998.
- Schalit, Abraham. *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk*. SJ 4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- Schaper, Joachim. "Numismatik, Epigraphik, alttestamentliche Exegese und die Frage nach der politischen Verfassung des achämenidischen Juda." *ZDPV* 118 (2002): 150-68.
- . "The Pharisees." Pages 402-27 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- . *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of Tevul Yom." *DSD* 1 (1994): 285-99.
- . "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 81-98 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.

- . "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*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994.
- . "The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah." *JQR* 75 (1985): 323-50.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. KEK 7, 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Schmidt, Daryl. "1 Thess 2:13-16: Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation." *JBL* 102 (1983): 269-79.
- Schmidt, Francis. *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism*. Translated by J. Edward Crowley. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*. ZBK NT 3,2. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982.
- Schneider, Gerhard. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. HTKNT 5. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
- Schofield, Alison, and James C. VanderKam. "Were the Hasmonians Zadokites?" *JBL* 124 (2005): 73-87.
- Scholem, Gershom. "Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism." Pages 1-36 in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Schuller, Eileen. "4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph." *RevQ* 14 (55) (1990): 349-76.
- Schur, Nathan. *History of the Samaritans*. 2nd ed. BEATAJ 18. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159-77.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *Agrippa I*. TSAJ 23. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.

- . "The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven." (Hebrew). *Zion* 57 (1997): 5-22.
- . "KATA TOYTON TON KAIRON: Josephus' Source on Agrippa II." *JQR* 72 (1982): 241-68.
- . "'Kingdom of Priests' - a Pharisaic Slogan?" Pages 57-80 in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- . "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees." Pages 67-80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "On Some Papyri and Josephus' Sources and Chronology for the Persian Period." *JSJ* 21 (1991): 175-99.
- . "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifices: Opposition and Spiritualization in the Late Second Temple Period." Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1979.
- . *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2004.
- . "Temple and Desert: On Religion and State in Second Temple Period Judaea." Pages 29-43 in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. WUNT 60. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- . "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium." *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83-91.
- Schwarz, Eberhard. *Identität durch Abgrenzung*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1982.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Soma." Pages 1024-94 in *TDNT*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Schwier, Helmut. *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung: Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg (66-74 n. Chr.)*. NTOA 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Seeligman, Isac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. 2nd ed. FAT 40. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2004.
- Segal, Peretz. "The Penalty of the Warning Inscription from the Temple of Jerusalem." *IEJ* 39, no. 1-2 (1989): 79-84.

- Seybold, Klaus. "Jerusalem in the View of the Psalms." Pages 7-14 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2002.
- Slingerhand, H. Dixon. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. "High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine." *JTS* 13 (1962): 14-34.
- . *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Smith, D. Moody. "Jesus Tradition in the Gospel of John." Pages 81-111 in *The Fourth Gospel in Four Dimensions: Judaism and Jesus, the Gospels and Scripture*. Edited by D. Moody Smith. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2008.
- . *John Among the Gospels*. 2nd ed. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Smith, Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1987.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*. WUNT 27. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- . *Stories With Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.
- Sommers, Benjamin D. "Did Prophecy Cease: Evaluating a Reevaluation." *JBL* 115 (1996): 31-47.
- Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts: Volume III: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Stadelmann, Helge. *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter*. WUNT 2/6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.

- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn, 1971.
- Stemberger, Günter. "The Sadducees: Their History and Doctrines." Pages 428-43 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Volume Three. The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Stenhouse, Paul. *The Kitab al-Tarikh of Abu 'l-Fath*. Sydney: Mandelbaum Trust, 1985.
- Stenning, J. F. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.
- Stern, David. *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Stern, M. "The Death of Onias III." (in Hebrew). *Zion* 25 (1960): 1-16.
- Stern, Menahem. "Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and other Classes." in *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976.
- . *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1984.
- . "'Jerusalem, The Most Famous of the Cities of the East' (Pliny, *Natural History* V, 70)." (in Hebrew). Pages 257-70 in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Edited by A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980.
- Studel, Annette. *Der Midrasch Zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Stevens, Marty E. *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. BZNW 107. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Still, Todd D. *Conflict at Thessalonica: A Pauline Church and its Neighbours*. JSNTSup 183. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." Pages 61-75 in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth and Third Centuries B.C.E.* Edited by Michael E. Stone and David Satran. Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress Press, 1989.
- . "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins." *JSJ* 19, no. 2 (1988): 159-70.

- . *Fourth Ezra*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- . "Reactions to the Destruction of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion." *JSJ* 12 (1981): 195-204.
- . *Scriptures, Sects and Visions*. New York: Collins, 1980.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Günter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated by Markus Bockmuehl. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Strugnell, John. "Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII.18-22." *JBL* 77 (1958): 106-15.
- . "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163-276.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren. "'Reading the Present" in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85-90)." Pages 91-102 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Sussmann, Yaacov. "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 179-200 in *Qumran Cave 4. V. Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. Edited by Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Suter, David. "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16." *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-35.
- . "Revisiting "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest"." *Hen* 24 (2002): 137-42.
- Sweet, J. P. M. "A House Not Made with Hands." Pages 368-90 in *Templum Amicitiae*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert." Pages 162-99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958.
- . "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 3-24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

- Taylor, Joan. "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias." *JSJ* 29 (1998): 297-321.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1933.
- Tcherikover, Victor, ed. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957-1964.
- . *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1959.
- Theissen, Gerd. "Die Tempelweissagung Jesu: Prophetie in Spannungsfeld von Stadt und Land." *TZ* 32 (1976): 144-58.
- . *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. NTOA 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Thomas, Joseph. *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 v. J.-C. - 300 apr. J.-C.)*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1935.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. SBLEJL 4. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- . "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 4 (1997): 312-35.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch." Pages 397-407 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by Alan D. Crown. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1982.
- Trocmé, Étienne. "L'Expulsion des Marchands du Temple." *NTS* 15 (1968): 1-22.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

- Tsedaka, Benyamin. "Samaritanism - Judaism or Another Religion?" Pages 47-51 in *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties*. Edited by Menachem Mor. Omaha: Creighton University Press, 1992.
- Turner, Nigel. *Syntax*. Vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edited by James Hope Moulton. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.
- Turner, Victor. "The Center Out There: Pilgrim's Goal." *HR* 12 (1973): 191-230.
- Tyson, Joseph B. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- van Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 215-27 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*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- VanderKam, James C. "2 Maccabees 6, 7a and the Calendrical Change in Jerusalem." *JSJ* 12, no. 1 (1981): 52-74.
- . *The Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. Lovanii: Aedibus E. Peeters, 1989.
- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- . "Identity and History of the Community." Pages 489-533 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364 Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses." *CBQ* 41 (1979): 380-411.

- . "Simon the Just: Simon I or Simon II?" Pages 303-18 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Vermes, Geza. *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda*. 2nd ed. Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1954.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *Messianism and Mishnah: Time and Place in the Early Halakhah*. The Louis Caplan Lecture on Jewish Law: Hebrew Union College Press, 1979.
- Wagner, J. Ross. "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread." Pages 154-78 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Universalistic and Particularistic Trends During the Exile and Restoration." Pages 251-66 in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. LSTS 54. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Wenschkewitz, Hans. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Angelos-Beiheft 4. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932.
- Widengren, Geo. "The Persian Period." Pages 489-538 in *Israelite and Judaeon History*. Edited by John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.
- Wiedemann, Thomas. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Wiess, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Wilcken, Ulrich. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde)*. 2 vols. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1927.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. "Stulos." in *TDNT*. Edited by Gerhard Freidrich⁷. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. WBC 16. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- . "The Historical Value of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities XI, 297-301." *JTS* 28 (1977): 49-66.

- . "Sanballat." Pages 5.973-75 in *ABD*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Wise, M. O. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103-32.
- Wrede, William. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1971.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood." Pages 189-222 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research*. Edited by P.C. Beentjes. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- . "Sirach and 1 Enoch: Some Further Considerations." *Hen* 24 (2002): 179-87.
- Wright, G. Ernest. *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Wright, R. B. "Psalms of Solomon." Pages 2.639-70 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Yadin, Y. "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)." *IEJ* 9 (1959): 95-98.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Young, Frances M. "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity." *NTS* 19 (1973): 325-38.
- Zangenberg, Jürgen. *Frühes Christentum in Samarien: Topographische und traditionsgeschichtliche Studien zu den Samaritentexten im Johannesevangelium*. TANZ 27. Tübingen: Francke, 1998.
- Zias, Joseph, and Azriel Gorski. "Capturing a Beautiful Woman at Masada." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 69 (2006): 45-48.
- Zsengellér, József. "Maccabees and Temple Propaganda." Pages 181-95 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Biography

Timothy Wardle was born in South Bend, Indiana on October 4, 1974. He earned a B.A. from Wheaton College in Illinois in 1997, double-majoring in History and Biblical Studies. Two years later he traveled to Israel and earned a M.A. in Religious Studies from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 2002. Most recently, he has been enrolled at Duke University in the Graduate Program in Religion (2002-2008). While in Durham, NC, Tim and his wife Cherie have welcomed three daughters, Autumn Elizabeth (4), Aspen Ruth (3) and Brooke Abigail (8 months), into their family. While writing this dissertation, he has also precepted extensively in Duke's Divinity School and has been a Visiting Instructor at Duke University and Meredith College.