The Setting and Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors

by

Read Ward Marlatte



A thesis submitted for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
at the University of Oxford

Oriel College
Hilary, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 5

SHORT ABSTRACT 7

LONG ABSTRACT 9

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 14
1.1. THE QUESTION OF PAUL AND THE TEMPLE 14
1.2. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION 16
1.2.1. Spiritualization *17*
1.2.2. Critique of Spiritualization *25*
1.2.3. Other Models and Ways Forward *31*
1.3. METAPHOR THEORY AND PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS 33
1.3.1. Prolegomena to Conceptual Metaphor Theory *33*
1.3.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory *38*
1.3.2.1. The Conduit Metaphor 38
1.3.2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory 39
1.3.3. Hermeneutical Implications for Paul's Temple Metaphors *44*
1.4. EFFECTIVE-HISTORY 46
1.4.1. Effective-History in Philosophical Hermeneutics *46*
1.4.2. Effective-History in New Testament Studies *52*
1.5. THE SETTING AND EARLY EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS ..55

CHAPTER TWO: THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN SECOND TEMPLE PRACTICE AND THOUGHT 61
2.1. INTRODUCTION 61
2.2. ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD ..62
2.2.1. Procedure *62*
2.2.2. The Singularity of the Temple in Jerusalem *63*
2.2.3. Jewish Pilgrimage in the First Century CE *65*
2.2.4. The Jewish Temple Tax *68*
2.2.5. Threats to the Jerusalem Temple *71*
2.2.6. Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple *75*
2.2.7. Conclusion *79*
2.3. CRITICISM OF THE CULT IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD 81
2.3.1. Cultic Criticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls *82*
2.3.1.1. The Dead Sea Sectarians and the Essenes 84
2.3.1.2. Sectarian Criticism of the Cult 86
2.3.2. Other Criticisms of the Cult *95*
2.3.2.1. Sibylline Oracles 4 96
2.3.2.2. Stephen's Speech, Acts 7.2-53 99
2.3.3. Criticism of the Cult: Conclusion *103*

2.4. THE TEMPLE AS CONCEPT IN SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH THOUGHT 105
2.4.1. Temple Metaphor in the Dead Sea Scrolls *106*
2.4.1.1. The Community Rule 108
2.4.1.2. 4QFlorilegium 112
2.4.2. The Temple in Philo of Alexandria *116*
2.5. CONCLUSION 124

CHAPTER THREE: PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS 126
3.1. INTRODUCTION 126
3.2. PAUL AND THE TEMPLE 128
3.2.1. Romans 9.4 ..... *129*
3.2.2. 1 Corinthians 9.13-14 ..... *134*
3.2.3. 1 Corinthians 10.14-22 ..... *138*
3.2.4. Paul and the Temple: Conclusion *143*
3.3. PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS 145
3.3.1. 1 Corinthians 3.16-17 ..... *145*
3.3.2. 1 Corinthians 6.19-20 ..... *157*
3.3.3. 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1 ..... *160*
3.3.3.1. The Authenticity and Integrity of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 160
3.3.3.2. The Temple Metaphor in 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 165
3.4. EPHESIANS 2.11-22 169
3.4.1. Introduction *169*
3.4.2. Ephesians and 1 Corinthians *171*
3.4.3. Conceptual and Verbal Correspondence *173*
3.4.3.1. Ephesians 2.11-13 173
3.4.3.2. Ephesians 2.14-18 175
3.4.3.3. Ephesians 2.19-22 177
3.4.4. Ephesians 2.11-22 and The Dead Sea Scrolls *181*
3.4.5. The Development of Paul's Temple Metaphor *183*
3.4.6. Ephesians 2.11-22 as Effective-History *185*
3.5. CONCLUSION 188

CHAPTER FOUR: EARLY EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS (1): 1 PETER 2.4-10 192
4.1. INTRODUCTION 192
4.2. IS THERE A TEMPLE METAPHOR IN 1 PETER 2.5? 194
4.3. 1 PETER AND PAUL 201
4.4. 1 PETER 2.4-10 AND PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS 206
4.4.1. 1 Peter 2.6-10: The Use of the Scripture *207*
4.4.2. 1 Peter 2.4-5: The Structure of the Temple Metaphor *213*
4.4.2.1. Christ the Cornerstone 213
4.4.2.2. Building and Growth 216
4.4.2.3. A Spiritual House 219
4.4.2.4. A Holy Priesthood 221
4.4.2.5. Race, Nation, People 225

4.5. Conclusion 228

Chapter Five: Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors (2): The Epistle to the Hebrews 234
5.1. Introduction 234
5.2. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Corpus 236
5.2.1. A Brief History of Reception of Hebrews and Paul 236
5.2.2. Recent Accounts of Hebrews and Paul 245
5.3. Hebrews' Tent and Paul's Temple: A Comparison of Cultic Language 249
5.3.1. The Tent and not the Temple 249
5.3.2. The Tent in Hebrews - A Sketch and a Shadow 254
5.3.3. Sacrifice in Hebrews - Once for All 262
5.3.4. The Great High Priest 268
5.4. Cultic Criticism and Supersession in Hebrews 270
5.5. Conclusion 276

Chapter Six: Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors (3): The *Epistle of Barnabas* 280
6.1. Introduction 280
6.2. *The Epistle of Barnabas* – Contextual Issues 281
6.2.1. Authorship 281
6.2.2. Provenance 283
6.2.3. Date 285
6.2.3.1. *Barnabas* 16.3-4 286
6.2.3.2. *Barnabas* 4.4-6a 296
6.3. The Issue of the Temple in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 299
6.4. The *Epistle of Barnabas* and Paul 310
6.5. Paul's Temple Metaphor and the *Epistle of Barnabas* 316
6.5.1. Barnabas 4.11 317
6.5.2. Barnabas 6.15 320
6.5.3. Barnabas 16.10 323
6.6. Conclusion 329

Chapter Seven: Conclusion 332

Bibliography 340

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support of a multitude of people. First and foremost, the space allowed for by this section and the prose of its author are both grossly insufficient to express the immeasurable gratitude I owe to my thesis supervisor, Markus Bockmuehl. Through a decade of delays and setbacks, you never gave up on my project or on me. You met my challenges with tireless patience, steadfast belief, and unflagging empathy, while simultaneously engaging my work through exceptionally close readings and with uncompromising and challenging examination. The mere submission of this thesis is a testament to your immense stature as a conscientious scholar, a dedicated supervisor, and a devoted friend.

I would also like to thank those who formally examined my thesis: Christopher Rowland, Christopher Tuckett, David Lincicum, and my final examiners, Richard Ounsworth and James Carleton Paget. Your comments, questions, and critiques provided an invaluable contribution not only to the completion of this research in its final form, but also to my own intellectual development.

This thesis also would not have found its completion without the contributions of my friends and colleagues at Regent's Park College, Keble College, Oriel College, and at home in Vancouver. I would especially like to thank William Wood, whose hiring of me as a Graduate Teaching Assistant at Oriel College not only acted as a catalyst for my submission, but also taught me how to be a better thinker and teacher. Thank you for being an exemplary mentor and loyal friend.

To my parents George and Donna Marlatte, I am unable to overemphasize your contribution to and investment in this degree. Mum, not only did you teach me how to

read and write, but you also taught me to fall in love with both. No one has spent more time reading, and often correcting, my words and throughout you have been my most constant cheerleader, supporter, and friend. The two of us sitting at my dining room table up until the day of my submission, editing my work and going for walks will remain among my most cherished memories. Dad, thank you for encouraging me to "just write the *thing*". I know that the long hours you worked and weekends you had to be away all those years were all to facilitate opportunities for me such as attending Oxford. While this thesis in no way equals the sacrifices you have made for me, I do hope that it makes you proud.

To my sister and brother-in-law Thea and Jonathan Reimer, thank you for being my most insightful and inspiring interlocutors. Thea, from a young age you have taught me the necessity of intellectual engagement and to this day, I aspire to your level of academic rigor and am constantly awestruck by your ability to overcome any challenge you face. You are an academic Amazon, the likes of whom are matched only by your husband and my now brother Jon. I will always look up to you big sister.

Finally, to my fiancé and soon-to-be wife Alexandria Rash, your arrival in my life brought with it a transformed confidence, a renewed sense of motivation, unconditional support, and was unquestionably the *sine qua non* for my return to Oxford and the completion of my degree. You made the impossible in my life possible, and continue to do so every day. I am eternally grateful you chose me even though it required time zone separation, transatlantic travel, and endless late night editing. You are the love of my life and the reason I am where am and am who I am.

SHORT ABSTRACT
THE SETTING AND EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS

This study examines the nature, function, and implications of Paul's Temple metaphors (1 Cor 3.16-17, 6.19-20; 2 Cor 6.14-7.1) and asks whether these metaphors indicate that the Jerusalem Temple has been superseded by the Christian community. Answers to this question have often relied upon the prioritization of particular backgrounds for Paul's language and the implementation of ideologically biased, interpretive models such as *spiritualization*. Issues arise in both these procedures due to the hermeneutical ambiguities involved in identifying metaphorical meaning. Our approach to Paul's Temple metaphors utilizes the analytical tools provided by Conceptual Metaphor Theory and calls for an awareness of these metaphors' early effective-history. Metaphors do not contain meaning but rather provide a conceptual structure that generates meaning through a hermeneutical act. Thus, in order to understand Paul's metaphors we must recognize not only their conceptual structures, but also how these structures have generated meanings and, as a result, how these meanings have shaped our interpretations of Paul himself.

The historical setting of Paul's Temple metaphors is examined first in order to establish a set of assumptions and anticipations of meaning for when we encounter this type of language in this period. The public behaviour of the majority of Jews towards the Temple, as well as the presence of cultic criticisms, and conceptualizations in the Second Temple period demonstrate a widespread adherence to and support for the Temple. Turning to Paul's metaphors, we see how the Temple provides a conceptual model with which Paul can structure and reason about the status of both the community and body as

indwelt and holy. While these metaphors do not suggest a deviation from Temple adherence, we demonstrate how they offer a set of conceptual and linguistic tools open to various interpretations and applications. We then examine a series of texts which highlight aspects of these metaphors' early effective-history: Ephesians 2.11-22, 1 Peter 2.4-10, Hebrews, and the *Epistle of Barnabas*. Through actualizing Paul's metaphors or by being associated with them, we observe how subsequent texts interpret, extend, and apply these metaphors to address their own particular questions. Awareness of this early effective-history reveals the semantic potential of these texts and allows us to reflect on the origins of some of our own interpretive tendencies, particularly those which lead us to supersessionist interpretations of Paul.

Thus we conclude that a supersession of the Temple and its cult is not demonstrable from Paul's Temple metaphors as this is not the question these texts seek to answer. However, the conceptual framework provided by these metaphors places no observable hermeneutical constraints such that these texts could not be utilized in different historical circumstances to address the question of the validity of the Temple in relation to the Christian community. Observing how these metaphors provide conceptual structure and generate meaning enhances our understanding not only of Paul's texts, but also of ourselves as interpreters of Paul.

LONG ABSTRACT
THE SETTING AND EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS

This study aims to investigate the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors (1 Cor 3.16-17, 6.19-20; 2 Cor 6.14-7.1). These metaphors are most commonly examined in order to answer the question of whether Paul believed that the Christian community had replaced the Jerusalem Temple in both standing and function. In what follows, we address the question of Paul's view of the Temple but further inquire into whether this is the question that these metaphors seek to answer. We approach these issues by establishing an appropriate historical setting for Paul's Temple metaphors, while also utilizing the central insights of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and creating an awareness of these texts' early effective-history.

In CHAPTER ONE, we review various approaches to Paul's Temple metaphors, focusing primarily on the most commonly used model: *spiritualization*. This approach suggests that Paul and his cultic language should be placed within a larger narrative of development away from ritual practice which results in a supersessionist reading of Paul. The descriptive power of *spiritualization* is limited and can be criticized for being evolutionary, dualistic, and incoherent. While competing models provide more suitable approaches by focusing on the function of Paul's language, the multitude of possible backgrounds posited by these studies and the variety of interpretations that result, suggest the need for a better account of the hermeneutical implications of this language's metaphorical meaning.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory defines metaphor as a mapping wherein a conceptual structure from a source domain is mapped onto a target domain. This mapping fixes a set of correspondences between the two domains and allows reasoning about the

target domain to take place using the conceptual structure provided by the source. Thus abstract subject matter can be understood in terms of more concrete experiences. However, a metaphor's meaning is not contained within this structure. Rather this mapping generates meaning through an act of construal on the part of the interpreter. Since this is a hermeneutical act, it is necessary for us to reflect upon how our own construals of these metaphors are achieved through becoming increasingly aware of how these metaphors have been construed by those before us. Therefore, we argue that an exposure to the early effective-history of these Temple metaphors will not only illuminate the possibilities of their meanings, but also allow us to scrutinize our own interpretive tendencies, particularly those which result in supersessionist readings of Paul.

In CHAPTER TWO, we examine the setting of Paul's Temple metaphors. By setting, we do not refer to this language's essential background or to parallels, but rather aim at establishing a set of historical assumptions and anticipations of meaning which we can foreground for our examination of Paul. Our focus is not on a collection of discrete statements about the cult, but on the public behaviour of Jews in the period towards the Temple. In surveying Jewish pilgrimage, the payment of the Temple tax, the Gaius incident, and reactions of the destruction to the Temple, we aim to demonstrate that overwhelmingly the standard posture towards the Temple by Jews was one of support and adherence. From this vantage point, we examine criticisms and conceptualizations of the Temple cult, particularly those found in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Philo. We argue that this language, with few possible exceptions, signifies the centrality and indispensibilty of the Temple institution, not the desire to replace it.

In CHAPTER THREE, we turn to a historical and rhetorical examination of Paul's Temple metaphors. We preface this discussion with an assessment of Paul's direct statements toward the cult (Rom 9.4, 1 Cor 9.13, 10.18) to see if these reveal his views of the institution and thus can guide our analysis of his metaphors. Here we observe a general respect for the Temple and begin to discern how Paul can draw principles from a cultic domain and map them onto other phenomena (Rom 12.1, 15.16). In 1 Cor 3.16-17, we demonstrate how Paul develops a conceptual structure drawn from the domain of the Temple and uses it to address the issue of divisions in Corinth. This mapping provides Paul with a framework within which he can lead the Corinthians to understand themselves as holy and indwelt. 1 Cor 6.19-20 maps the Temple domain onto a different target, the body. However, a similar structure of correspondences is fixed in order to address a different issue, sexual morality. The dual targets for Paul's mappings suggests that he is utilizing the Temple as a conceptual tool rather than claiming an ontological identity. 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 is complicated by issues of authenticity and integrity, but exhibits a similar conceptual structure. Here, the metaphor is connected with scriptural citations which may suggest eschatological fulfillment, though this need not denote a supersession of the Jerusalem Temple.

CHAPTER THREE ends with an analysis of Eph 2.11-22. This text both belongs to the Pauline corpus and also represents the earliest instantiation of an effect of Paul's Temple metaphors. Thus the analysis here serves as both a model for and bridge into our subsequent case studies into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. In Eph 2.11-22, we observe how the metaphorical structure of 1 Cor 3.16-17 is extended and adapted to address the question of Jew and gentile relations in the church.

Our first case study into the effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors examines 1 Pet 2.4-10 and follows the procedure introduced by our analysis of Eph 2.11-22. In CHAPTER FOUR, we argue that the Petrine author uses the phrase οἶκος πνευματικός to construct a Temple metaphor that draws upon the conceptual structure provided by Paul. The metaphor here is employed to console the community and define them as the holy and elected people of God. However, the Temple conceptualization is combined with other cultic metaphors drawn from Paul and synthesized into a single metaphorical structure. This may reveal an underlying conceptual system in Paul, but also highlights particular conceptual strategies that the apostle himself does not employ.

Our second case study is on the Epistle to the Hebrews. However, in CHAPTER FIVE we do not observe an actualization of Paul's Temple metaphors, but rather examine how the literary association between Hebrews and Paul has affected the ways in which Paul's metaphors are construed. Through a survey of its ancient reception and modern interpretation, we argue that Hebrews has functioned as a supplement to the Pauline corpus, as an epistle addressed to Jews about the Jewish cult. In Hebrews, the superior realities of a heavenly tent, the sacrifice of Christ, and Christ's role of high priest are presented as contingent upon the inefficacy of the institutions on which they are modeled. While Hebrews does not mention the Temple, the system of contingency explicated by this epistle, when associated with Paul, provides a particular logic and set of implications for how the apostle's metaphors are to be construed.

The final case study in CHAPTER SIX is on the *Epistle of Barnabas*. We argue that *Barnabas* was composed in the Roman East c. 98 CE and addresses a renewal of Jewish hopes in a rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple. *Barnabas* employs Temple metaphors

that bear conceptual and linguistic resemblances to Paul's (*Barn.* 4.11, 6.15, 16.10) but utilizes them within a critique of cultic practices in order to suggest the non-necessity of the Jerusalem Temple. These metaphors create a polemic that determines that the Christian community is the eschatological fulfillment of and ontological replacement for the Jewish Temple, in what can appropriately be deemed a *spiritualization* of the Temple. However, we note that aspects of this critique of cult and metaphorical actualization are reliant on the reality of the destruction of the Temple which should lead us to reevaluate some of the models and assumptions we bring to bear on Paul's metaphors.

Therefore, we conclude that it cannot be demonstrated that Paul's Temple metaphors indicate a supersession of the Jerusalem Temple while it still stood. The setting of these metaphors does not lead us to assume supersession when we encounter this language, nor are these metaphors ever connected in Paul's texts with an explicit critique or replacement of the Temple. Rather these metaphors seek to provide a conceptual structure for an exposition of the status of the Christian community and body. Drawing upon the highly delineated and well-known conceptual domain of the Temple, Paul is able to reason about new and less well-defined phenomena: the individual's and collective's identity as holy and indwelt. However, by fixing a set of correspondences between the Temple and the community/body, Paul creates a series of conceptual and linguistic tools with which subsequent authors could address different questions for different ends. By understanding this language as metaphor and by becoming aware of how it has been construed historically, we can better account for the questions that we, as interpreters of Paul, bring to bear on our understanding of his Temple metaphors.

CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE QUESTION OF PAUL AND THE TEMPLE

This study seeks to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors (1 Cor 3.16, 6.19-20; 2 Cor 6.14-7.1) through an examination of their setting and early effective-history.[1] To this end we investigate the nature, function, and implications of these metaphors with regard to the reconstruction of Paul's view of the Temple and potential supersession of the cult. Composed by a Jewish author writing before the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, do these metaphors indicate that Paul believed that the Temple in Jerusalem had been replaced, in both standing and function, by the Christian community? From the dialogical perspective of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, "[w]e can understand a text only when we have understood the question to which it is an answer."[2] Therefore, we do not simply put the question of Paul's view of the Temple to these metaphors, but rather inquire whether Paul's view of the Temple is the question that these metaphors seek to answer. In order to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors we pursue answers to two queries: the question of Paul's view of the Temple, and whether this question is the right question to ask at all. In doing so, we shall see that Paul's Temple metaphors invite the question of Paul's view of the Temple, not because they aim to address this question, but because they provide the resources to answer it so well.

---

[1] This term is a translation of the German *Wirkungsgeschichte*, coined in this technical sense by Gadamer 2004. In this study we opt for the conventional translation "effective-history", hyphenating the words in order to demonstrate the unity of the concept. See section 1.4.1 below.
[2] Gadamer 2004:363.

To answer these questions, we enter into a conversation with three interlocutors: the historical setting of Paul's Temple metaphors, Paul's texts themselves, and a sampling of these texts' early effective-history.[3] By utilizing the central insights of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, we address these issues with an approach that is both historically grounded and hermeneutically self-reflective. Thus, this study aims to establish that there is insufficient evidence to claim that Paul's Temple metaphors were intended to polemicize or supersede the Jewish Temple and its cult. Rather, we demonstrate how Paul is able to derive conceptual models from well-established cultural and religious experiences and apply them to structure his understanding of a new, undelinenated phenomenon: the Christian community and body. At the same time, these metaphors display no observable hermeneutical constraints such that they could not provide the linguistic and conceptual tools with which to construct a position regarding the Jerusalem Temple under different historical circumstances. This is not to argue for a linear or necessary trajectory from Paul's texts to a replacement of the Temple. Rather we claim that Paul constructed distinct and formative Temple metaphors. These metaphors provided subsequent authors tools with which to answer questions that Paul's texts themselves do not ask. These answers have, in turn, shaped and directed the questions that we, as interpreters of Paul, now ask of these metaphors.

---

[3] Nicholls 2008:5, taking her lead from Mitchell 2000, suggests "three-way conversation between the 'effect', the present-day reader and the text itself." We also include the 'setting' of Paul's Temple metaphors in this conversation as a means of reflecting upon our historical assumptions and anticipations of meaning.

1.2. The State of the Question

In order to address the question of Paul and the Temple we must first explore how it is currently being asked. Regarding the interpretation of Paul's letters in general, Boyarin claims,

> If one measure of the greatness of a work of literature is its ability to support many interpretations, then certainly these texts must range among the very greatest of literature, for they have spawned and continue to spawn – anew every morning – not only new interpretations of particular passages but entirely new constructions of their complete thought world.[4]

This insight is particularly acute in its application to the interpretation of Paul's metaphors. Indeed, it has been the case that the reinterpretation of particular metaphors have led to complete reconstructions of Paul's thought world.[5] Similarly, entire thought worlds or historical narratives are constructed and posited in order to identify the meaning of certain metaphors.[6]

When it comes to the question of Paul's cultic metaphors, including his Temple metaphors, one can chart the modern history of this question through an account of one such reconstruction, the *spiritualization* model. This model suggests that Paul's language about cult and Temple must be understood within a larger narrative concerning religious development regarding material ritual practice. This narrative results in a particularly supersessionist reading of Paul. In this section, we trace the history of this *spiritualization* model and observe how it has provided, and continues to provide the analytical tools and interpretive frameworks within which Paul's language is understood. We shall also note

---

[4] Boyarin 1994:1.

[5] As one example, we may look to the various reconstructions of Paul's thought world determined by the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη and δικαιόω. For a summary of the modern debates, see Westerholm 2004:101-258.

[6] Similarly, in Sanders 1977:75 we observe how the positing of a new background, in this case 'covenantal nomism', completely alters our understanding of the metaphors mentioned in n.5 and creates a 'New Perspective on Paul'.

criticisms of this approach and competing models. In doing so we shall see that the primary problem in addressing Paul's Temple metaphors lies not in locating an appropriate historical background, but rather in issues with the exegesis of metaphor itself.

1.2.1. Spiritualization

The modern use of the term *spiritualization* can be traced back to the work of Hans Wenschkewitz. For Wenschkewitz, *spiritualization* can be observed when cultic terminology is applied "to a cultic event in a manner not in the strict sense of ritualism."[7] A distinction emerges between "naïve *spiritualization*", found in the Old Testament, Pseudepigrapha, and Apocrypha, and "reflective *spiritualization*" seen amongst Stoics, in particular Philo of Alexandria. Wenschkewitz detects a tension between Hellenistic and Jewish views of the body and sees *spiritualization* as a fusion of Jewish morality into a Hellenistic philosophical framework. In the New Testament, the major catalyst for *spiritualization* is the atoning death of Christ.

Wenschkewitz's work remains highly influential and most subsequent mention of *spiritualization* will make reference to it. Several tendencies established by Wenschkewitz become developed and more evident in later elaborations of his work. First, writing before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Wenschkewitz identifies *spiritualization* as a Hellenistic pattern of thought. Second, he places *spiritualization* within a historical process of linear development. Third, he sees this process resulting in the ultimate separation between ritual and its underlying principles. Wenschkewitz is

---

[7] Wenschkewitz 1932:228, "auf ein nicht in strengen Sinne des Ritualismus kultisches Geschehen."

often easy to criticize. At the same time, that his theory could be applied so effectively to the yet to be discovered Dead Sea Scrolls may speak to its utility.

Weiß formalizes and develops Wenschkewitz's arguments. Weiß more than Wenschkewitz sees a strong, if not irresolvable tension, between ritual and spiritual meaning. *Spiritualization* creates an essentially new, non-ritualistic, religious perspective. He defines *spiritualization*:

> It is a matter not of an external but of an internal detachment from cultic processes and objects because these are perceived as an expression no longer valid or even in contradiction to the intended and spiritual realities.[8]

Spiritualization is viewed as an inevitable historical process in which the validity of ritual acts is called into question.

In the English-speaking world, C.F.D. Moule reconstructs a "sanctuary and sacrifice apologia" that forms part of a wider early Christian catechesis aimed at answering Jewish questions concerning the absence of a Christian material cult. Moule speaks of St. Paul taking "a certain delight also in 'sublimating' the Levitical terms and Judaistic phrases, which had formerly been his boast, into purely spiritual senses, wholly on the level of personal relationships and volition."[9] The speech of Stephen in Acts 7 is "a defense of the living, personal, progressive nature of true Judaism – the Judaism of the Christians, as against a rigid and static externalism."[10] Ultimately, "Judaism itself implies Christianity."[11]

---

[8] Weiß 1954:361, "[e]s handelt sich nicht um eine äußere, sondern eine innere Loslösung von den kultischen Vorgängen und Objekten, weil diese als nicht mehr gültiger Ausdruck oder geradezu als im Widerspruch zu den gemeinten und beabsichtigen geistigen Wirklichkeiten stehend empfunden werden."
[9] Moule 1950:36.
[10] Moule 1950:29.
[11] Moule 1950:37.

The foundations laid by these early works on *spiritualization* were formalized, most influentially, in the works of Gärtner, McKelvey, Young, Daly, and Finlan. Gärtner argues that the self-identity of the Temple is the fundamental tenet of the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which provides the essential background for the New Testament Church. He constructs a progression from the Maccabees to the Rabbis in which the law begins to occupy a more prominent position and which sets the stage for "a spiritualizing of the temple and the terms of the cultus."[12] During this process, the Qumran sectarians "transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem temple to the community."[13] Gärtner provides us with a further definition of *spiritualization*:

> The word is used to indicate the transference of the concrete entity, the temple building, to a more 'spiritual' realm in the living community, and of the sacrifices to deeds in the life lived according to the Law.[14]

Spiritualization can also be seen in Philo and Josephus, but they lack the messianic self-consciousness, the *verus*-Israel self-identity, and explicit criticisms of the Jerusalem Temple which are found in the Scrolls. For this reason Gärtner argues that the New Testament Temple symbolism originated in the Qumran tradition.[15] Gärtner's work has remained influential foremost for seeing the Dead Sea Scrolls as the hermeneutic key to understanding New Testament Temple imagery.

R.J. McKelvey, like Gärtner, is an heir of Wenschkewitz. McKelvey also sees an evolution in the history of Israel, from cultic forms to law-based religion. The Psalms and

---

[12] Gärtner 1965:18.
[13] Gärtner 1965:18.
[14] Gärtner 1965:19.
[15] Gärtner 1965:56, "[t]he overall resemblance to the Qumran symbolism is so striking as to prompt the question whether the temple symbolism of the early Church, a symbolism which was to become so important in the ecclesiology of the New Testament, may not have originated in the Qumran tradition."

the prophets provided the building blocks for *spiritualization* which can be observed later in the Stoics, Philo and the Dead Sea Scrolls but was truly achieved following the destruction of the Temple. McKelvey has a more guarded approach to the definition of *spiritualization*. He states:

> The word 'spiritual' is not altogether satisfactory for our purpose. The opposition in character and in quality to what is bodily, material, and earthly which the term normally implies does not apply to the Bible and ancient tradition, which never divorced the material and the spiritual. *Spiritualization* of worship means its interiorization, inasmuch as the emphasis is on the intention, disposition, and motivation of the worshipper, but it means more than this, for the ancients were not only concerned with *why* a certain thing was done but *that* it was done.[16]

It is strange, however, that these remarks, found in a footnote, do not shape the subsequent analysis. He analyzes the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, the Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament all in terms of *spiritualization*. His conclusions are more balanced than those of Gärtner, particularly with regard to Paul whose view of the Temple, McKelvey claims, demonstrates "a certain ambivalence."[17] However, as the title of his work *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* suggests, McKelvey's views are ultimately supersessionist, viewing the *spiritualization* of the cult in the New Testament as an effective substitute for literal cultic practice.

Frances Young's work charts the development of *spiritualization* in Judaism, pagan philosophy and Christianity. The biblical prophets' moralizing and the Psalms' internalization began this process and led the Deuteronomist to remould the rituals of the Priestly Code.[18] This tendency towards *spiritualization* was advanced by the decentralization of the Jewish people in the diaspora and the focus on synagogue

---

[16] McKelvey 1969:42 n.1.
[17] McKelvey 1969:123.
[18] Young 1983:32.

worship, ultimately leading to a more spiritual religion. Like Moule before her, she reconstructs what she sees as the Christian spiritualized cult:

> The spiritual cult was the offering of prayers, the spiritual altar was the mind of faithful Christians, and spiritual images of God were the virtues implanted in men by Christ. The body of Christ was a spiritual Temple. The Christian people continually celebrated feasts by constant prayer and fasts and through the abstention from wickedness. Above all, Christ himself was the perfect sacrifice and the High Priest through whom Christian prayers were offered. The Christians claimed that they *did* have a cult, but it was entirely immaterial.[19]

Once more the spiritual cult is intricately systematized and seen as a substitution for the literal cult.

Robert Daly defines *spiritualization* as:

> All those movements and tendencies within Judaism and Christianity which attempted to emphasize the true meaning of sacrifice, that is, the inner, spiritual, or ethical significance of the cult over against the merely material or merely external understanding of it.[20]

He lists as synonyms: *dematerializing, sublimating, humanizing, deepening, ethicizing, rationalizing, interiorizing, symbolizing* and includes within this process: i) the effort among Jews to make material sacrifices an expression of an ethically good life, ii) prophetic criticism of the sacrificial cult, iii) philosophically influenced doubts about the sense of offering material sacrifice to a spiritual God, iv) the necessity of finding substitutes, and v) various practices in areas of cult and worship in which Christians saw the old economy of salvation superseded. These phenomena, Daly asserts, have in common "a shift in emphasis from material to the spiritual,"[21] though he concedes, "[s]piritualization is a term so open to different and even opposing meanings that it can hardly be defined adequately, let alone be represented by a few synonyms."[22]

---

[19] Young 1983:54.
[20] Daly 1978:7.
[21] Daly 1978:7.
[22] Daly 1978:6.

Daly also sees *spiritualization* as a historical process, but formalizes this process by identifying three stages within a wider "Spiritualizing Trend" in early Christianity. These stages are as follows: i) where dispositions are emphasized while ceremonial action remains central, ii) where ceremonial actions become superfluous, iii) the incarnational *spiritualization* of sacrifice. This last stage is where "the internal dispositions for spiritualized sacrifice are not needed just for prayer and worship; they must… be incarnated in the practical, diaconal, and ministerial deeds of the Christian life."[23]

Until the work of Finlan, Daly's book provides the most detailed exposition of the mechanics and process of *spiritualization*. However, the use of the term is ubiquitous in other discussions of Paul and the Temple. Heikki Räisänen views Paul's *spiritualization* of cult as being drawn from his experience of the Antiochene synagogues. He focuses on Hellenistic spiritualization, those whose "spiritualized view of Torah"[24] led them to discard the requirement of circumcision. As a result the ritual part of the law becomes *adiaphoron*, a matter of indifference. Dalferth, citing both McKelvey and Wenschkewitz, locates the Christian appropriation of sacrifice within a general and widespread process of *spiritualization*:

> For *spiritualization*, I should like to suggest, is a process of symbolization by which things or actions (or descriptions of things, events and actions) become used as interpretative symbols, that is, by which the meaning which things, events or actions have acquired in one context is used to discover, to elucidate, to articulate or to represent the meaning of things or events in some other context.[25]

---

[23] Daly 1978:138.
[24] Räisänen 1986:300.
[25] Dalferth 1991:307.

Later he clarifies that this involves a concentration on the *notion* of sacrifice rather than sacrifice itself and a shift from the purely cultic to the wider religious and ethical implications of this notion. Boyarin takes Gal 3.26-9 as the hermeneutical key to Paul's thinking and states, "[t]he very impulse toward universalism, toward the One, is that which both enabled and motivated Paul's move toward a spiritualizing and allegorizing interpretation of Israel's Scripture and Law as well."[26] Paul thus creates a dualism, both hermeneutical and ontological, in order to universalize Jewish theology. Boyarin states, "for Paul truth lies in the spiritual, allegorical interpretation of text, history, and world, while the physical is but a shadow of this truth."[27] Roetzel also claims a *spiritualization* hermeneutic for Paul which he inherited from his Pharisaic background. However, this "*spiritualization* of cult recognizes the axiomatic nature of the sacrificial cult."[28]

Finlan's *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors* provides the fullest exposition of the term *spiritualization*.[29] Finlan, acknowledging that *spiritualization* has a range of meanings, provides a great service by cataloguing uses of this term. He creates Six Levels of *spiritualization* which describe the various uses of the term in scholarly discourse:

1) The Transformation of Ritual through Substitution[30]
2) Increasing Symbolic or Moralizing Interpretation[31]
3) Internalization[32]

---

[26] Boyarin 1994:8.
[27] Boyarin 1994:86.
[28] Roetzel 1999:192 n.93.
[29] His position here is later defended in Finlan 2011.
[30] This pertains particularly to the replacement of human sacrifice with animal sacrifice, Finlan 2004:47. Cf. Levenson 1995:4-6, 20-23.
[31] Finlan 2004:48-49 refers to "attributing new spiritual and abstract meanings to the cult practice; for instance, adding morality to the notion of purification."
[32] Finlan 2004:49-50 defines this as the assertion that "what matters to God is the right attitude." Cf. Psalms 51.10, 17; 141.2.

4) Metaphorical Application of Cultic Terms to Non-Cultic Experiences[33]
5) Repudiation of Sacrifice[34]
6) Affirmation of Spiritual Transformation as the Real Goal of Piety[35]

Finlan notes that in scholarship, often two or more of these levels are joined together. He does acknowledge a difference between them but also sees a significant correlation. He states, "[i]n different ways, each of the levels registers *transformation through representation* [...]"[36] He notes that while all levels do not *intend* any change in the cult, they all *rethink* cult by reinterpreting the cult's rationale. Thus Finlan defines *spiritualization*:

> *Spiritualization* expresses an inward movement toward increasingly personal interaction with God or divinity, and it exerts on ritual practices a pressure for change in response to this inward demand. [37]

Finlan's schema not only involves historical progression, but also seems to imply *spiritualization* is a personified force, revealing intimacy with the divine and demanding the transformation of ritual practice. Finlan's view of ritual is later revealed:

> Cult relies on traditions that stretch back beyond memory, often embodying a forgotten or rejected metaphysical logic. Old rites receive new explanations. Heightened appreciation of relational values, along with declining belief that all affliction is caused by impurity infractions, leads to a reassessment of cult practices and to a rejection of beliefs and practices that are deemed crude, brutal, or childish.[38]

Later he states, "[o]nce sacrificial thinking has really been left behind, the noncoercive nature of God will emerge as the only rational alternative."[39] Though not explicit, the tone of Finlan's exposition and his choice of the term "Levels" seems to imply a structure stacked in the chronological order of its natural historical progression and increasing in

---

[33] Finlan 2004:50-51. Cf. 4 *Macc*. 6.29; 17.21-22; *Sir.* 35.1-2; Rom 3.25; 1 Cor 6.19; Phil 2.17.
[34] Finlan 2004:51-60 Cf. Amos 5.21-25; Jer 7.22-23.
[35] Finlan 2004:60-61 describes level six as "a *philosophy of spiritual progress or transformation*."
[36] Finlan 2004:63.
[37] Finlan 2004:64.
[38] Finlan 2004:64.
[39] Finlan 2011:96.

quality, from substitution to repudiation and to true *spiritualization*. All roads, it would appear, lead to Levels Five and Six. Clearly the early Church and Paul belong at the end of this progression as "[t]he attitude of Christianity is supersessionist."[40]

1.2.2. Critique of Spiritualization

Vahrenhorst notes that since Wenschketwitz, *spiritualization* has become a household term.[41] However, critics of the term *spiritualization* have also emerged.[42] Our own criticisms of this model will be fleshed out most fully in the analysis of Jewish and Pauline texts in CHAPTERS TWO and THREE. Here, however, we state several preliminary points of contention.

First, Vahrenhorst notes that the discussion of Pauline cultic language is always accompanied and determined by "religio-historical and theological preliminary decisions."[43] Klawans concurs that every treatment of sacrifice begins with a 'theory'. He argues these theories can generally be characterized as "evolutionist" which posit "a broad, definitive, and positive development of human civilization."[44] Three of the most influential scholars on the nature of sacrifice, E.B. Tylor, James Frazer and William Robertson Smith all write under the spectre of Darwin.[45] Even Girard's structure of mimetic violence appears to proceed through a linear path of development.[46] This type of thinking has clearly influenced treatments of Second Temple Jewish cultic practices.

---

[40] Finlan 2004:63.
[41] Vahrenhorst 2008:10.
[42] Klinzing 1971, Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, Hogeterp 2006.
[43] Vahrenhorst 2008:10, "religionsgeschichtlichen und theologischen Vorentscheidungen."
[44] Klawans 2006:7.
[45] Tylor 1871, Frazer 1922, Smith 1907.
[46] Girard 1977.

Thus, the *spiritualization* and ultimate rejection of cult is often treated as a historical inevitability, if not necessity. ‘’

Klawans asks if this evolutionist framework fits our evidence and begins with the prophetic critique of cult (cf. 1 Sam 15.2-23; Isa 1.11; Jer 7.21-23; Hosea 6.6; Amos 6.6). He challenges the Weberian dichotomy of prophets versus priests which is often applied to these texts. It appears that at least some prophets were also priests (Jer 1.1, Ezek 1.1-3, perhaps Isa 6.1) and others were remembered as performing sacrificial acts (Exod 23.4-8; 1 Sam 3.1, 7.10, 9.14; 1 Kgs 18.30-39).[47] What is more, many of the prophets themselves engage in symbolic actions whose expression depends entirely on their external form: Hosea’s marrying a prostitute (Hos 1.2); Isaiah’s walking barefoot and naked (Isa 20.1-6); Jeremiah’s wearing a yoke (Jer 27.1-175). As Klawans puts it, “[b]y referring to the prophets' behavior as ‘symbolic action' while dryly describing cultic behaviors as ‘ritual’, scholars force a divide between them, and prevent a comparison of two phenomena that are not altogether different.”[48] This generally may question whether prophets were distinctly opposed to externalism. However, even if they were, to quote Young “such advice was certainly not followed”,[49] for as we shall see in CHAPTER TWO, the subsequent Second Temple period gave witness to the height of a flourishing Jewish cult.

There are similar problems when assessing early Christian materials. Evidence from Acts demonstrates that Christians, including Paul, continued to frequent the Jerusalem Temple and engage in its cult up until the Temple was destroyed (cf. Acts 3.1;

---

[47] Klawans 2006:79.
[48] Klawans 2006:83.
[49] Young 1983:33.

21.18-26).[50] In addition, far from rejecting ritual externalism the early church developed its own ritual, one with undeniable sacrificial overtones: the Eucharist (Matt 26.26-29; Mk 14.22-25; Luke 22.15-20; 1 Cor 11.23-26; *Did*. 9-10).[51] While the Eucharist could perhaps be seen as "transference",[52] this does not appear to emphasize inner notions at the expense of external forms. One may wonder why the sacrament of the Eucharist has not itself become subject to *spiritualization* and its external performance ceased.

Furthermore, *spiritualization* appears to assert that the only form of true adherence to a ritual or cult must be unreflective. As soon as reflection occurs, the ritual is subtly subverted. Thus it denies that the Temple could be seen as "as a powerful source of meaning and symbolism for those who believe in it."[53] Finlan appears to confirm this denial at every turn. When Hayward suggests that Philo extends ideas already impicit in the ritual,[54] or when Daly says this process is "to emphasize the true meaning… or ethical significance of cult"[55] Finlan responds, "in fact their sources have imported those meanings into the cult. *Spiritualization* Two is a strategy of pouring new wine into old wineskins, new values into old forms."[56] When Olford suggests that the "interiorization of a symbol does not ruin or discredit it,"[57] Finlan responds that the "redefinition of a

---

[50] See our discussion of the Temple in Acts in section 2.3.2.2.
[51] Daly 1978:140 refers to this as the "Institutionalizing Trend" in the early Church. "Finally in Justin, Irenaeus, and especially Hippolytus, one can detect growing evidence of an institutionalizing trend which not only tends to institutionalize Christian Eucharistic worship, but also begins to reintroduce what seems to have been superseded… the idea that the performance of the ritual action is a sacrifice."
[52] The preferred term of Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:161, see below.
[53] Klawans 2006:4.
[54] Hayward 1996:116.
[55] Daly 1997:238.
[56] Finlan 2004:49.
[57] Olford 1985:30.

ritual term does indicate impatience (conscious or unconscious) with the ritual […]"[58] When Clooney argues that a certain attitude is implied in sacrifice,[59] Finlan argues, "the ethical implications he wants to draw out cannot be found in the earlier, unspiritualized, ritual texts."[60] Finally, on the question of the metaphorical application of cultic terms, Finlan states "[f]or a cultic image to carry metaphoric power requires that the referent be *recognized*, not that there be unquestioning faith in the cult's literal efficacy."[61] Finlan renders it practically impossible for a participant to have an abstract or a non-literal contemplation about the cult's significance while remaining ritually adherent. However, it seems unlikely that the Second Temple could house the sacrifice of thousands of Jews who at great financial and personal cost delighted purely in the unreflective externalism of their ritual performance. Thus Petropoulou reminds us that,

> The religion of Christianity did not result from an evolutionary process… Christianity emerged unexpectedly from the well-functioning Jewish religious environment, and spread rapidly within the well-functioning pagan religious environment.[62]

The second criticism leveled against this model is that *spiritualization* assumes, and in some cases imposes, a dualistic hermeneutic upon the evidence. Schüssler Fiorenza has written, "[t]he category usually entails an opposition between what is spiritual, interior, heavenly, religious, and what is material, exterior, institutional, or earthly."[63] While it is certainly possible for a Jew of the Second Temple Period to hold such a view, this should not simply be assumed, nor should non-literal applications of cultic terminology be taken in isolation as evidence for dualism. In fact, Finlan's levels

---

[58] Finlan 2004:50.
[59] Clooney 1985:369.
[60] Finlan 2004:50.
[61] Finlan 2004:51.
[62] Petropoulou 2008:291.
[63] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:159.

One to Four, need not be dualistic, though Finlan formulates them as dualistically as possible by suggesting they are all part of the same process. Vahrenhorst summarizes this well:

> On the other hand, this concept is connected with another, indeed a sort of confusion between corporeality and spirituality which, in ancient thought, is by no means as common as is often assumed. Thus in Philo, but also in other authors of Jewish and Greek provenance, we can observe tendencies to "spiritualize" or to understand matters in their deeper meaning, but this is by no means a depreciation of the real cult. On the contrary, spiritual and visible/practical dimensions are kept together and remain related to one other.[64]

This issue is particularly acute when it comes to the question of Pauline cultic imagery, where a cultic *spiritualization* is often assumed while conversely the same authors deny a more general dualism in Paul.[65] As we shall see, in Paul cultic terms are often applied to and affirm the outward body (cf. Rom 12.1; 1 Cor 6.19-20).[66] Daly calls this "incarnational *spiritualization*", a paradoxical statement that may itself demonstrate the inherent problem with this model. Thus if we are to use *spiritualization*, we must accept its underlying dualism and follow it through to its logical conclusions.

---

[64] Vahrenhorst 2008:11, "[z]um anderen verbindet sich mit diesem Begriff ein Gegenüber, ja geradezu ein Auseinandertreten von Leiblichkeit und Geistigkeit, das im antiken Denken längst nicht so verbreitet ist, wie vielfach angenommen wird. So lassen sich bei Philo, aber auch bein anderen Autoren jüdischer und grieschischer Provenienz Tendenzen beobachten, kultische Sachverhalte zu "spiritualisieren" oder in ihrer tieferen Bedeutung zu verstehen, doch verbindet sich damit keineswegs eine Entwertung des realen Kultes. Im Gegenteil: geistige und sichtbar-praktische Dimensionen werden zusammengehalten und bleiben aufeinander bezogen."

[65] Boyarin, to his credit, founds his theory of spiritualization on a defense of Pauline dualism. Cf. Boyarin 1994:57-85. However, not all are in agreement, see Hays 1989:130, "the Christian tradition's reading of the letter-spirit dichotomy as an antithesis between the outward and the inward, the manifest and the latent, the body and the soul, turns out to be a dramatic misreading, indeed complete inversion. For Paul, the Spirit is – scandalously – identified precisely with the outward and palpable, the particular human community of the new covenant, putatively transformed by God's power so as to make Christ' message visible at all. The script, however, remains abstract and dead because it is not embodied."

[66] See the analysis of Rom 12.1 in section 3.2.1.

Finally, *spiritualization* has become a blanket term covering every treatment of the cult that is non-ritualistic. Schüssler Fiorenza contends that *spiritualization* has "so many different shades of meaning and entails certain dogmatic presuppositions, its use tends not to clarify but to confuse."[67] This results in the term being imprecise, incoherent, and ultimately misleading. We have demonstrated that there is no standard agreement on matters of definition or use. More worrying, however, are those instances in which the term is applied without definition, simply footnoting Wenschkewitz, Gärtner or McKelvey.[68] In such cases it appears to have become a term of convenience rather than one of elucidation or clarity. Its use is so ubiquitous, and the phenomena it describes so numerous, that one easily forgets what it actually means.

To his credit, Finlan to a large extent has sought to solve this problem. However, in Finlan's exposition we see that the term is used incoherently in that it defines incongruous, if not mutually exclusive phenomena. Finlan recognizes hostility between his levels, particularly Two and Five, but does not believe this to affect the utility of the term.[69] Often passages found in these categories will differ in motivation, rhetorical form, and implication but are described by the same term *spiritualization*.

What is of particular concern is the combination of the two points above. If the term is being used imprecisely or casually and can have opposing meanings, it then becomes misleading or even deceiving. By using a single term to characterize various or even opposing phenomena there is a danger of harmonizing our interpretation of those phenomena. For example, one is at risk of observing an expression of Level One, Three

---

[67] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:161.
[68] For example, Conzelmann 1975:77, "Paul is alluding to the apocalyptic expectation of the temple of the last days and spiritualizes it."
[69] Finlan 2004:63.

or Four and, by labeling it *spiritualization,* assuming the motivations or implications of Level Five. Thus allegory can easily be massaged into criticism, internalization into rejection, and metaphor into repudiation. Certainly these various tropes could be utilized in the service of a wider rejection of cult, but it is a category mistake to think they do so simply by their rhetorical form.

1.2.3. Other Models and Ways Forward

Ultimately, the utility of the *spiritualization* model will have to be determined through an analysis of the texts themselves. Other models have also been suggested in its place. Klinzing argues against a *spiritualization* of the cult in his comparative study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. He suggests that the language in these texts presents an *Umdeutung*, reinterpretation, of cultic concepts.[70] Schüssler Fiorenza prefers the term *transference* which indicates that "Jewish and Hellenistic cultic concepts were *shifted* to designate a reality which was not cultic."[71] Similarly, Rowland claims that "[t]he Pauline letters continue the widespread way in the Second Temple Jewish texts in which the transferred sense of temple and cult are applied to lives of service."[72] Wardle observes a "Templization" of the Christian community. However, this conceptualization is occasioned by ongoing hostilities with the Temple in Jerusalem, particularly with its priestly leadership.[73]

Böttrich and Hogeterp focus less on the depreciating aspects of this language and more on how the Temple takes on a positive role in Paul. Böttrich argues that Paul does

---

[70] Klinzing 1971.
[71] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:161.
[72] Rowland 2005:475.
[73] Wardle 2010:11.

not refer to the Temple itself, but simply to the idea it is based on. As a result, there is no opposition to the Temple as Paul's references are characterized as "positive relation."[74] Likewise, Hogeterp argues that for Paul, Temple imagery serves "a paideutic purpose of teaching the Corinthians a holy way of life."[75] Thus no tension is created with the concrete Jerusalem Temple as ultimately it functions as a normative model for Paul.

Vahrenhorst focuses on how elements of cultic thinking in the Pauline letters function in the communication between Paul and his non-Jewish addressees.[76] To do so, he examines cultic terminology not only in its Jewish context but in its pagan context as well. In particular he examines the *Leges Sacrae* often found at the entrance of a sanctuary which speak of purity requirements. In investigating this word field, he concludes, "the area of Temple terminology proves to be 'common ground' upon which Jews and no Jews can be assured of their identity and responsibility to God."[77] Like Vahrenhorst, Liu emphasizes the purity language in Paul. Jewish and pagan contexts are in play as they "both link one's moral integrity with temple purity."[78] Thus the Temple image is "evocative and exhortative", as "every believer ought to lead a life delimited by the ethical requirements concerning temple purity."[79]

As with the *spiritualization* model, the value of these positions will have to be assessed in an analysis of the evidence. However, these studies do offer more subtle and appropriate approaches to the meaning of Paul's cultic language by focusing primarily on

---

[74] Böttrich 1999:423, "positive Anknüpfung."
[75] Hogeterp 2006:384.
[76] Vahrenhorst 2008.
[77] Vahrenhorst 2008:154, "[d]er Bereich der Tempelterminologie erweist sich als 'common ground', auf dem sich Juden und Nichtjuden ihrer Identität und ihrer Verantwortung für Gott vergewissern können."
[78] Liu 2013:31.
[79] Liu 2013:283.

the function of this language rather than inserting Paul into a developmental scheme in an attempt to clarify its implications. Ultimately, what all these studies demonstrate is the ability of Paul's language to sustain many different parallels and in turn, generate many different interpretations. They do not explore why this language is so susceptible to such hermeneutical variance. The answer, we suggest, lies not in the background of Paul's statements, but in their linguistic and conceptual form as metaphors. Therefore, a better understanding of how metaphors structure and generate meaning, will better equip us to address the question of Paul's Temple metaphors.

1.3. Metaphor Theory and Paul's Temple Metaphors

1.3.1. Prolegomena to Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The history of the vast and differing theories of metaphor has been recounted many times.[80] Since our purpose here is an understanding and application of the central insights of a particular theory, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), such a survey is not required. However, a brief summary of some aspects of theories that preceded CMT and against which it was conceived, is both necessary and illuminating.

Conventionally, accounts of metaphor theory begin with Aristotle, as he provides the first systematic treatment of metaphor as well as the categories which still govern the conversation today.[81] However, this immense influence is often deemed negative, as

---

[80] For useful summaries see Johnson 1981:3-47, Soskice 1985:1-53.

[81] So Kirby 1997:518, "[t]hat being so, a sustained study of Aristotle's concept of metaphor needs no further justification since it is to him that we owe the terms in which the debate was framed for many hundreds of years. Indeed, here as often, even those who wish to propose new or different parameters for the analysis of metaphor must do so against the grain of the Aristotelian tradition." See also Eco 1983:88, "[o]f the thousands and thousands of pages written about metaphor, few added anything of substance to the first two or three fundamental concepts stated by Aristotle."

Aristotle is responsible for what Johnson characterizes as the "fateful triangle" in accounts of metaphor: i) metaphoric transfer is located at the level of *words* rather than sentences, ii) metaphor is understood as a *deviance* from literal usage, and iii) metaphor is said to be based on *similarities* between two things.[82] These aspects of his account are readily demonstrable. Aristotle treats the phenomenon of metaphor under the heading ὄνομα, nouns or words. It is deemed a ὄνομα ἀλλότριον, a foreign name, which suggests some deviation from ὄνομα κύριον, a standard name (*Poet.* 4.5.2). The term metaphor, which already suggests "a carrying over", is further defined as ἐπιφορά, "a putting on", and seeks τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν, "to observe likeness" (*Poet.* 4.5.5; *Top.* 1.8).

While many modern theories are reactions to this triangle, Aristotle can also be seen to prefigure many aspects utilized by contemporary metaphor theory, which also apply to our analysis of Paul.[83] Aristotle acknowledges that metaphor is an aspect of everyday language and description (*Poet.* 4.5.5.). Furthermore, though constructed around similarities, metaphor is superior to simile in that it says "this *is* that," and thus is a form of predication. Direct predication has important hermeneutical implications as it leads the listener's "mind to seek to understand" (*Rhet.* 4.10.2). As a result metaphor is like a riddle (*Poet.* 4.5.4*; Rhet.* 3.2.12), which forces its interpreter into a "cognitive exercise of decoding."[84] In this way, "[m]etaphor most brings about learning" and "creates understanding (μάθησις) and knowledge (γνῶσις)" (*Rhet.* 3.10.2) and thus functions as a heuristic device which demands hermeneutical engagement.

---

[82] Johnson 1981:5-6. Similarly Ricœur 1977:14 concludes, "[t]hus the destiny of metaphor is sealed for centuries to come: henceforth it is connected to poetry and rhetoric, not at the level of discourse, but at the level of a segment of discourse, the name or noun."
[83] This is the central argument of Kirby 1997 and is also evident in Derrida 1974 and Ricœur 1977:8-48.
[84] Kirby 1997:545.

Many of these overlooked Aristotelian themes were revisited in twentieth-century accounts of metaphor, particularly the *Interactive* theories of Richards, Black, and Beardsley.[85] These accounts have in common the recognition that metaphor occurs through an interaction at the level of the sentence, rather than in an isolated word. So Richards states, "[w]hen we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a result of their interaction."[86] For Richards, this interaction is between a *tenor*, the underlying idea or principal being conveyed, and a *vehicle* which delivers this *tenor*. Black differs from Richards in viewing two distinct subjects in a metaphor, the *focus* – the word or words used nonliterally, and the *frame* – the word or words used literally. This secondary subject is not an individual thing, but a system of associated commonplaces and implications which functions as a "filter" or "screen" and selects, emphasizes, suppresses, and organizes features of the primary subject.

Beardsley claims that metaphor achieves "a special feat of language, or verbal play, involving two levels of meaning in the modifier itself."[87] However, this interaction is in terms of "controversion" or "verbal opposition". In metaphor there is a failure of designation which occurs when there is direct incompatibility between designated properties and the presuppositions of the terms. Thus, we are forced to call up associated connotations of the modifying term and apply them to the principle subject: "[t]his twist

---

[85] Richards 1936, Black 1962, 1979a, b, Beardsley 1962, 1978. Soskice 1985:31-50, who favours greatly Richards' theory, separates these authors' accounts, respectively, into *Interanimation, Interactive,* and *Controversion* theories of metaphors. Ricœur 1977 draws heavily on all three of these theories.
[86] Richards 1936:62.
[87] Beardsley 1962:294.

of meaning is forced by inherent tensions, or oppositions, within the metaphor itself."[88] This is how our verbal repertoire is expanded, allowing for change, novelty and unpredictability. As a result "[m]etaphor is inherently expansive."[89] This idea of a semantic clash is also utilized by Ricœur, for whom the predication in metaphor is both an "is" and an "is not". The tensions that arise from this force the reader into an act of intuition and imagination in order to understand the metaphor.[90]

These interactive theories highlight three important aspects of metaphor theory. First, metaphors are not merely tropes, but distinct intellectual operations that communicate cognitive content. For this reason, they are irreducible to literal paraphrase as this "fails to be a translation because it fails to give the insight that the metaphor did."[91] Second, metaphors become an indispensable means not only to conceptualize and describe things but to offer fresh insight. Richards states, "[t]he process of metaphor in language, the exchanges between meanings of words which we study in explicitly verbal metaphors, are superimposed upon a perceived world which is itself a product of earlier or unwitting metaphor."[92] Similarly, Black argues that the world is necessarily "a world *under description* – or a world seen from a certain perspective. Some metaphors can create such a perspective."[93] Ricœur argues further that the "semantic impertinence" of metaphor allows us to suspend and bracket off our previous understanding of reality and redescribe it. Metaphors' referential function, therefore, is it its redescriptive power.[94]

---

[88] Beardsley 1962:294.
[89] Beardsley 1978:12.
[90] Ricœur 1981:165-181. See also Ricœur 1978.
[91] Black 1962:46.
[92] Richards 1936:73.
[93] Black 1979b:38.
[94] Ricœur 1977:229, 272.

Finally, this cognitive content is understood and these conceptualizations created as the result of the demands metaphors make of their interpreters. On Ricœur's theory, Simms summarizes "[m]etaphors are only valuable because they force the listener or reader to interpret them… [it] is the part of language which invites us to do hermeneutics."[95] Ricœur himself concludes, "a metaphor does not exist in itself, but in and through an interpretation."[96]

This third and final point is taken to its extreme by Donald Davidson and used to criticize *Interactive* theories. Davidson argues against the idea that metaphors have a special "metaphorical meaning", but rather that metaphor is a form of communication alongside ordinary communication. He states, "metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more."[97] Davidson highlights the difference between what words mean and what they do. Metaphor, for him, belongs entirely to the domain of *use*. It is the imaginative employment of words or sentences that "*makes us attend* to some likeness" or "*nudges* us into noting."[98] This nudging depends on nothing more than the literal meanings of the words involved. Metaphor may lead us to notice what we might not otherwise have noticed, but there is no reason to say that what is noticed is true or false. Therefore, metaphors have no propositional or cognitive content; they are not subject to truth-conditions. So Davidson states, "[w]e must give up the idea that a metaphor carries a message, that it has content or meaning."[99] Literal paraphrase is impossible because there is nothing to paraphrase. It would simply be an attempt to evoke

---

[95] Simms 2003:73.
[96] Ricœur 1976:50.
[97] Davidson 1979:30.
[98] Davidson 1979:31, 36.
[99] Davidson 1979:43.

what the metaphor brings our attention to. Davidson continues, "[j]oke or dream or metaphor can, like a picture or a bump on the head, make us appreciate some fact – but not by standing for, or expressing, the fact."[100] He begins his essay:

> Metaphor is the dreamwork of language. Its interpretation reflects the interpreter as much as the originator. As in the interpretation of dreams understanding metaphor is as much a creative endeavor as making a metaphor, and as little guided by rules.[101]

Davidson's *Causal* theory has been subject to responses from Black and from Lakoff and Johnson.[102] While criticisms of this position will become clear below, what Davidson does highlight, or "nudge us into noting", is the instability of locating metaphorical meaning.

1.3.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

1.3.2.1. The Conduit Metaphor

The central insight of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) originated in Michael Reddy's article, "The Conduit Metaphor". Reddy seeks to examine how we frame our discussions of the problem of communication. What he discovered was a metaphor pervasive in the English language, which he called the *conduit metaphor*:[103]

i. Language functions like a conduit, transferring thoughts bodily from one person to another
ii. In writing and speaking people insert their thoughts or feelings into words
iii. Words accomplish the transfer by containing the thought or feelings and conveying them to another
iv. In listening or reading people extract the thoughts and feelings once again from the words

---

[100] Davidson 1979:44.
[101] Davidson 1979:29.
[102] Black 1979a, Lakoff and Johnson 2003:271.
[103] Reddy 1993:170.

Reddy supports his findings with many examples (e.g. "it is very difficult to put this concept *into* words"; "his words *carry* little in the way of recognizable meaning", etc.). Reddy's fundamental insight is that language and views of reality have developed hand in hand. The "stories English speakers tell about communication are largely determined by semantic structures of the language itself."[104] The way we use language frames the way we discuss problems such as communication and affects how we attempt to solve them. For example, because language is seen as a conduit, failure in communication is usually attributed to a lack of success in the insertion process (thus a failing of the speaker).

Reddy believes that the conduit metaphor results in a *semantic pathology* and offers what he believes to be a better conceptual frame for communication. He argues that in communication a speaker constructs a *blueprint,* which is sent to a hearer who is then forced to construct with his own tools what is found on the blueprint. He calls this the *toolmaker's paradigm*. While he believes this to be radically subjectivist, he argues it has two strengths. First, it emphasizes that "[s]ignals *do something*. They cannot *contain* anything."[105] Second, the toolmaker's paradigm does not "neglect the crucial human ability to reconstruct thought patterns on the basis of signals." Thus a different conceptual metaphor places equal emphasis on speaker and hearer in the task of communication.

1.3.2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The names most associated with the CMT are Mark Johnson and George Lakoff.[106] The latter writes of Reddy,

---

[104] Reddy 1993:165.
[105] Reddy 1993:184.
[106] See Lakoff and Turner 1989, Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Lakoff 1993, 2003.

> Reddy showed, for a single, very significant case, that the locus of metaphor is thought, not language, that metaphor is a major and indispensable part of our ordinary, conventional way of conceptualizing the world, and that our everyday behavior reflects our metaphorical understanding of experience.[107]

This conceptual basis for metaphor is the central insight of CMT, which Lakoff and Johnson summarize:

> Metaphor is not a mere matter of words, not based on similarity, not just a feature of poetic or rhetorical language, and not deviant. Rather, metaphor is conceptual, not merely linguistic. A metaphor is a systematic conceptual mapping from one conceptual domain (the source) onto another (the target). It may introduce conceptual structure. And metaphor functions primarily to allow sensory-motor reasoning to apply to subjective judgments. [108]

Metaphor is thus defined as "*understanding and experiencing* [not merely speaking of] *one kind of thing in terms of another.*"[109] The verbal utterances we deem metaphorical are in fact linguistic realizations of more fundamental conceptual structures.[110]

These conceptual structures are created through a cross-domain mapping. In cognitive linguistics, a conceptual domain is "a coherent area of conceptualization relative to which semantic units may be characterized."[111] Domains are based on the *encyclopedic view* of language, in which words are not seen as neatly packaged bundles of meaning, the *dictionary view*, but as 'points of access' to vast repositories of knowledge relating to a particular concept or conceptual domain. In order to properly understand any concept, one must call on encyclopedic knowledge of the world within which that concept is situated.

---

[107] Lakoff 1993:204.
[108] Lakoff 2003:62.
[109] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:5. This is the point on which Soskice 1985:16 strongly disagrees, "[m]etaphor is by definition a figure of speech and not an 'act', 'fusion', or 'perception'."
[110] Croft and Cruse 2004: 197, "[a]n open-ended range of linguistic expressions can tap into the same conceptual structure in both conventional and unconventional ways, and be understood immediately; a conceptual metaphor cannot therefore be reduced to a finite set of linguistic expressions."
[111] Langacker 1987:488.

The concept of a domain also draws upon the *embodiment thesis*. For cognitive linguists, and Lakoff in particular, "the concepts we have access to and the nature of the 'reality' we think and talk about are a function of our embodiment",[112] and thus are grounded in our physical experience of the world. As a result, "domains encompass many aspects of an experience that are conceptualized as associated."[113] The most basic domains are Orientational, our experience of three-dimensional space, and Ontological, our experience of substances. Examples of the former are HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN, and THE FORESEEABLE IS AHEAD.[114] The domains of up, down and ahead are all drawn from our physical experience of spatial orientation. We have already observed an example of an Ontological metaphor in Reddy's conduit metaphor, where LANGUAGE IS A CONDUIT. Here, it is our physical experience of substances, in this case conduits or containers, that structure the domain.

Metaphors do not simply draw upon domains but map them onto each other. Mapping refers to the establishment of a fixed set of *correspondences* from the *source* domain to the *target* domain. These correspondences are fixed according to the *Invariance Principle*:

> Metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (that is, the image-schema structure) of the source domain, in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain.[115]

This is similar to Black's "set of associated common places" which filter and frame the subject. However, in CMT, it is not merely structural elements of the source domain that

---

[112] Evans, Bergen, and Zinken 2006:7.
[113] Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007:181.
[114] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:14-21. In cognitive linguistics it is the convention to present a metaphor in its simplest predication in SMALL CAPS.
[115] Lakoff 1993:215.

are mapped onto the target, but also their accompanying inference patterns. The fixed correspondences facilitate reasoning about the target domain using the conceptual structure provided by the source domain. These inference patterns are referred to as the metaphor's *entailments*.

For example, in the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, the source domain JOURNEY is mapped onto LOVE.[116] As a result, a set of correspondences is fixed between lovers and travellers, the relationship and a vehicle, common goals and the journey's destination, etc. These correspondences allow us to reason about love as we would a journey. Examples of the accompanying entailments might be "the relationship has come to a dead end" or "we need to find a different route in order to progress", etc. The word JOURNEY stirs up all our associated experiences of travel, and serves as a source domain in that it is both encyclopedic and embodied. The type of mapping seen here is typical as "metaphors come out of our clearly delineated and concrete experiences and allow us to construct highly abstract and elaborate concepts."[117] Thus JOURNEY, the more grounded and highly delineated domain, provides conceptual structure and inference patterns for the more abstract domain of LOVE.

Metaphorical mappings are *partial* in that they do not create a conceptual identity between the source and target. Therefore, metaphors both "highlight and hide" certain aspects of the target. A target is not comprehensively conceptualized by its source, which

---

[116] An example from Lakoff and Turner 1989:65.
[117] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:105. Lakoff 1993:205 goes even further when he states, "as soon as one gets away from concrete physical experience and starts talking about abstractions or emotions, metaphorical understanding is the norm."

leads to the need for multiple metaphors.[118] This also serves as an interpretive *constraint*, in that "when we say that a concept is structured by a metaphor, we mean that it is partially structured and that it can be extended in some ways but not others."[119] Subsequently, metaphorical mappings are also *asymmetrical* in that they only go in one direction. Mapping the target back onto the source creates a different set of correspondences and entailments. To use Black's example, to say "Man is a Wolf" will create a different set of correspondences than to say "Wolf is a Man". In the first instance correspondences such as ferocity or savageness might be mapped, while in the second, the opposites of kindness or personality are implied.[120]

Finally, although metaphorical mapping gives conceptual structure to a metaphor through its correspondences and entailments, understanding a metaphor is still achieved through a hermeneutical act on the part of the interpreter.

> Metaphor essentially involves the use of an expression to elicit a construal whose content is the result of an interaction between two construed domains… The result is a unique semantic confection, unobtainable by any other means.[121]

Since metaphors are fundamentally conceptual and their domains are encyclopedic, their meaning is in no way found within the words that articulate them. The metaphorical mapping with its correspondences and entailments, while suggested by the linguistic realization of the metaphor, actually transpires in the mind of the interpreter, as the text asks them *to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another*. Although in disagreement with Davidson that metaphors only have *perlocutionary* force, since the

---

[118] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:95, "[t]he reason we need two metaphors is because there is no one metaphor that will do the job."
[119] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:13.
[120] Black 1962:41.
[121] Croft and Cruse 2004:220-221.

linguistic formulation does provide a conceptual structure and thus possible interpretive directionality and constraints, ultimately a metaphor's meaning is not contained by its words but rather is generated by those who construe them.

1.3.3. Hermeneutical Implications for Paul's Temple Metaphors

How then does this aid in understanding the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors? The CMT is now being used in analysis of the New Testament in general.[122] Of particular note is the work of Gupta, who applies CMT to Paul's cultic metaphors.[123] In this study, Gupta considers "the importance of metaphors as conceptual constructs and rhetorical devices."[124] As with the studies above, the focus here is on the function of these metaphors rather than their implications. Gupta rightly notes that "[m]any studies of the apostle Paul's worship and cultic language have lacked methodological acuteness, rushing ahead to theological assessments before the necessary hermeneutical groundwork has been laid."[125] However, although he applies CMT to demonstrate how Paul's cultic metaphors provide conceptual structuring, the hermeneutical implications of that structuring are not explored. Why do these conceptual structures generate so many different meanings depending on the background posited and how should these be negotiated?

In agreement with Gupta, this account of metaphor helps us ground and structure our analysis in a first order, generalizable linguistic model. At the same time, it suggests a

---

[122] In particular, Howe 2008 provides a in depth analysis of CMT and comprehensive application of it to the metaphors of 1 Peter.
[123] Gupta 2010.
[124] Gupta 2010:4
[125] Gupta 2010:27

particular hermeneutical approach which diagnoses the issues and problematizes some previous attempts to examine the meaning of Paul's metaphors. An understanding of CMT allows us to examine the structure of Paul's Temple metaphors; how the source domain of the Temple is mapped onto the target domain of the community/body. In CHAPTER TWO, by examining the behaviour and texts of Paul's Jewish contemporaries we can begin to observe how the Jerusalem Temple could serve as a thoroughly experienced and highly delineated source domain the in first century CE. In CHAPTER THREE, by examining Paul's mappings, we can observe what correspondences are fixed and what entailments are drawn explicitly by these texts. In doing so we can detect the possible interpretive directions and constraints these metaphors exhibit with regard to the status of the Jerusalem Temple.

We will also observe that most attempts to account for the meaning and implications of Paul's Temple metaphors are a result of historical critical *exegesis*, with the assumption being that if the metaphor's source domain is accurately and comprehensively reconstructed historically, its meaning can be extracted. This interpretive strategy, however, is based on a now familiar conceptual model. *Exegesis*, drawn from the Greek verb ἐξηγεῖσθαι meaning "to lead out", is itself a linguistic realization of the conduit metaphor, and like all conceptual metaphors, this unconsciously and automatically frames our reasoning and thus how we approach a text. The meaning and implications of Paul's Temple metaphors have been inserted into the words, tasking the exegete to extract them. Perhaps then, this meaning and these implications have been so hard to find because we have been looking in the wrong place. If we are to make a

claim regarding the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors, it will not be the result of an extraction, but rather the result of our own hermeneutical act of construal.

Therefore, the task of understanding the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors is to situate ourselves in the best possible interpretive position to construe them. To do this, we must observe how these metaphors have been construed, particularly by those in closer historical and cultural proximity to their composition, in order to view their hermeneutical possibilities and assess what construals we may have unconsciously inherited and by which we are being informed. Thus we must take into account the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors.

1.4. Effective-History

1.4.1. Effective-History in Philosophical Hermeneutics

We concluded the previous section with the determination that if we are to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors, we are required to construe them ourselves. This construal is a hermeneutic act and thus will be controlled by the question that we ask of the metaphor; we will construe metaphorical meaning as an answer to a question. Thus it is crucial to understand how these questions are formed, where they originated, and how we find the right questions to ask. To do so we return to the hermeneutical framework of Hans-Georg Gadamer and, specifically, his idea of *effective-history*. Gadamer's position is explicitly not a method. His aim is "not to develop a procedure of understanding, but to clarify the conditions in which understanding takes place", or, more simply, to ask the question, "how is understanding possible?"[126] Effective-history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*),

[126] Gadamer 2004:295, xxvii.

therefore, is not an interpretive strategy, but describes what is already operative in any act of understanding: "*[u]nderstanding is, essentially, an historically-effected event.*"[127] Our aim here is not a full exposition of Gadamer's thesis, but an outline of its central insights, how they have been incorporated into the study of the New Testament, and what they contribute to how we ask the question of the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors.

Gadamer takes his lead from Heidegger's account of the three-fold fore-structure of understanding.[128] For Heidegger, since we are always already in the world and familiar with it, every act of understanding is grounded in a pre-understanding of its subject matter. It begins with a *fore-having* (*Vorhabe*), something we have in advance or "a taken-for-granted background."[129] From this *fore-having*, there is also a *foresight* (*Vorsicht*), a "sense of how to approach the problem, some perspective from which to undertake the interpretation."[130] Finally, all understanding is grounded in a *fore-conception* (*Vorgriff*), something we grasp in advance, or the expectations brought to any act of interpretation. Thus understanding is always already based on and directed by pre-existing interpretations; this fore-structure of understanding provides us with the questions to which we seek answers. Heidegger puts it, "[a]ny interpretation which is to contribute understanding, must already have understood what is to be interpreted."[131] This results in understanding having a circular logic and thus a hermeneutic circle. However, this circular structure of understanding is not regressive nor should it be

---

[127] Gadamer 2004:299.
[128] Gadamer 2004:269, cf. Heidegger 1962:188-195.
[129] Dreyfus 1991:199.
[130] Heidegger 1962:191, Dreyfus 1991:199.
[131] Heidegger 1962:194.

avoided: "[w]hat is decisive is not to get out of the circle but to come into it in the right way."[132] How is this to be achieved?

> It is not to be reduced to the level of a vicious circle, or even a circle which is merely tolerated. In the circle is hidden a positive possibility of the most primordial kind of knowing. To be sure, we genuinely take hold of this possibility only when, in our interpretation, we have understood that our first, last, and constant task is never to allow our fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception to be present to us by fancies and popular conceptions, but rather to make the scientific theme secure by working out these fore-structures in terms of the things themselves.[133]

In other words, the fore-structure of our understanding should not simply be absorbed and assumed unreflectively, but constantly scrutinized through an engagement with the thing that is to be understood.

Gadamer addresses the question of how we work out our fore-structures of understanding. He develops his understanding of the fore-structure and circular nature of understanding by employing the concepts of a hermeneutical "horizon" (*Horizont*), "prejudice" (*Vorurteil*), and a "historically-effected consciousness" (*wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewußtsein*). For Gadamer, an act of understanding is an act of projection, which begins from an interpreter's horizon. A horizon is "the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point."[134] It describes an interpreter's particular hermeneutical situation or standpoint, which determines and limits their vision. As such, the interpreter knows the relative significance of everything viewed within this horizon, which can be both narrowed and expanded, but the interpreter cannot see beyond it. In understanding a text an interpreter projects a historical horizon for that text, its anticipated meaning as a whole, and then constantly revises it in terms of

---

[132] Heidegger 1962:195.
[133] Heidegger 1962:195, cited in Gadamer 2004:269.
[134] Gadamer 2004:301.

what emerges as he penetrates deeper into its parts. This revision takes place within a fusion of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*), a new projection wherein the initial fore-conceptions are replaced by more suitable and appropriate ones. For Gadamer the hermeneutic circle is understood in terms of this dialectic between the parts and the whole: "[t]he anticipation of meaning in which the whole is envisaged becomes actual understanding when the parts that are determined by the whole themselves also determine the whole."[135]

For Gadamer we can only enter this hermeneutic circle from our own particular horizon. The projections of the whole arise from this horizon and are based on our anticipations of meanings and form the questions we seek to answer. Prejudice both informs our horizons and controls the questions we ask. Gadamer claims, "all understanding inevitably involves some prejudice."[136] For Gadamer, however, prejudices are not simply an interpreter's false judgments. Like Heidegger's fore-structure of understanding, an interpreter's prejudices "*constitute the historical reality of his being.*"[137] Since we are historical beings, prejudices, our pre-judgments, constitute our horizon and enable us to have a vantage point from which we can see.[138] While for Heidegger the preconditions of understanding are a result our familiarity with the world, for Gadamer prejudice arises from our unavoidable participation in tradition (*Überlieferung*): "[u]*nderstanding is to be thought of less as a subjective act than as a participating in an event of tradition*, a process of transmission in which past and present

---

[135] Gadamer 2004:291.
[136] Gadamer 2004:272
[137] Gadamer 2004:278.
[138] Gadamer 2004:278, "[i]n fact history does not belong to us; we belong to it… The self-awareness of the individual is only a flickering in the closed circuits of historical life."

are constantly mediated."[139] Thus belonging to a tradition is a condition of understanding in that it provides the requisite prejudices which form our hermeneutical horizon and from which we can project the historical horizon of a text.

Any interpretation of text, thus any question we ask of it, results from existing predispositions towards that text. As Gadamer claims, "we understand traditionary texts on the basis of expectations of meaning drawn from our own prior relation to the subject matter."[140] However, not all of these prejudices are equally productive. As Heidegger suggested earlier, it is possible to be distracted by pre-understandings that are not borne out by the things themselves:

> Thus is it quite right for the interpreter not to approach the text directly, relying solely on the fore-meaning already available to him, but rather explicitly to examine the legitimacy – i.e., the origin and validity – of the fore-meanings dwelling within him.[141]

Gadamer describes this in terms of distinguishing between true prejudices, by which we understand, from false ones by which we misunderstand. Since prejudices are requisite for understanding, the goal is not to bracket them out but rather to bring them to the fore: "the hermeneutically trained mind… will make conscious the prejudices governing our own understanding, so that the text, as another's meaning, can be isolated and valued on its own."[142] However, this task poses a problem. Since prejudices form our hermeneutical horizon, they can not be viewed within it: "[i]t is impossible to make ourselves aware of prejudice while it is constantly operating unnoticed [...]" How then can these prejudices be addressed and assessed? Gadamer claims we become aware of our prejudices only

---

[139] Gadamer 2004:291.
[140] Gadamer 2004:294.
[141] Gadamer 2004:270.
[142] Gadamer 2004:298.

when they are "provoked" or "put at risk".[143] This becoming aware of prejudices is the work of the *historically-effected consciousness*.

For Gadamer the temporal distance that stands between an interpreter and a text is hermeneutically productive.

> Every encounter with tradition that takes place within the historical consciousness involves the experience of a tension between the text and the present. The hermeneutic task consists in not covering up this tension by attempting a naïve assimilation of the two but in consciously bringing it out.[144]

The result of this is not only the realization that we are "always affected by history" in that "[i]t determines in advance both what seems to us worth inquiring about and what will appear as the object of investigation", but also that we must recognize that "in all understanding… the efficacy of history is at work."[145] Understanding a text involves being aware of its *effective-history,* which stands between us and it; "the continuity of custom and tradition, in light of which everything handed down presents itself to us."[146] Since understanding is a historically-effected event, it requires a historically-effected consciousness or to be conscious of historical effects. "A hermeneutics adequate to the subject matter would have to demonstrate the reality and efficacy of history within understanding itself. I shall refer to this as 'history of effect.'"[147] Consciousness of a text's history of effects is what allows us to challenge the prejudices which inform and

---

[143] Gadamer 2004:298, 299.
[144] Gadamer 2004:305
[145] Gadamer 2004:300.
[146] Gadamer 2004:297
[147] Gadamer 2004:299

locate our horizons in order to acquire "the right horizon of inquiry" and find "*the right questions to ask.*"[148]

1.4.2. Effective-History in New Testament Studies

Gadamer's concept of effective-history has taken on a large role in recent biblical criticism. This shift to the text's influence and reception is due in large measure to a rising dissatisfaction with historical critical methods. Gadamer claims that "[t]he text that is understood historically is forced to abandon its claim to be saying something true."[149] For Gadamer truth, by definition, must transcend the historical contingencies of its initial articulation. This is where Luz, whose commentary on Matthew has served as a catalyst for many of these studies, begins. Luz claims that '[o]ne does not understand what the subject matter of a text means if one only understands what it *has meant.*"[150] As a result, he suggests, "the study of a text's influence should help bring its interpretation into our own present."[151] Similarly, in light of the "troubled fortunes of New Testament scholarship", Bockmuehl has suggested the effective-history of the text could provide a way forward and a source of common conversation for a discipline defined by its "infinite library" and increasing specialization and sub-specialization.[152] He suggests we cannot jump from a text's original intent to what it means without attention paid to "what

---

[148] Gadamer 2004:302, 301.
[149] Gadamer 2004:302.
[150] Luz 2007:98.
[151] Luz 2007:62.
[152] Bockmuehl 2006:27-61.

it has meant in the meantime."[153] This takes the form of a "hermeneutical return trip" which illustrates and illuminates the task of interpretation.

Luz is cognizant that proposing an inquiry into the history of effects of a text expressly goes against the wishes of Gadamer.[154] However, Luz argues that such a procedure is an unavoidable preliminary to achieving Gadamer's aim of an effective historical consciousness. As a result, Nicholls notes that in New Testament studies, the term *Wirkungsgeschichte* denotes "the compiling of a description of the 'effects' of a particular text." [155] Luz wishes to make a distinction between a text's *Auslegungsgeschichte*, its "history of interpretation" in commentaries, its *Rezeptionsgeschichte,* its "history of reception" or the people who received the text, and its *Wirkungsgeschichte,* how the text is received and actualized in media other than commentaries. While the sub-categorization of media can be useful, there is no reason that a commentary cannot function as an aspect of a text's effective-history. As Evans argues, these "terms certainly do not represent a *methodological* distinction in Gadamer's hermeneutics."[156]

Räisänen suggests a similar distinction between mere use and effect through an appeal to "plausible meaning", a concept again absent in Gadamer. He argues that "[t]he Bible is an effective factor, when something results from a reading which is plausible in the circumstances" and "such readings as are in *some* agreement with a literal reading of

---

[153] Bockmuehl 1994:59.
[154] See Gadamer 2004:299, "I am not saying that historical inquiry should develop into the history of effect as a kind of inquiry separate from understanding the work itself."
[155] Nicholls 2008:5.
[156] Evans 2014:17, cf. 124-126.

the Bible are the most relevant."[157] Bockmuehl argues that a text's footprint, "for good and for ill, can in turn serve as a valuable guide to the scope of the text's meaning and truth."[158] He wishes to locate a text's effective-history within its living memory and asks "can the history *generated* by the text shed any light whatsoever on the history of the world of meaning presented by the text itself?"[159]

The aims of the majority of these works are more historical than hermeneutical, concerned with locating the meaning of the text rather than situating the interpreter in relation to it.[160] For this reason both Parris and Evans suggest the integration of Jauss' literary theory of *Rezeptionsaesthetik*, which offers a specific method into the inquiry of a text's "trajectories".[161] However, Gadamer himself would be the first to claim that the truth of his theories must have relevance and application beyond their initial instantiation. As such, an inquiry into the meanings a text has generated and how these might illuminate our understanding of their original intent, both has independent merit, and is of benefit to the interpreter attempting to locate their own hermeneutical horizon. Therefore, our case studies into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors are concerned both with how these metaphors can be construed and actualized in different historical circumstances and with how these effects may have influenced our pre-understanding of these texts and thus the questions we bring to them.

---

[157] Räisänen 1992:313
[158] Bockmuehl 2006:65
[159] Bockmuehl 2006:165. Bockmuehl 2007:361 argues that "[i]n its day that living memory could still serve as a gauge of both the diversity and of the hermeneutical limits of authentic apostolic faith."
[160] Evans 2014:6, "that understanding is as much about self-understanding as it is about understanding a text, is often not well represented in accounts of Gadamer or in the practice that refers to *Wirkungsgeschichte.*"
[161] Parris 2009, Evans 2014. Parris 2009:2 even suggests that "[w]e must understand Gadamer as a prelude to Jauss."

1.5. The Setting and Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors

Thus far, we have argued that most studies into the meaning Paul's Temple metaphors aim at identifying the correct historical background of these texts. However, the variety of backgrounds suggested and interpretations provided demonstrates the need for a better understanding of how metaphor functions. Metaphor generates meaning by eliciting an act of construal on the part of the interpreter. Since this is a hermeneutical operation, it takes place within that interpreter's particular horizon. Consequently, understanding metaphorical meaning is contingent upon finding the right horizon of inquiry or the right questions to ask. This is the work of the historically-effected consciousness. Therefore, situating ourselves appropriately to understand the meaning of these metaphors requires an awareness of their historical effects. These effects demonstrate possible ways in which these metaphors can be construed and may indicate construals which have been unconsciously inherited and which function as prejudices in our own hermeneutical horizons.

What this study proposes, therefore, is an act of hermeneutical provocation. By examining Paul's Temple metaphors in light of their setting and early effective-history, we aim to stimulate the historically-effected consciousness. In doing so we seek to become aware of the historical effects of Paul's Temple metaphors in order to provoke our prejudices, acquire the right horizon of inquiry, and find the right questions to ask.

In Chapter Two, we seek to establish a set of historical assumptions and expectations with which to approach Paul's metaphors through an examination of their setting. By setting, we do not refer to the identification and explication of particular parallels with Paul's language, but rather to the reconstruction of a general posture of

Jews towards the Temple in the late Second Temple period. This reconstruction is accomplished through an assessment of observable public behaviour by Jews *en masse,* which indicates a general adherence to the Temple in Jerusalem. It is within this context of a widespread adherence to the Temple that we can observe various cultic criticisms and conceptualizations and inquire as to whether they ask the question, or raise the issue of Temple *spiritualization* or supersession.

With this adherence as a hermeneutical baseline, in CHAPTER THREE we provide a rhetorical and historical analysis of meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors: 1 Cor 3.16-17, 6.19-20, and 2 Cor 6.14-7.1. These texts will be read in light of our discussion of CMT and our observations in CHAPTER TWO. We examine these metaphors' conceptual structures as well as how they interact with various possible historical backgrounds. Drawing on the source domain of the Temple and others, we observe how Paul creates a conceptual toolkit with which he can address the issues in Corinth and elicit the Corinthians to rethink their status. We also investigate whether, in creating this conceptual structure, these texts ask the question of Paul's view of the Temple and possible supersession.

The meaning and implications of these Temple metaphors are taken to be demonstrative of Paul's view of the Temple and concentrating on them in particular presents several advantages. First, Paul rarely makes direct reference to the Temple and its cult and never discusses it in depth. Most cultic terminology and concepts, including the term ναός, are found exclusively in metaphors and, consequently, Paul's view of the Temple must be inferred from how these metaphors function. Due its singularity, the Jerusalem Temple can be taken to be the organizing component of a Jewish cultic

domain.[162] Temple metaphors can be viewed as a base metaphor for other cultic conceptualizations and as particularly representative of his view of the institution as a whole. As a result, Paul's Temple metaphors, especially in 1 Cor 3.16-17, occupy a central place in contemporary discussions of Paul's view of the cult.[163]

Furthermore, these Temple metaphors also emerge as the most identifiable of Paul's cultic metaphors. This has value both in comparing Paul's metaphors views with his contemporaries, but also in identifying and observing their early effective-history. Since these Temple metaphors are recognizable and distinct, they are also more easily discernible in later texts that may have employed them. Additionally, they are found within the Corinthian correspondence, Paul's most widely used and influential letters in this early period.[164] Therefore, the implications of Paul's Temple metaphors provide the most direct access to his appraisal of the Temple and provide a focus and control for our effective-historical examination, a type of analysis that can often and quickly become unwieldy.

CHAPTER THREE ends with an examination of Eph 2.11-22. This text occupies a unique position in our study as it belongs to the Pauline corpus but also appears as the Temple metaphor's earliest and most proximate actualization. Thus, this text functions as a primer and bridge to a series of three subsequent case studies on the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. Many studies have been dedicated to issues of terminology and criteria when it comes to the identification of a text's reception or

---

[162] On this see section 2.2.2.
[163] Cf. Gärtner 1965, McKelvey 1969, Schüssler Fiorenza 1976, De Lacey 1991, Lanci 1997, Böttrich 1999, Hogeterp 2006.
[164] On the use and influence of 1 Corinthians in the early church see Kovacs 2005.

effects.[165] This pursuit of a "common language"[166] for identification often can complicate as much as it clarify.[167] As van den Hoek states, "the forest of quotations should not be hidden by the trees of classification."[168] As this study takes its lead from Gadamer, we are more interested in pursuing questions than applying criteria. Therefore, a series of questions, introduced in CHAPTER THREE will guide us through the texts.[169] The aim of these questions is not to determine scientifically the presence of Pauline influence but rather to lead us to a position where we can form an interpretive judgment regarding its possibility.

Similarly, there is the question of exactly what type of influence we are attempting to identify. We noted earlier that verbal metaphors are the linguistic realizations of underlying conceptual models. Thus what we aim to identify is not simply the use and influence of Paul's language, but whether his Temple metaphors provide conceptual structure to subsequent discussion. As particular linguistic expressions are what provide us access to conceptual structures, it is with an analysis of verbal parallels that we begin. However, our primary aim to is compare the models being utilized, the source and target domains, the mappings, the correspondences that are fixed and the entailments that are drawn. Thus we ask whether subsequent Temple metaphors are structured by Paul's understanding of one thing in terms of another.

---

[165] Most studies on these methodological issues are in the field of the use of the OT in the NT. For the most recent contributions on the reception of Paul see Still and Wilhite 2016, Strawbridge 2015, Still and Wilhite 2013, Bird and Dodson 2011, Childs 2008, Gregory and Tuckett 2007a, b, Lindemann 1999, Beker 1996.
[166] Porter 1997:80.
[167] See section 4.3 for our criticism of the criteria used to identify Pauline influence in 1 Peter.
[168] van den Hoek 1996:229 cited in Strawbridge 2015:21.
[169] See section 3.4.1.

Beginning with Eph 2.11-22, then, we investigate whether Paul's Temple metaphors have influenced subsequent conceptualizations. Thus we observe verbal parallels, but more fundamentally we look to how the domains are constructed and the correspondences fixed. From there we can begin to observe how a particular use of a metaphor may highlight, hide, or extend some aspects of Paul's metaphor. We shall observe how Eph 2.11-22 draws upon the conceptual structure of 1 Cor 3.16-17 to address its own particular question: the relationship between Jews and gentiles in the church.

CHAPTERS FOUR, FIVE and SIX present three case studies into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors, examining 1 Peter 2.4-10, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the *Epistle of Barnabas* respectively. There is no illusion here that the texts chosen comprehensively represent the effective-history or even the early effective history of these metaphors. These case studies are selected based on the temporal proximity to Paul and the events of 70 CE, the likelihood of possible Pauline influence, and their perceived impact on how we approach Paul's metaphors. By examining these texts within the early effective-history of Paul, we observe how, either through actualization or association, they draw upon or address the conceptual structure of Paul's Temple metaphors in order to answer to particular questions. The use of Paul's metaphors to answer these questions demonstrates the semantic range of Paul's conceptualizations but also exposes us to particular interpretations of them that may unconsciously affect the questions we ask.

In these Temple metaphors, we observe that Paul created a powerful conceptual framework that provides answers to many different questions. By investigating the

questions which control a selection of early construals of these metaphors, we can begin to observe how Paul's Temple metaphors, which were not addressed to the question of the Temple's validity, could be utilized so effectively to this end. In examining the setting and early-effective history of Paul's Temple metaphors, we can see how Paul, from a historical and hermeneutical perspective, laid the conceptual groundwork for an early Christian interpretation of the Temple. Thus we can understand why, at the beginning of the second century CE, Tertullian could say of Paul, "it was he who even in his first [Epistle to the Corinthians] was the first of all [the apostles] to dedicate the Temple of God: 'Do you not know that you are the Temple of God and that the Lord dwells in you?'"[170]

[170] Ter. *Pud.* 16.2: "Qui et in prima primus omnium templum Dei dedicauit: *Non scitis vos Dei esse et in vobis Dominum habitare?*"

CHAPTER TWO:
THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN SECOND TEMPLE PRACTICE AND THOUGHT

2.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we explore the setting of Paul's Temple metaphors. However, our primary task is not to locate and elucidate the essential background or specific parallels for Paul's language. Rather, this chapter forms an investigation into the historical assumptions and anticipations of meaning that we bring to asking the question of Paul and the Temple. Here we reconstruct a general attitude and posture towards the Temple in Jerusalem held by Jews in this period, which will serve as a hermeneutical baseline and starting point for addressing Paul. Our examination does not begin with explicit verbal appraisals of the Temple, but focuses on observable public behavior exhibited by Jews towards the Temple. In doing so, we will see that the majority of Jews believed the Temple to be a central and necessary facet of their social and religious lives and adhered to the biblical commandments regarding it. This premise, having been established, will then function as a control for our subsequent investigation into various criticisms of the cult and conceptual understandings of the Temple. Our aim is to explore and demarcate the bounds of this Temple adherence, whether certain types of criticism and symbolic appropriation of the cult suggest a deviation from this stated norm and raise questions regarding the supersession of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem. While it is possible for Jews in this period to articulate statements that aim at the replacement or the rejection of facets of cultic worship, this is not the inherent or primary implication of this type of language. Nor can this language be used as evidence of a historical process of evolution away from material cultic practice. On the contrary, cultic criticism and symbolic

appropriation more often suggest the significance, centrality, and indispensability of the Temple rather than the desire to do away with it, and it is this assumption that we shall foreground in our subsequent examination of Paul's Temple metaphors.

2.2. Attitudes Towards the Jerusalem Temple in the Second Temple Period

2.2.1. Procedure

Scholarly discussions of Second Temple cultic language and its implications commonly take the form of various lists of citations, collected and categorized, and frequently arranged in a linear trajectory in order to demonstrate the gradual *spiritualization* of cult or the evolution away from material cultic practice.[1] Such compilations regularly remove these quotations not only from their textual contexts but, more significantly, from everyday religious practice in the ancient world. As a result, single sentences, themselves not self-interpreting, drawn from disparate texts are employed to represent the general sentiment of Jews towards the cult in this period, and ultimately their progression away from it. This procedure misses the wood for the trees by disproportionately prioritizing and taking as representative the words of the few over the observable and sustained activity of the many.[2] To combat this trend, we shall focus on public events and recurring patterns of behavior surrounding the Jerusalem Temple performed by Jews *en masse*. This activity is taken to be more indicative of general attitudes towards the institution held by Jews in the first century CE and thus provides a firmer basis upon

---

[1] As we saw with Finlan 2004:47-72.

[2] This procedure takes its lead from Goodman 2012:516, "I suggest the inclusion of such public events within a model that attempts to explain reactions to 70 may seem at least as reasonable as inclusion of the utterances of the individual authors whose writings have been preserved from this period by happenstance or due to the agenda of later Jews or Christians [...]"

which we can examine the implications of cultic language. While the depiction of these events and behaviours are certainly coloured by the biases of the authors who recorded them, their occurrences are widely attested and thus are not simply the products of particular perspectives.

To this end, four different activities will be examined, two of which are periodic, and two of which are exceptional: Jewish pilgrimage, the Jewish Temple tax, reactions to the Gaius incident, and reactions to the destruction of the Temple. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate and establish the position with which E.P. Sanders begins his depiction of the Temple in Jewish practice and belief,

> The overwhelming impression from ancient literature is that most first-century Jews, who believed in the Bible, respected the temple and the priesthood and willingly made the required gifts and offerings.[3]

It is in light of this general assessment that we shall then examine the implications of cultic criticism and metaphor.

2.2.2. The Singularity of the Temple in Jerusalem

In *Contra Apionem* 2.179, Josephus presents an idealized description of the unity of the Jewish people, claiming "wonderful agreement of minds amongst us all." The Temple is highlighted as one aspect of this solidarity: "[w]e have but one temple for the one God (for like ever loveth like), common to all as God is common to all." What would be certainly unremarkable about this statement to Josephus' Roman readers is that the Jews worship their God at a sanctuary with sacrifices.[4] More curious, perhaps, would be that

---

[3] Sanders 1992:52.
[4] Sanders 1992:49, "[i]n Rome, Greece, Egypt, Mesopotamia and most other parts of the word, religion was sacrifice... When Greeks or Romans commented on Judaism, they found none of this

Josephus continues to present Temple worship as a central facet of the Jewish religion some two decades after the Temple was destroyed. Most striking, however, is Josephus' contention that, for Jews, there should be only one Temple and locus of sacrifice. The belief in a single and centralized Jewish Temple is attested not only by priests in Palestine, such as Josephus, but also by philosophers in Egypt:

> He [God] moreover foresaw that there could not be any great number of temples built either in many different places, or in the same place, thinking it fitting that as God is one, his temple also should be one (*Spec. Leg.* 1.67). [5]

Philo's Diasporan admiration for the Temple is echoed in the *Letter of Aristeas*, thought to be written by a Jew in Alexandria in the second century BCE. Within the lofty panegyric of the Temple in vv. 83-99, he describes priestly activity as "absolutely unsurpassable in its vigor and arrangement of its well ordered silence" (92). The cumulative effect of witnessing the Temple service leaves one "awe-struck" and "dumbfounded", experiencing "astonishment and amazement beyond words, his very being transformed by the hallowed arrangement on every detail." (99). Even non-Jews marveled at Jerusalem and its Temple, particularly in the size and splendour of its

---

strange." So also Goodman 2005:459, "[t]o worship through offering sacrifical animals, libations, and incenses on special altars in areas consecrated and purified by dedicated priests was standard religious behaviour for almost everyone in the ancient world."

[5] This claim is all the more significant due to the temple of Onias at Leontopolis, whose construction and destruction is described by Josephus in *War*. 7.420-436. For an overview see Schürer et al. 2014a:145-147. Surprisingly, the Jews of Egypt have very little to say about this sanctuary. Regarding Philo, Leonhardt 2001:220 writes, "there is no hint that he might acknowledge the existence of other Jewish temples such as the one in Leontopolis." Rabbinic sources seem to downplay the validity of offerings placed there, cf. *m. Men* 13.10. Frey 1999:194 concludes, "[t]he influence of Onias' temple, however, should not be overestimated. The Jews of Egypt esteemed Jerusalem as a centre of pilgrimage..., and we can not see that the presence of a Jewish shrine in Egypt diminshed their loyalty in any way."

Herodian version.[6] The singularity and centralization of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem is what made it unique within the ancient world and provided the fundamental basis for its significance for Jews in the first century CE, for those both proximate and abroad.

2.2.3. Jewish Pilgrimage in the First Century CE

The distinctiveness of the Jewish Temple subsequently led to the religious, political, and economic centrality of Jerusalem among the Jewish people.[7] For evidence of this, one needs to look no further than the immensity and regularity of participation in Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem in this period. The law mandated that every male Israelite make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the three major festivals: Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles (Exod 23.17, Deut 16.16). It is unlikely that Jews in the Diaspora would be able to attend annually, but many, like Philo, made the journey at least once in their lifetime (*Prov*. 2.64). For this reason, Josephus seems to have eased the command in his account of pilgrimage to "only inhabitants from the ends of land which the Hebrews shall conquer" (*Ant.* 4.204), which likely reflected contemporary practice. Nonetheless, this should not lead us to underestimate the significance of these annual events.

Philo claims, "[f]or innumerable companies of men from a countless variety of cities, some by land and some by sea, from east and from west, from the north and from the south, came to the temple at every festival," (*Spec. Leg*. 1.169). This may appear hyperbolic, but Acts 2.9-11 and 6.9 similarly speak to the international flavour of these

---

[6] Tacitus says of Jerusalem, "[i]n it was a temple possessing enormous riches" (*Hist.* 5.8). Pliny the Elder writes of "the district that formerly contained Jerusalem, by far the most famous city of the East and not of Judaea only." (*Nat. Hist.* 5.15)

[7] Goodman 1999:69, "[t]he wealth of Jerusalem derived in one form or another from its sanctity... the main cause of its prosperity was the presence of the Temple."

events. Many Diaspora Jews, including women, who were not obligated to attend, seem to have done so (*War* 5.199). *The Letter of Aristeas*, written before the construction of the Herodian Temple, speaks of thousands of animals being sacrificed (88) and seven hundred priests on duty (95). Josephus estimates the presence of 3,000,000 Jews at Passover in 65 CE, and in *War* 6.420-427, he similarly claims 2,700,000 attendees. These numbers are universally doubted in modern demographic studies. Jeremias approximates 500,000-600,000 in attendance,[8] while Sanders concludes 300,000-500,000.[9] With population estimates for Jews in the Mediterranean world at the lower limit circling around 4,000,000,[10] the attendance at these festivals is proportionally impressive. On these events, Goodman writes,

> Such mass international pilgrimage is not attested for any other cult in the Roman empire, for the simple reason that only Jews insisted (at least in theory) both that only one Temple was a valid place for sacrifices and that all adult male devotees of the cult were duty bound to make regular obeisance there.[11]

The scale of these annual migrations cannot be explained without some appeal to a widespread dedication to the Temple and commonly held belief in the obligation to follow the legal prescriptions surrounding it.

Further evidence for these masses, as well as for the sense of national solidarity that accompanied their congregation, can also be observed in the large and often violent disturbances that occurred during these festivals. Even before the Roman occupation, we hear of demonstrations against Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) at the festival of Tabernacles, resulting in the deaths of "about six thousand" people (*Ant.* 13.373). During

---

[8] Jeremias 1969:205.
[9] Sanders 1992:128.
[10] For a discussion of these estimates cf. Feldman 1993:293 He cites this as the "minimum estimate" with others suggesting 8,000,000.
[11] Goodman 1999:70.

Pentecost in 4 BCE, "tens of thousands" of Jews attacked Sabinus' troops as they tried to lay claim to Herod's treasure (*Ant.* 17.254-268). At Passover in 4 CE, Josephus describes, "a vast crowd streamed in from the country for the ceremony" (*War* 2.10-13). Several among them took the opportunity to mourn and protest the killing of two teachers. Alarmed at this, Archelaus, the ethnarch, sent troops into the Temple, who themselves were met with Jewish stones. The soldiers responded and "about three thousand" were slain. A similar occurrence took place at Passover when Cumanus was procurator (48-52 CE). Here Josephus reports that the Romans were forced to increase security due to the masses: "the Roman cohort had taken up its position on the roof of the portico of the Temple; for a body of men in arms invariably mounts guard at the feasts, to prevent disorders arising from such a concourse of people" (*War* 2.224). Following a crude act committed by one of the Romans on guard, the Jews attacked the soldiers. Cumanus sent in reinforcements and 30,000 Jews were killed.[12] Once more Josephus' numerical precision can be doubted, but it is unlikely that his description of these events, both in their tone and scale, is completely unrepresentative. The regularity of these commotions attests to the size of the assemblies as well as their fervor. These festivals were not only well attended but also functioned as unique occasions for the expression of Jewish solidarity and were treated with the utmost seriousness and solemnity by the attendees.

This is not to say that pilgrimage to the Temple could not also be a joyous occasion. Philo, having made the journey himself, describes:

> They take the temple for their port as a general haven and safe refuge from the bustle and great turmoil of life, and there they seek to find calm weather, and, released from the care

[12] *Ant.* 20.112 reports that 20,000 were killed.

> whose yoke has been heavy upon them from their earliest years, to enjoy a brief breathing-space in scene of genial cheerfulness. Thus filled with comfortable hopes they devote the leisure, as is their bounden duty, to holiness and the honouring of God. Friendships are formed between those who hitherto knew not each other, and the sacrifices and libations are the occasion of reciprocity of feeling and constitute the surest pledge that all are of one mind. (*Spec. Leg*. 1.69-70)

Undoubtedly, Philo is presenting an idyllic description of the chaos of ancient travel. Nevertheless, in all likelihood, these festivals and the pilgrimages could function like national holidays and be anticipated and enjoyed as such. Like many holidays, these trips would have come at no small cost, in terms of either time or money. Goodman writes,

> Proper performance of pilgrimage without considerable expenditure was more or less impossible, however cheaply the pilgrim tried to live, since, according to early rabbinic texts, there was a requirement for the money earned in exchange for the second tithe (Deut. 14:26) to be spent by the pilgrim while within the boundaries of the city.[13]

Large temporal and financial expenditure can generally be taken as a secure indication of an individual or community's values and priorities. For so many Jews to invest so much in order to partake in these festivals demonstrates a commonly held and deeply felt devotion for the Temple and desire to partake in its services.

2.2.4. The Jewish Temple Tax

This worldwide support for and solidarity with the Temple is further exemplified in the payment of the Temple tax. The one time payment of a half shekel for the upkeep of the sanctuary is prescribed in Exod 30.13-16. In Neh 10.32 it is implemented as an annual one-third shekel payment, with the expenses of the Temple listed in v.33.[14] By the first century, these had been combined into an annual half-shekel tax and the evidence for this

---

[13] Goodman 1999:70. Cf. Sanders 1992:128-129.

[14] The tax was paid "for the rows of bread, the regular grain offering, the regular burnt offering, the sabbaths, the new moons, the appointed festivals, the sacred donations, and the sin offerings to make atonement for Israel, and for all the work of the house of our God." (Neh. 10.33)

transaction is abundant: "[t]hat this was paid is one of the things about first-century Judaism that is most certain."[15] *Arist.* 40 speaks of the delivery of the "first fruits of offerings for the Temple and one hundred talents of silver for sacrifices and the other requirements." Josephus describes the delivery of this tax from Mesopotamia:

> The Jews, in consequence, trusting the natural strength of these places, used to deposit there the two drachm coins which it is the national custom for all to contribute to the cause of God, as well as many other dedicatory offerings… Many tens of thousands of Jews shared in the convoy of these monies because they feared the raids of the Parthians, to whom Babylonia was subject (*Ant.* 18.313).

Similarly, Philo states that the Romans knew that the Jews "collect money for sacred purposes from their first-fruits and sent them to Jerusalem by persons who would offer the sacrifices" (*Leg*. 156) and again, "[f]or it is ordained that everyone, beginning at his twentieth year, should make an annual contribution of first-fruits" (*Spec. Leg*. 1.77). Following this, he states,

> Practically in every city there are banking places for the holy money where people regularly come and give their offerings. And at stated times there are appointed to carry the sacred tribute envoys sleeved on their merits, from every city those of the highest repute, under whose conduct the hopes of each and all will travel safely (*Spec. Leg*. 1.78).

Evidence from *m. Shek* 2.1 and Matt 17.24 further support Philo's description that the tax was collected locally and then delivered to Jerusalem.[16]

Knowledge of this tax and reality of its payment was also known to non-Jewish authors. This payment appears as one of the special allowances bestowed upon the Jews as gratitude for their support of Julius Caesar (*Ant*. 14.227). Cicero in his defense of

---

[15] Sanders 1992:156.
[16] Schürer et al. 2014b:270-274.

Flaccus, references the procurator stopping this payment (*Flacc.* 28.66-7).[17] Similarly, mention is made of it by Tacitus and in the epitome of Dio Cassius' *Roman History*.[18]

Philo again presents a rather idealistic depiction of the Jews desire to pay this tax:

> But our people pay gladly and cheerfully. They anticipate the demand, abridge the time limits and think that they are not giving but receiving. And so at each of the yearly sessions they make their contributions with benediction and thankfulness, men and women alike, and with a zeal and readiness which needs no prompting and an ardour which no words can describe (*Spec Leg*. 1.144).

While parting with funds, no matter what the destination or how appropriate the levy, is rarely celebrated, it is plausible to suggest that the payment of the Temple tax could have provided a sense of contribution to and participation with the Temple, as well as a sense of personal gratification from the fulfillment of a national and religious obligation. On Philo, in particular, Leonhardt writes,

> The problem of participation in this Temple cult over distances of time and space is solved… in the collection of the Temple dues… the worshipper need not be present in person when the sacrifices are offered: their knowledge of the rites being performed is sufficient to ensure participation.[19]

While it is possible that Philo's evaluation is unique, it is clear that the majority of Jews felt this tax ought to be paid and were recognized for doing so. Sanders states, "the Temple tax, along with observance of sabbath and food laws, would be a major sign of Jewish identity. Paying it marked one as a Jew; not paying it would lead others to think

---

[17] *Flacc.* 67: "When every year it was customary to send gold to Jerusalem on the order of the Jews from Italy and from all our provinces […]" Stern 1974:198 comments, "[t]here is little doubt that [this payment] was the annual half-shekel payment for the Temple."

[18] Tac. *Hist.* 5.5: "For the worst rascals among other people, renouncing their ancestral religions, always kept sending tribute and contributions to Jerusalem, thereby increasing the wealth of the Jews again; again, the Jews are extremely loyal toward one another, and always ready to show compassion, but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity." Dio *Hist.* 65.7: "From that time forth it was ordered that the Jews who continued to observe their ancestral customs should pay an annual tribute of two denarii to Jupiter Capitolinus."

[19] Leonhardt 2001:275.

that one had apostatized."[20] This appears to be the case in the pericope of Matt 17.24ff, where Jesus, though claiming possible exemption, still pays the Temple tax so as not to cause offense. The Romans seemed equally aware of the importance of this tax to Jewish identity when, following the fall of Jerusalem, the Flavians took the extraordinary and humiliating punitive measure of converting it into the *fiscus Iudaicus*, a levy which funded the building of the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome (*War* 7.18; Dio *Hist.* 66.7).[21]

As with pilgrimage, the evidence for the widespread and consistent payment of the Jewish Temple tax is illustrative of generally shared positive appraisals of and support for the Temple in Jerusalem. That Philo can speak of "the neglectfulness of some" (*Spec. Leg.* 154), in this respect, makes the contribution of the majority all the more significant. Jews from as far away as Babylonia sent or travelled with funds dedicated to the upkeep of the Temple and its continual cultic service, and in doing so, likely felt a sense of solidarity with this central Jewish institution.

2.2.5. Threats to the Jerusalem Temple

While the two cases above exemplify regular and voluntary engagement with and dedication to the Temple, widespread support for the Jerusalem Temple can also be observed in the reactions of Jews to that Temple coming under threat. Examples of such threats from this period are abundant. The most illustrative, however, is the attempt of Gaius Caligula to erect a statue of himself in the Jerusalem Temple. The events surrounding this crisis are recorded in Jewish sources by Josephus (*Ant.* 18.257-309) and

---

[20] Sanders 1990:49.
[21] For a summary, cf. Goodman 1989. See section 2.2.5 below.

Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium*). As with pilgrimage and the Temple tax, these authors' apologetic intentions shape the narratives and thus, possibly overstate the gravity and the uniformity of the Jewish response. Nevertheless, their independent attestation to this event and many of its particulars, as well as reports from other non-Jewish texts, lends credibility to their accounts' accuracy regarding both the historicity and character of the Jewish reaction.

The basic assumption of both these accounts is the utter seriousness any threat to the Temple posed to the Jewish people as a whole. Philo claims Gaius' motivation for the order was the Jews' reluctance to acknowledge his divinity. The Emperor decided to punish the Jews "on whom he could inflict no greater injury than the ruin of the sanctity of their temple" (*Legat.* 198). Petronius, who was to implement this order, anticipating the extent of the opposition took several legions with him towards Judaea.[22] Once he arrived at Ptolemais, he was met by "many tens of thousands of Jews…with petitions not to use force to make them transgress and violate their ancestral code" (*Ant.* 18.263). Philo also describes the meeting: "the multitude of the Jews suddenly descended like a cloud and occupied the whole of Phoenicia" (*Legat.* 226). Petronius was similarly met by "many tens of thousands" when he went to Tiberias (*Ant.* 18.271, 279).

While these petitions appear as peaceful protests, the possibility of escalation was certainly present. According to Josephus, Petronius knew "it would be impossible without a battle to carry out Gaius' behest and set up his image. Indeed there would be great slaughter" (*Ant.* 18.269). Philo likewise has Petronius ponder "that the Jews would willingly endure to die not once but a thousand times, if it were possible, rather than

---

[22] Two legions according to *Ant.* 18. 262 and three according to *War* 2.186. Philo claims it was "half his army", *Legat.* 207.

allow any of the prohibited actions to be committed" (*Legat.* 209) and "[h]eaven forbid indeed that the Jews in every quarter should come by common agreement to the defense" (*Leg.* 215). The Roman historian Tacitus even claims "when Caligula ordered the Jews to set up his statue in their temple, they chose rather to resort to arms" (Tac. *Hist.* 8.9). Although it is unlikely to have come to violence,[23] the extent of the response and extreme measures Jews were willing to take to prevent this action are very likely not to be inventions by our authors and are thus telling of the gravity that any threat to the Temple was considered to have represented.

Moreover, it is not only the actions of the masses but also the efforts of various individuals during these events that demonstrate the severity of this threat. Aristobulus, Agrippa's brother, Helcias, and many other prominent Jews joined the appeal to Petronius and were able to cause him to delay (*Ant*. 18.273ff). Petronius, whose motivations may not have been as noble or divinely inspired as Josephus and Philo claim, does seem to have endangered both his station and his life to prevent a conflict of immense scale from erupting (*War.* 2.193-202; *Ant*. 18.277, 283, 287). Agrippa I, who had endeavoured to ingratiate himself into the Roman court and befriend Gaius in particular, was willing to forfeit this status and risk death in order to appeal to the emperor. On this, Josephus comments,

> And thus did Agrippa venture to cast the die upon this occasion, so great was the affair in his opinion, and in reality, though he knew how dangerous a thing it was so to speak; for, had not Caius approved it, it had tended to no less than the loss of his life (*Ant.* 18.289).[24]

---

[23] Cf. Goodman 2008:402.

[24] Philo's version of this narrative differs in many ways from Josephus' account. What they both agree upon is the immensity of the risk taken by Agrippa's entreaty to Gaius.

Perhaps most illustrative are the actions of Philo himself. At the time of Gaius' order, Philo was in Rome on an embassy to the emperor to represent the Alexandrian Jews who had been victim of a series of violent pogroms.[25] Upon hearing of Gaius' plans, he considers,

> For small things must needs give way to big and particular to general interests, the loss of which means the perdition of the body politic. For what religion or righteousness is to be found in vainly striving to show that we are Alexandrians, when we are menaced by the danger which threatens a more universal interest, the corporate body of the Jews (*Legat*. 193-194).

He clearly states what he believes the consequences of Gaius' plans will be:

> For it is to be feared that the overthrow of the temple will be accompanied by an order for the annihilation of our common name and nation from the man who deals in revolution on so great a scale (*Legat.* 194).

Philo of Alexandria, a Jew from the Egyptian diaspora, prioritized the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple over the immediate and violent persecution which his own community was experiencing. For him, a threat to the Temple was a threat to the Jewish people and to their future and took precedence over the physical safety of himself and the Alexandrian Jews.

The extraordinary response to Gaius' plan suggests the indispensability of the Temple's existence and operation. Both the recorders of these events and their historical participants testify, implicitly and explicitly, to the horror the majority of Jews would experience at the cessation or defilement of its proper service. The response to this threat cannot be explained within and runs counterpoint to any narrative of a progressive and

---

[25] Philo records that Jewish homes were plundered (*Flacc.* 56; *Leg.* 121-2), Jews were murdered and their bodies mutilated (*Flacc.* 65-72; *Legat.* 127-131), synagogues were destroyed and desecrated (*Legat.* 132-4, 137), members of the gerousia were flogged, some until death (*Flacc*. 73-85), and Jewish women were forced to eat pork in a public arena (*Flacc.* 86-96).

incremental abandonment or rejection of the Jerusalem Temple by Jews before its destruction.

2.2.6. Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple

In 70 CE Jerusalem was sacked and its Temple destroyed. The actions of both the Romans and the Jews immediately following this event speak to the importance of the Temple for the Jewish people, though in vastly different ways. The Romans recognized it as a central, unifying national symbol which needed to be undermined, while for the Jews, its non-existence could only be comprehended as temporary and its return, necessary.

In the final assault, Roman historian Dio Cassius records that "the Jews defended themselves much more vigorously than before, as if they had discovered a piece of rare good fortune in being able to fight near the temple and fall in its defense" (Dio *Hist.* 65.6).[26] Perhaps it was due to this zealous defense on the part of the Jews that the Jerusalem Temple became a central symbol in Flavian propaganda depicting the Roman victory over the Jews. With Vespasian's ascent to the imperial throne, the requirements of imperial status and propaganda made necessary the depiction of a military victory over a foreign people, with Jerusalem and the Jews being the most expedient candidate.[27] We have already noted the imposition of the *fiscus Iudaicus,* the converted Temple tax, to which we may also add the minting of *Iudaea Capta* coins.[28] This tax would not only

---

[26] Later he says of the Temple's defenders, "it seemed to everybody and especially to them, that so far from being destruction, it was victory and salvation and happiness to them that they perished along with the temple." (Dio *Hist.* 65.6)
[27] For a full treatment of this thesis, cf. Goodman 2008.
[28] Cf. Schürer et al. 2014b:509-510 n. 128.

have been embarrassing, a constant reminder of defeat to Jews both in Palestine and the Diaspora, but also redirected the only economic source available for a rebuilding of the Temple. A triumph was awarded to Titus, in which, Josephus records, "[t]he spoils in general were borne in promiscuous heaps; but conspicuous above all stood out those captured in the temple at Jerusalem" (*War* 7.148). [29] These were all deposited and put on display in the new temple of Peace in Rome by Vespasian (*War* 7.158-162).

Domitian, son of Vespasian and brother of Titus, who himself had not participated in the Jewish war, doubled down on his family's earlier accomplishments. Following the death of his brother, he erected the Arch of Titus in 81 CE, which depicted Titus' triumph and the procession of the Temple utensils. In 85 CE, fifteen years after the fall of Jerusalem, he reissued the *Iudaea Capta* coins and, according to Suetonius, collected the *fiscus Iudaicus* "with special severity" ("acerbissime", Suet. *Dom.* 12.2). Since the destruction of the Temple became the centerpiece of the Flavians' right to rule, the Romans took the extraordinary measure of not allowing the Jews to rebuild it.

> In principle any temple could be rebuilt, but to allow rebuilding in this case would be hopelessly counter productive for the image of the new regime, since it would imply that the dynasty had begun with the sacrilegious desecration of an ancient sanctuary, hardly a propitious omen. Instead, Titus and Vespasian claimed the destruction as the brilliant culmination of their campaign...[30]

Roman activity indicates that they identified the Temple as the heart of the Jewish national and religious identity and, from their perspective, a victory over the Jewish people was no more clearly exhibited than by a victory over their Temple.

---

[29] Josephus lists in particular the shew-bread table and the seven-branched lampstand (*War*. 7.148).
[30] Goodman 2004:17.

Unfortunately, concrete historical information regarding Jewish reactions to the Temple that can be dated between 70-135 CE is rather limited,[31] and thus the immediate effects of 70 CE are a matter of constant debate.[32] We have already seen that Josephus writing in the 90s CE speaks of the centrality of the Temple to Jewish belief in the present tense.[33] Other texts, such as 4 Ezra, articulate a sense of despair. The standard narrative of post 70 CE Judaism suggests that the Temple and, more particularly, sacrifice was quickly replaced by Yohanan b. Zakkai and his rabbinic school at Yavneh:

> Once as Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai was coming out of Jerusalem, Rabbi Joshua followed after him, and beheld the Temple in ruins. Woe unto us, Rabbi Joshua cried, that this place, the place where the iniquities of Israel were atone for, is laid waste. My son, Rabban Yohanan said to him, be not grieved. We have another atonement as effective as this, and what is it? It is acts of lovingkindness, as it is said, 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice'.[34]

Accounts of such normative innovations immediately following the Temple's destruction are remarkably absent in Josephus. Goodman asks, "[i]s it, perhaps, rather the case that they were historically retrojected onto the post-Destruction generation by religious thinkers of much later centuries – who had had time to come to terms with the need to survive without the Temple?"[35] Even the Mishnah records very little of such innovation. In fact, what we find is Yohanan simply allowing the sounding of the *shofar* and the waving of the *lulavim* in places outside of Jerusalem (*m. Roš Haš.* 4.1, 3), hardly a concerted or comprehensive attempt to replace the cultic system. What Rabbinic texts of this period do provide is an abundance of description and discussion of Temple practice:

---

[31] Cf. Goodman 2012.
[32] Cf. Schwartz and Weiss 2012.
[33] This phenomenon is also seen in contemporary Christian texts, cf. *1 Clem.* 40; *Diogn*. 3. On the use of the present tense in Hebrews, see section 5.3.1.
[34] *'Abot R. Nat*. Translation from Neusner 1962:146.
[35] Goodman 2012:510. Cf. Neusner 1970.

> In tannaitic literature, there are not only individual testimonies on particular practices or ceremonies from Temple times, but also entire chapters and even tractates that describe the daily service in the Temple on ordinary weekdays, on the Day of Atonement and during the Sukkot festival.[36]

While Safrai notes that "[f]irst and foremost [tannaitic sages] wished to preserve for perpetuity the description of Temple and Jerusalem life", these descriptions have a secondary purpose, "to provide information on how to act when the Temple will be rebuilt in the near future."[37] For the latter, he cites as evidence the closing passage of *m.Tamid*: "[t]his is the order of the daily sacrifice in the service of the house of our God, May it be His will to rebuild it speedily in our days, amen."

Clements suggests there are two possible ways to construe the paucity of explicit responses immediately following the destruction of the Temple. The first explanation is that the Temple was of "minimal spiritual significance for most Jews by the late Second Temple period."[38] The evidence we have observed thus far argues against this position, with Clements herself deeming it "anachronistic". The second explanation is that there was "an underlying, taken-for-granted assumption of the continued centrality of Jerusalem and its Temple, within which the fact of the Roman destruction has yet to attain anything other than a temporal and temporary significance."[39] In support of the second option, Clements states, that

> Up through the composition of the Mishnah, Jewish sources, including apocalypses and Josephus, operate on the assumption that 'normative' Judaism has the Temple at its center, whether this entail the consciousness of a functioning cult or the expectation of its imminent or eventual reestablishment.[40]

---

[36] Safrai 1998:150.
[37] Safrai 1998:151.
[38] Clements 2012:521.
[39] Clements 2012:521.
[40] Clements 2012:535.

This position best accounts for the manner in which both Jewish and Christian texts discuss the Temple as an ongoing reality in the period, and the continued and preserved rabbinic reflection on Temple matters. Thus even after its disappearance, the Temple was not immediately abandoned, but rather traditions about it are preserved, betraying continued dedication to it. Furthermore, it seems possible that frustration at the lack of fulfillment of the hope for rebuilding the Temple contributed to the further outbreaks of violence against Rome in 115 CE and 132 CE.[41] It appears that it was only following the latter conflict, the failed revolt of Bar Kokhba in 135 CE and the establishment of Aelia Capitolina on the Jerusalem site, that Jewish hopes for a rebuilt Temple were permanently dashed and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE was viewed as a permanent reality.[42]

2.2.7. Conclusion

What emerges from this survey is that the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem in the first century CE was not a religious institution in decline. The evidence indicates that before its destruction, the Temple was more widely supported and attended than ever in its history. We have seen that Jewish people *en masse*, from both Palestine and the Diaspora, were willing to commit their time, money, and even their lives to the support and preservation of it. The popularity of pilgrim festivals, the ubiquity of the payment of the Temple tax, and the universal outrage at the Temple's possible desecration shows that on the whole

---

[41] So Goodman 2004:26; Horbury 2014:276. Similarly coins bearing the image of a star over the temple minted during the Bar Kokhba revolt may suggest plans to attempt to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, cf. Schürer et al. 2014b:554, Horbury 2014:382, 384.

[42] Clements 2012:525-533, notes that it is only after 135 CE, particularly in the works of Justin Martyr, that Christians began to capitalized on the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.

Jews of the period were not yearning to escape cultic obligations or to be saved from sacrifice. Distance from the Temple for those Jews in the Diaspora would certainly have resulted in a different relationship and perspective on the Temple. Tuval, in survey literature from these areas, concludes "the Temple and the cult did not function in any immediate and meaningful way in the Judaisms of the authors who produced the literature under review."[43] This does not mean that the Jews of the Diaspora did not hold the Temple in high regard,[44] or were left unaffected by its destruction,[45] but rather that the Temple did not play the same role in their day-to-day practical piety. While threats to the Temple always loomed and the possibility of its destruction was believed by some, it would be hard to imagine that an institution and structure of this magnitude, with worldwide religious and financial support could cease to exist or that its disappearance would be desirous in any way to any Jew. So Philo, "[f]or as long as the human race endure, and it will endure for ever, the revenues of the Temple also will remain secure co-eternal with the whole universe" (*Spec. Leg.* 1.76). Unfortunately for Philo, this was not to be the case. But even in its destruction, the Temple's significance can be seen. This was not an event that expedited the evolution away from ritualism and material cultic

---

[43] Tuval 2012:238.

[44] Tuval 2012:238, "[t]he Jews of the Diaspora read and venerated basically the same Torah as their brethren in the Land of Israel, the Torah which held Temple, its cult and its priests in great esteem. They had no need to argue about these things."

[45] Here Tuval and Goodman somewhat disagree. Goodman 1992:27 argues that "[t]here is... every reason to suppose that the rasing of the Temple horrified the Diaspora Jews as much as their Judaean compatriots. Jews outside of Palestine seem to have presumed the central importance of the Temple in Jewish worship despite the physical obstacles to their frequent attendance at the cult." While Tuval 2012:238-239, to the contrary, states, "[a]lthough it is reasonable to assume that the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple caused a certain amount of anxiety on the part of the Diaspora Jews, especially as events in Palestine gave rise to uncertainty concerning the status of Jewish communities elsewhere in the Roman Empire, it might not be too bold to suppose that for the religious life of the average Diaspora Jew, nothing much changed on the morning of the tenth of Ab in 70 CE."

practice, but a catastrophe which struck at the heart of Jewish people and religion, both in Palestine and the Diapora, and took decades to comes to grip with. It is with the basic but fundamental assumption of significant and widespread support for the Jerusalem Temple that we turn to some critical appraisals of the institution expressed during this period.

2.3. Criticism of the Cult in the Second Temple Period

While the previous section aimed at presenting the perception, generally held by the majority of Jews in this period, of the centrality and significance of the Jerusalem Temple, we should not simply assume there was complete harmony with regard to cultic issues. It is both intuitively likely and demonstrably true that Jews of the first century CE would vary in their particular perspectives towards the Temple and how its procedures should be conducted. Indeed, it is because the Temple and the precise execution of its divinely prescribed procedures were so significant, that substantial and consequential disagreements arose.

In this section, we focus on the nature and implications of Jewish criticisms that were leveled against the Jerusalem Temple and those conducting its service. By nature, we aim to examine not only the levelers and targets of criticisms, but also the tacit and commonly shared assumptions revealed by them. By implications, we seek what is suggested or required as a result of that criticism. Is it a call to reform, a command to withdraw from participation, or a rejection of the institution *in toto*? The sectarian texts found at Qumran, which in most studies are considered to be the paradigm of a "Gemeinde ohne Tempel",[46] and are most often appealed to as parallels for New

[46] Ego et al. 1999.

Testament cultic language,[47] will be the focus here. The symbolic appropriation of cultic concepts by the community will be discussed further below. Additionally, two further critiques of the cult from *Sibylline Oracles* 4 and Acts 7 will also be discussed. The form and implications of these critiques, often deemed radical, are exceptional in their desire to do away with sacrifice and Temples. We shall see that the criticisms of the Temple found in the scrolls often assume and arise due to the Temple's importance rather than its dispensability. While the critiques of *Sib. Or.* 4 and Acts 7 do undermine cultic principles, the uniqueness of these positions contextualizes the intentions and implications of other criticisms, but should not be taken as widely held or representative.

2.3.1. Cultic Criticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Schiffman's article "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Temple" provides a useful sketch of the standard reconstruction of the Qumran sectarian's relationship with the Temple.[48] He contends that the initial disagreements between the sectarians and the Temple authorities led to a withdrawal from participation in the Temple, and to the sectarians' substitution of Temple worship within their daily life and rituals. The sect continued to study the laws regarding sacrifice, as they were expecting to reclaim the Temple while they awaited the building of a new divine Temple at the end of days. Consequently, the Qumran community is held up as the example *par excellence* of the capacity and inclination of Jews in the Second Temple

---

[47] This hold true for nearly every volume on this topic, but in particular, see Gärtner 1965, Klinzing 1971, Schüssler Fiorenza 1976.
[48] Schiffman 1999. For a similar picture cf. Schürer et al. 2014b:528.

period to replace and live without the Temple and as a precursor and representative of the religious progress that would culminate in 70 CE:

> Like the Rabbinic Jews later on, the Qumran sectarians and other similar groups were in the process of shifting from Temple worship to prayer even before the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The destruction simply hastened a long ongoing process taking place in Judean society throughout the Second Temple period.[49]

This reconstruction relies on a number of debatable assumptions regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls. The first is the identification of a single group behind the composition of all the sectarian Scrolls. As a result, in order to maintain a single provenance, incongruous or even contradictory positions found in different Scrolls are assigned to different stages of the community's development. Second, this community is then often identified as Essenes,[50] another group thought not to have participated in the Temple cult, thus bolstering the view of a sectarian withdrawal. Lastly, it is not only assumed that the history of the community can be reconstructed, often along the lines mentioned above, but also that this reconstruction should guide our interpretations of the text.[51] The aim here is not to overhaul this standard picture, but to challenge and temper it by suggesting that neither the reality of a Qumran withdrawal from Temple participation nor the implication that this would result in a permanent rejection of the Temple is as assured as is often presented.

---

[49] Schiffman 1999:274.
[50] Schürer et al. 2014a:375-385, Sanders 1992.
[51] Both Goodman 2010: 263 and Klawans 2009: 146 highlight the problem of assuming that texts with a positive view of the Temple must be earlier. See Hempel 2010:277, "we may want to ask whether some of the texts that reached us more recently were, in fact, allowed to tell their story, or whether their voices were made to fit into the script of a much larger narrative."

2.3.1.1. The Dead Sea Sectarians and the Essenes

One of the parallels used to identify the authors and compilers of the sectarian texts at Qumran with the Essenes is the mutual refusal of both groups to participate in the Jerusalem Temple cult. This aspect of the Essenes' religious life is derived from two texts in particular:

> Their name which is, I think, a variation, though the form of the Greek is inexact, of ὁσιότης (holiness), is given them, because they have shown themselves especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds (Philo, *Prob.* 75).
>
> They send votive offerings to the temple, but perform their sacrifices employing a different ritual purification. For this reason they are barred from the precincts of the temple that are frequented by all people and perform their rites by themselves (Jos., *Ant.* 18.19).

In the Philonic passage, the key phrase comes at the end, οὐ ζῷα καταθύοντες, ἀλλ' ἱεροπρεπεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἀξιοῦντες, which seems to suggest the Essenes do not participate in animal sacrifice. However, the καταθύοντες is an instrumental participle, which specifically indicates the activity *by which* they have shown themselves especially devout. It is not an indicative verb demarcating what they do and do not do. Taylor argues that "Philo (and the Jews who are named the Essenes) distinguished between what priests do in the Temple (offer animal sacrifices) and what the Essenes do in terms of their service (construct their minds as holy, cf. *Her.* 184)."[52] Since Philo regularly uses the term θεραπευταί of priests and Levites,[53] the mention of not sacrificing animals denotes how the Essenes are "utterly dedicated to the service of

---

[52] Taylor 2012:29. *Her*. 184: "This mind filled with the breath of inspiration from heaven above is guarded from malady and injury, and then reduced to a single element is fitly rendered in its entirety as a holy libation to Him who inspired it and guarded it from all evil that could harm it."
[53] Taylor 2012:30 Cf. Philo, *Det.* 160, *Leg*. 1.135, *Sacr.* 13, 118-19, 127.

God",[54] without being or behaving like priests. It would also be uncharacteristic for Philo to lavish praise upon a group that did not sacrifice when he is so critical of such behavior (*Mig.* 89-93, see below) and, at the very least, argued that one should participate in the cult so as not to cause offense (*Ebr.* 87).[55]

The passage in Josephus begins with the presumption of some participation with the Temple, as the Essenes send votive offerings to the Temple. A textual variant has often governed the interpretation of the rest of the text. The earliest manuscript in Greek of this passage is generally considered unreliable and thus critical additions have relied upon the epitome of E and the Latin version. In these versions an οὐκ is placed between θυσίας and ἐπιτελοῦσιν, which results in the rather contradictory suggestion that the Essenes "do not perform their sacrifices employing a different ritual purification".[56] If the οὐκ is not integral, the passage simply suggests that the Essenes are "barred" or "shut themselves out" from the common precincts, so they can maintain and preserve their own particular and likely stricter practice of purity. Thus the ἐφ' αὑτῶν does not denote a separate sanctuary but "some form of segregation within the precincts of the Temple."[57] Within his own narrative, Josephus himself places Essenes at the Temple (*War* 1.78-80; 2.562-67; *Ant.* 13.311-13) and, as with Philo, it is unlikely the historian priest would commend their rejection of sacrifice.

---

[54] Vermès and Goodman 1989:21.
[55] Philo, *Ebr.* 87: "Again, that master as he stands at the outer, the open and visible altar, the altar of common life, will seem to pay much regard to skin and flesh and blood and all the bodily parts lest he should offend the thousands who, though they assign to the things of the body a value secondary to the things of the soul, yet do hold them to be good."
[56] Taylor 2012:98.
[57] Baumgarten 1977:67.

Therefore, from these passages it is not evident that the Essenes rejected sacrifice or participation in the Jerusalem Temple cult. Rather, it could be argued that they demonstrated their esteem for it by practicing more stringent purity standards. Consequently, an identification of the Qumran sectarians with the Essenes does not support a communal withdrawal from or rejection of the Jerusalem Temple.

2.3.1.2. Sectarian Criticism of the Cult

Whether or not the Dead Sea sectarians are identified as Essenes, it is certainly true that the texts discovered in the Qumran caves contain multiple criticisms leveled against the Jerusalem Temple. Many of these are understood within the context of the narrative provided by *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab). This text, interpreting the prophecy of Habakkuk in light of contemporary events relating to the community, presents a series of conflicts between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest. According to an interpretation of Hab 2.15, this Priest "pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to the house of his exile that he might confuse him with his venomous fury" (1QpHab. 11.5) and in Jerusalem, "committed abominable deeds and defiled the Temple of God" (1QpHab. 12.7).[58] The Wicked Priest is thus taken to be a Temple official, perhaps the high priest, and his conflict with the Teacher is the primary impetus for the community's withdrawal from Jerusalem and, more importantly, the context within which the scrolls disputes with the Temple should be interpreted.

[58] Translations are taken from Vermès 2004, unless otherwised indicated.

Schiffman argues that "[t]he disagreements of the sectarians with the Temple authorities are best illustrated from the MMT document."[59] He finds 22 examples of such disputes within the fragmentary text, including the offering of Gentiles (4Q394 3-5; 4Q395 8-9), the eating of the cereal offering (4Q395 10-13), ashes of the red heifer (4Q395 14), and the slaughtering of pregnant animals (4Q397 36-37). Upon its publication, 4QMMT was declared by its editors to be a letter from the Teacher of Righteousness to the Wicked Priest.[60] This immediately controlled the interpretation of the text as a document "to justify the sectarian schism".[61]

Recently, the assigning of this text's author/redactor(s) to the Teacher and its addressee to the Priest has become highly suspect:

> That this anonymous author is the Teacher of Righteousness is sheer conjecture. Such a hypothesis probably obscures our ability to understand the historical and sociological matrix of the document […][62]

One of the issues with this hypothesis is the tone of 4QMMT. Brooke states, "[t]he dialogical stance of the composition implies that its authors still consider the situation redeemable."[63] Similarly Goodman writes that 4QMMT "does not read like the polemic of a group which has cut itself off from the temple altogether."[64] This conciliatory tone was acknowledged by the document's original editors, who consequently suggested that its composition belonged to community's early life or even pre-existed its formation.[65] However, this solution is not completely satisfactory. Six or seven manuscripts of MMT

---

[59] Schiffman 1999:269.
[60] Qimron and Strugnell 1984.
[61] Schiffman 2000:558.
[62] Kampen 1996:132, as cited in Hempel 2010: 279.
[63] Brooke 2005:424.
[64] Goodman 2012:269.
[65] Qimron and Strugnell 1984.

were discovered in Cave 4, dating from the Hasmonean to Herodian eras. This suggests that the document continued to be copied late into the Qumran community's life and thus bore some enduring significance and authority. Brooke has suggested that,

> The issues discussed at the time of the break with the Jerusalem Temple were revisited from time to time by members of the community, perhaps at times when there seemed to be the possibility of genuine reform and reconstruction, such as with Herod.[66]

Weissenberg argues that the writing, preservation, and study of 4QMMT actually point to "a continuous, real and acute concern for the purity of the Temple cult."[67] She takes as an important indicator of this the use of the *maqom*-formulae in 4QMMT, where the command of Lev 17.3-7 that all slaughtering must be done at the Temple, is combined with Deut 12, where it is in Jerusalem that sacrifices must be made.

> [And concer]ning what is written […] outside the camp a bull, or a sheep or a goat, for…[… in the n]orthern part of the camp. And we think that the Temple [is the tent of meeting, and Je]rusale[m] is the camp; and outside the camp [is outside of Jerusalem;] it is the camp of their cities. Outside the ca[mp…]…[…the sin-offe]ring [and] removing the ashes of [the] altar and bur[ning there the sin offering, for Jerusalem] is the place which [he has chosen] among all the trib[es of Israel…].
>
> And one should not let dogs enter the h[o]ly camp, because they might eat some of the bones from the temp[le with] the flesh on them. For Jerusalem is the holy camp and it is the place he as chosen among all the tribes of Israel. For Jerusalem is the head of the camps of Israel.[68]

Similarly, Kratz notes that here Jerusalem is explicitly identified with both the מחנה of Lev. 17 and המקום אשר חריב יהוה of Deut. 12.[69] From this, Weissenburg argues that "the identification of the central cultic place with Jerusalem, only implied in Deuteronomy, is explicit in 4QMMT."[70] It is difficult to understand how later copiers of 4QMMT could

---

[66] Brooke 2005:424.
[67] Weissenberg 2010:296.
[68] These translations are from Weissenberg 2010:299, 300.
[69] Kratz 2007:57.
[70] Weissenberg 2010:300.

reconcile these statements of the cultic centrality of Jerusalem with their own abandonment of that Temple and their supposed Temple self-identification.

Another piece of evidence is the "separation passage", found in most editions of 4QMMT at the beginning of the epilogue,[71] which reads: "[And you know that] we have segregated ourselves from the rest of the peop[le…]".[72] Hempel states this passage "is commonly read as a reference to the separation on the part of the authors of the document from society at large."[73] However, once this text is removed from the context provided of 1QpHab. and the previous ritual disputes are seen to demonstrate the continuous concern for the Temple on the part of the author(s)/redactor(s), the passage reads much differently. From its initial publication, the text's editor, Qimron, noted the novelty of the meaning "depart, secede" of פרשׁ in this passage: "[t]he neutral, or even positive, use of the verb פרשׁ to describe the creation of 'sects' and especially of MMT's sect is noteworthy."[74] Yet, the assertion of semantic innovation may be unnecessary. This separation could easily be understood as halakhic in nature, a parting in interpretation from the people and practices that have been deemed inappropriate by the author(s)/redactor(s) and already outlined.[75] The term could also refer to a type of intra-communal segregation that we observed with the Essenes in *Ant.* 18.19.[76] It need not

---

[71] The placement of this passage at the beginning of the epilogue rather than in the body has been challenged by Weissenberg 2009:95-104.

[72] ([…ם]פרשנו מרוב העם ש[ואתם יודעים]. This separation passage is found in both 4Q397 (MMT^{d}) and 4Q398 (MMT^{e}).

[73] Hempel 2010:284.

[74] Qimron and Strugnell 1994:111.

[75] Weissenberg 2009:235.

[76]Similarly, it is unclear to whom the term עם refers. Hempel 2010:286 notes that only traces of the ayin are preserved and the mem is entirely reconstructed, thus the reading of "people" is not wholly secure, Qimron and Strugnell 1994:111, 115 suggest that this to refer to the "they" group found in the body of the document, likely the Pharisaic precursors of the rabbis. However, the

read, as it only unnaturally does, as a statement of the formation of sect. On this reading Hempel concludes, "[i]t seems likely that the schism notion has been imported into this particular text from outside, it is part of the baggage of the overall assessment of this document that is now being questioned."[77] In this case, 4QMMT may not be a document that justifies a schism but rather evidence of an ongoing halakhic debate regarding the proper interpretation and implementation of various Temple practices.

Similar cultic disputes and debates can be found throughout the Scrolls, but are particularly concentrated in the *Damascus Document* (CD) and the *Temple Scroll* (11QT). Both these texts contain complaints of moral and ritual defilements of the Temple.[78] However, as with 4QMMT, if the standard narrative for the Qumran community is not assumed, the implications of these criticisms are not so clear.

CD 4.15 lists the three nets of Belial: "[t]he first is fornication, the second is riches, and the third is the profanation of the Temple.". These three complaints, and the causal connection between them, provide a succinct summary of the text's subsequent cultic criticisms.[79] In CD 5.6-9, the author(s)/redactor(s)' targets "profane the Temple because they do not observe the distinction (between clean and unclean) in accordance with the Law, but lie with a woman who sees her bloody discharge." A related command is presented in 12.1-2, "[n]o man shall lie with a woman in the city of the Sanctuary, to defile the city of the Sanctuary with their uncleanness." That lying with a woman defiles,

---

'they" group appears to refer to a priestly caste who lead the people astray rather than the people themselves, cf. 4QMMT B 25-27, 80; C 27, C 31.

[77] Hempel 2010:287.

[78] This categories are provided by Klawans 2006:147-161.

[79] So Brooke 2005:423, "[t]o all intents and purposes all three signs may be suitably linked with the Temple, since all three areas involve acts that transgress the distinction between clean and unclean in some way."

seems to suggest this is characteristic behavior of the contemporary Temple administrators. Like the *maqom*-formulae of 4QMMT, this passage supports the centrality of and concern for Jerusalem as the עיר המקדש. Furthermore, the purity concerns presented here are not only more stringent but also more expansive and govern the whole city, not simply the sanctuary.

Evidence for the second net of Belial also abounds. In CD 6.11-17, separation is required from "the unclean riches of wickedness acquired by vow or anathema or from the Temple treasure." This is followed by a command "they shall not rob the poor of His people, to make widows their prey and of the fatherless their victim." As with lying with a menstruant in 5.6-9, this type of economic behavior is connected with distinguishing between clean and unclean and between holy and profane. Similarly, CD 16.13-14 states "[n]o man shall vow to the altar anything unlawfully acquired. Also, no Priest shall take from Israel anything unlawfully acquired." If these requirements were aimed at contemporary practice, as they seem to be, this would suggest large-scale economic mismanagement, if not outright theft, on the part of Temple priests.

The economic critique of CD 6 is preceded in the text by what is often taken to be a clear prohibition against Temple participation:

> None of those brought into the Covenant shall enter the Temple to light His altar in vain. They shall bar the door, forasmuch as God said, *Who among you will bar its door?* And, *You shall not light my altar in vain* (CD 6.11-14).

This text is further combined with CD 20.22 in order to suggest that these disputes led to an abandonment of the Temple:[80]

> And every member of the House of Separation (בית פלג) who went out of the Holy City and leaned on God at the time when Israel sinned and defiled the Temple, but returned

---

[80] Baumgarten 1977:42.

> again to the way of the people in small matters, shall be judged according to his spirit in the Council of Holiness.

Commenting here, Schiffman writes, "Temple sacrifice according to prevailing norms was considered by this text to be null and void."[81] Klawans concludes, "[w]hen we read this evidence alongside the other anti-temple polemics… the evidence becomes cumulative, supporting the claim that the critiques raised here are 'rejectionist' ones, not 'reformist' ones."[82]

Once more, this interpretation is not self-evident. First, it neglects other sections of CD where participation at the Temple is clearly assumed. In CD 9.13-14, Hempel notes that the sacrifice of the ram demonstrates "an uncritical and unpolemical reference to the sacrificial cult."[83] CD 11.17-18 provides regulations for Sabbath offerings and 11.19-20 for burnt and cereal offerings. CD 14.19 assumes the efficacy of sin and meal offerings and regulations for free-will offerings are provided 16.13-17. Even the criticisms we observed above, to which we add the prohibition of Gentile offerings in 12.9, assume some level of participation.[84] According to Brooke, CD "recognizes the basic worth of the Temple, through permitting members to sacrifice there, but it attacks vehemently those connected with running it."[85] Unless we are to suggest that CD is internally contradictory on this point, 6.11-14 and 20.21 likely do not imply a total abandonment of Temple participation.

---

[81] Schiffman 1999:271.
[82] Klawans 2006:152. He defines as rejection approach as one that "not only criticizes the current temple as inadequate in some way but also takes the critique to the next level by boycotting the temple and possibly by establishing some alternative." See Klawans 2006:147.
[83] Hempel 1998:92.
[84] On this Davies 1983:136 notes that "the law reminds community members of the sanctity of the Temple."
[85] Brooke 2005:423.

CD 6.11-14 is an interpretation of Malachi 1:10. The crux of this interpretation lies in how the author(s)/redactor(s) of CD understood Malachi's חנם, "in vain".[86] As this passage is succeeded by a number of prohibitions against improper practice, the phrase appears to relate to Temple procedures conducted improperly. This certainly need not suggest that all cultic activity is "in vain", as Schiffman does, nor that proper procedure is presently impossible within the Temple, as Klawans does. But rather, like the prophetic critique of cult, the passage calls for a return to appropriately conducted cultic processes.

While CD 20.21 does suggest some sort of withdrawal from Jerusalem, the passage also refers to a rejoining or accommodation with the Temple authorities.[87] Furthermore, the "House of Separation" should not be viewed as a concrete appellation for the community in sectarian texts. 4QpNah. 4.1 states, "Interpreted these are the wicked of [Judah], the House of Separation (בית פלג), who joined Manasseh." Clearly the phrase could have pejorative connotations and its meaning was not fixed or self-defining. As with the debates we observed in 4QMMT, when divorced from the sectarian narrative, the prohibitions and critiques of CD can be equally read as affirmation of the importance of the Jerusalem Temple and the maintenance of its purity as a rejection of them.[88]

Following our examination of the *Damascus Document*, the tone and the types of the criticism found in the *Temple Scroll* appear very familiar. A variety of purity laws are preserved in 11QT 45.7-51.10, many of which suggest the Temple may be defiled due

---

[86] Collins 1998:12 writes, "[t]his statement is ambiguous, depending on how we take the phrase 'in vain.' It may mean that the Essenes should refrain from all temple sacrifice, but it can more plausibly be taken to mean that they should not follow rituals that the sect regarded as improper."
[87] Baumgarten 1977:72.
[88] So Goodman 2010:272, "the emphasis of this latter passage, which cites Malachi 1:10, is precisely the need to take care to worship properly as the law requires, and the same must be true of the Dead Sea sect."

to the admittance of the ritually impure: the man with the nocturnal emission, the man who had sexual intercourse with his wife, the blind man. Here, the *Temple Scroll* presents higher standards than even the Pentateuch, as it requires three days for the purification from seminal emission, while Lev 15.16 and Deut 23.10-11 require only one. This section also reflects an expansionist view of purity, similar to that in CD 12.1-2. The text states "[t]he city which I will sanctify causing my name and [my] sanctuar[y] to abide [in it], shall be holy and pure of all impurity with which they can become impure" (47.4-5) and similarly "[y]ou shall not profane the city where I cause my name and my sanctuary to abide" (47.11).

These heightened requirements for purity may be the reason why the text envisions a different Temple structure.[89] However, unlike the *New Jerusalem* texts (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554-555, 5Q15, 11Q18), this Temple is explicitly not an eschatological Temple constructed by God:

> I shall accept them and they shall be my people and I shall be for them for ever. I will dwell with them for ever and ever and will sanctify my [sa]nctuary by my glory. I will cause my glory to rest on it until the day of creation on which I shall create my sanctuary, establishing it for myself for all time according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob in Bethel. (11QT 29.7-10)

The Temple outlined in here is unmatched in Jewish literature in scale and magnificence. While this may simply be an attempt to supplement the biblical text, which contains no prescription for Temple architecture, it is difficult not to view this as an inherent criticism

---

[89] Brooke argues that the Hasmonean dating of 11QT^{b} and the Herodian dating of 11QT^{a} suggests that these temple plans were intended to influence John Hyrcanus and Herod's construction programs. While this could be the case, it is equally possible these plans were composed and edited as a response to these programs. Cf. Brooke 2005:424-425.

of the existing structure. Certainly all other temples, the one standing in Jerusalem included, "fall short by comparison."[90] However, Klawans also notes:

> While the *Temple* Scroll's ritual purity rules appear to differ from those of other ancient Jews – leading to a critical evaluation of the current temple – the essential theology of the *Temple Scroll* seems largely consistent with other biblical, ancient Jewish, and rabbinic document.[91]

What Klawans is highlighting is that the *Temple Scroll's* concern with purity is directly correlated with its belief that God dwells in the sanctuary. This is clearly exemplified by the Scroll's insistence on a protective moat:

> You shall make a one-hundred-cubits-wide ditch around the sanctuary which shall divide the holy sanctuary from the city so that no one can rush into my sanctuary and defile it. They shall sanctify my sanctuary and hold it in awe because I abide among them (46.11-12).[92]

The criticisms of the *Temple Scroll* do not call for a Temple-less Judaism, or a paradigm of community evolving away from ritual practice. Rather what we observe is that the depth of the criticism and the urgency of the call for change often reflect the significance of the Temple rather than the desire to do away with it.

2.3.2. Other Criticisms of the Cult

While the Qumran sectarians criticized the cult and may have even temporarily withdrawn participation in it, the texts they produced still reflect a Temple centered, cultic mode of thinking. In this section, we examine two texts where the very idea of a Temple appears to be under attack, *Sibylline Oracles* 4 and Stephen's speech in Acts 7.

---

[90] Klawans 2006:159.
[91] Klawans 2006:155.
[92] Cf. also 11QT 45.12-14; 46.4, 8; 47.3-4, 10-11, 18; 51.7-10.

2.3.2.1. Sibylline Oracles 4

Sibylline Oracles 4 is a curious text both within both the *Sibylline* corpus and Jewish literature of this period at large. Its provenance is debated, with Nikiprowetzky suggesting Egypt and Collins debating this.[93] The date is somewhat more discernible as the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (70 CE) and the eruption of Vesuvius (79 CE) are mentioned in vv.116 and 130-15 respectively. Since it predates *Sib.* 5, which itself was written before the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132 CE,[94] *Sib. Or.* 4 is generally placed in the late first century CE, c. 80 CE.

What makes *Sib. Or.* 4 particularly noteworthy is its explicitly negative view of temples and sacrifice. In contrast to *Sib. Or.* 3:702 where "the sons of the great God will all live peacefully around the Temple", and *Sib. Or.* 5:400 which speaks of "the ever-flourishing, watchful Temple of God made by holy people and hoped by their soul and body to be always imperishable", *Sib. Or.* 4 is described as "arguably the most anti-Temple-and-cult composition written in the Diaspora."[95] This assessment comes from two specific passages in the oracle:

> But of the great God, whom no hands of men fashioned
> in the likeness of speechless idols of polished stone.
> For he does not have a house, a stone set up as a temple,
> dumb and toothless, a bane which brings many woes to men,
> but one which it is not possible to see from earth nor to measure
> with mortal eyes, since it was not fashioned by mortal hand (6-11).

It is clear from v.6, that the Sibyl here has idol worship primarily in mind. A textual variant may support this. Collins uses the ψ manuscript group, whose text reads, ναὸν λίθον ἱδρυθέντα, translated as, "a stone set up as a temple". The φ group substitutes ναῷ

---

[93] Collins 1983:382.
[94] Collins 1983:382, 390.
[95] Tuval 2012:222.

for ναὸν, while the Ω group replaces ἱδρυθέντα with ἑλκυσθέντα, suggesting, "a stone dragged into the temple." This reading may reflect the Semitic idea of sacred stones rather than simply a stone temple.[96] However, the final two verses of the passage appear to clearly state that God's habitation is immaterial.

A similar invective is found later in the text, where the Sibyl claims that happy men,

> will reject all temples when they see them;
> altars too, useless foundations of dumb stones
> (and stone statues and handmade images)[97]
> defiled with blood of animate creatures, and sacrifices
> of four-footed animals (27-30).

In this passage, the rejection of animal sacrifice is added to the denunciation of temples and altars. Indeed, the Sibyl goes as far to speak of temple being "defiled" (μεμιασμένα) with animal blood.

Although it is clear in both these passages that the Sibyl has pagan practice in her crosshairs, the attack on the principles of a temple and sacrifice viewed here are taken to have consequences for similar Jewish practices. Collins concludes, "[w]hile these passages are not specifically an attack on the Jewish Temple (which no longer existed), they undermine the very idea of temple worship and make no allowance for the possibility of an acceptable temple."[98] Similarly Chester writes, "[o]n balance, therefore, although the main thrust of both 4-11 and 27-30 is polemic against idolatry, they allow no positive place for the form and practice of the Jerusalem temple either."[99] Thus, since

---

[96] Cf. Chester 1991:63-64.
[97] Collins 1983:384 n. d: "this vs. is found only in Clement and is rejected by Geffcken."
[98] Collins 1983:383.
[99] Chester 1991:66.

Sib. 4 makes this argument against pagan worship, *mutatis mutandis*, its author would take this position against the Jewish cult.

However, several factors do temper this equation. Firstly, in its description of the destruction of the Temple, *Sib.* 4 discloses some reverence for the institution, calling it "the great Temple of God" (116). Its destruction is given a Deuteronomic interpretation as it is the result of sin: "they put their trust in folly and cast off piety and commit repulsive murders in front of the Temple" (117-118) This Deuteronomic theme is continued as the earthquakes in Salamis, Paphos, and Cyprus (128-9) and the eruption of Vesuvius (130-135) are a result of the destruction of the Temple and the slaughter of Jews: "Know then the wrath of the heavenly God, because they will destroy the blameless tribe of the pious" (135-136). The perspective found in these texts may give us pause as to whether the author of *Sib.* 4 would so quickly identify the Jewish cult with pagan practice.

Secondly, that we can date this text, or at least this redaction of the text, to the post-destruction period may be significant. This is not to say, as Chester does, that "*Sib.* 4 is completely caught up in the aftermath of the disaster of 70."[100] If the *Sibylline Oracles* can be read as "political propaganda"[101] or a "Jewish missionary pamphlet",[102] it may be possible to interpret these polemics not as a reaction to the destruction of the Temple but rather as the type of arguments that can be made against pagan practice now that the Temple has been destroyed. Since there is no longer a Jewish Temple or functioning cult, the writer need not worry if these critiques apply to Jewish practice. In this case, the

---

[100] Chester 1991:68.
[101] Collins 1983:320.
[102] Tuval 2012:223.

destruction of the Temple may not be the impetus or occasion for this polemic but rather that which allows for the possibility of it. Although the author does condemn the very principle of temples and sacrifices, it is not entirely clear she would have done so while the Temple still stood and operated. Nonetheless, this type of criticism of the foundations of temples and sacrificial worship, even in the period after the destruction of the Temple, characterize *Sib. Or.* 4 as outlier, with perhaps one exception.

2.3.2.2. Stephen's Speech, Acts 7.2-53

The speech of Stephen presented in Acts 7.2-53, particularly vv. 44-50, is often considered the closest parallel to critique of cult found in *Sib. Or.* 4. As with *Sib. Or.* 4, this speech, particularly with regard to its view of the Temple cult, is peculiar within its own context, the narrative of Acts. In chapter 6, Stephen is brought before the high priest on charges, attributed to false witnesses (μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς), that he "never stops saying things against this holy place and the law" (6.13). At the end of Stephen's response to his accusers, which takes the form of a narrative reflection on the history of Israel rather than a personal defense, he indeed appears to take aim at the Jewish cultic institution:

> Our ancestors had the tent of testimony in the wilderness, as God directed when he spoke to Moses, ordering him to make it according to the pattern he had seen. Our ancestors in turn brought it in with Joshua when they dispossessed the nations that God drove out before our ancestors. And it was there until the time of David, who found favor with God and asked that he might find a dwelling place for the house of Jacob. But it was Solomon who built a house for him. Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands; as the prophet says,
>
> 'Heaven is my throne,
> and the earth is my footstool.
> What kind of house will you build for me, says the Lord,
> or what is the place of my rest?
> Did not my hand make all these things?'

Several factors characterize this passage as "anti-temple". To begin with, v.44 appears to validate the tabernacle in the wilderness. Rowland claims that the NRSV

translation of this verse is misleading as θεός does not appear in the text, simply ὁ λαλῶν.[103] He suggests that this implies angelic mediation for the tabernacle rather than divine approbation as the last speaker in the text was the angel in v.38 (τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος). This is unlikely as it ignores the preceding first person prophesy in vv.42-43. The tent of witness (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου) clearly contrasts with the tent of Moloch in v.43 (τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ), as also the pattern presented to Moses (κατὰ τὸν τύπον) contrasts with the images (τοὺς τύπους) the Israelites worshiped.

A subsequent comparison emerges in vv.46-47, this time between the σκήνωμα David asked to build and the οἶκος which Solomon eventually does. The descriptions of the two kings are clearly contrastive. While David "found favour with God", Solomon is given no epitaph; while David makes a request, Solomon simply acts; while David desires a "dwelling place" for God, Solomon builds a "house".[104] The δέ, while not as emphatic as the ensuing ἀλλά, further indicates discontinuity with David's appeal and Solomon's actions. V.48 clearly expresses Solomon's failure and Stephen's thesis. The Most High (ὕψιστος), a term used to emphasize God's transcendence, does not dwell ἐν χειροποιήτοις, here clearly denoting not only physical temples but also suggests idolatrous structures. Although there are some uses of this term that simply mean "man-made", χειροποίητος "was virtually a technical term in Greek-speaking Judaism for idols".[105] This connects the Temple to the description of the golden calf as ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν in v.41 and contrasts it with heaven and earth as the work of God's hands in the Isaiah 66 quotation in v.50, which further relativizes the need for a Temple.

---

[103] Rowland 2005:473.
[104] There is a textual variant here. οἴκῳ is found in early, more secure manuscripts (ℵ, B, D) and is also the harder reading.
[105] Keener 2012:1416.

Keener argues, "Stephen need not reject the temple's usefulness in some ways to regard its abuse as equivalent to idolatry."[106] However, unlike what we observed in 4QMMT, CD, and 11QT, no cultic or ritual misconduct is mentioned by Stephen. In fact, the only "abuse" here appears to be the existence of the fixed Temple. As Dunn states, "[t]he Temple is presented, not least by contrast to the mobile tent, as a serious hindrance and embodiment of a false perception of God."[107] The Temple is not being misinterpreted or mistreated by Stephen's opponents, the Temple itself is an indication of their misunderstanding about God.

This statement is all the more stunning due to Luke's presentation of the Temple in the rest of Acts.[108] Both before and after Stephen's trial, Christian activity in Jerusalem was centered around the Temple (Acts 2.46; 3.1; 5.12, 20, 42). When Paul becomes the focus of the narrative he is presented as cultically observant Jew: he takes a Nazarite vow (18.18), is eager to visit Jerusalem for Pentecost (20.16), fulfills his vow through purification and sacrifice (21.26). prays in the Temple (22.17), brings alms and offers sacrifices (24.17), and claims to have spoken nothing against the Temple (25.8). On Luke's presentation, Barrett concludes, "we have the work of one who was concerned to affirm that the Christian who had the reputation of being the most radical treated the Temple with the greatest respect."[109] Dunn concludes that Luke "almost bends over backwards to show Paul in a conciliatory mood towards the Temple".[110] The closest parallel to Stephen's remarks in Acts are found in Paul's speech at the Areopagus, where

---

[106] Keener 2012:1418.
[107] Dunn 1996:91.
[108] For a thorough summary cf. Barrett 1991.
[109] Barrett 1991:355.
[110] Dunn 2006:64-65.

he claims "[t]he God who made the world and everything in it, he who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by human hands (οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ)" (17.24), which, like *Sib. Or. 4*, is specifically a critique of pagan worship.

There are several strategies available to account for Stephen's speech. One, as we saw in Keener, is to mollify Stephen's position. Another is to try and establish a source behind Luke's account. Dunn lists four reasons why the speech is not "Luke's own": (1) Its content is unique in Acts, particularly in that it is only overtly Christian at the end; (2) It contains features of an unorthodox account of Israel's history; (3) the lack of any anxiety over circumcision; and (4) "the denunciation of the Temple in 7.48 runs quite counter to Luke's otherwise consistently positive appraisal of the Temple."[111] The speech is often viewed as a synagogue sermon from the Jewish diaspora, particularly from Egypt with its connections to *Sib. Or.* 4 and the *Epistle of Barnabas*.[112] Others ascribe it to a Hellenistic Jewish-Christianity.[113] Still others claim the speech in Acts may reflect the arguments and comments Stephen actually made. The speech as it is presented certainly would qualify as ῥήματα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου (6.13). If the speech does relate to Stephen's trial, the setting would be pre-70 CE, whereas a Lukan composition or Hellenistic source could postdate the destruction of the Temple. As with much source criticism, however, precision and certainty here is lacking. Pervo is right to state "Luke may have availed himself of a source here, but its limits cannot be securely identified and thus used as an aid to understanding the passage."[114]

---

[111] Dunn 1996:92.
[112] Tuval 2012:225. On the presentation of the Temple in *Barnabas* see section 6.3.
[113] Conzelmann 1987:177.
[114] Pervo 2009:178.

For our purposes, what is most important is not the origin of the critique but simply its articulation. Barrett remarks, "the treatment of the Temple in Acts has no adequate parallel in Judaism… The paradoxical – or, perhaps, thoughtless – combination of the positive and negative principles is without analogy."[115] From a narrative perspective Stephen's speech does serve a purpose in Acts. Stephen's argument for a de-localized presence of God serve Luke's purpose articulated in 1.8, and prepares for the conversion of the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch, as well as the spread of the Gospel amongst the gentiles. However, the gravity of the criticism presented here, that in this period there could be a Jewish critique of cult that questioned not just the validity of Herod's Temple, but of Solomon's as well, seems of no concern to Luke and difficult to reconcile with the rest of the narrative. While Stephen's speech is similar to *Sib. Or.* 4, it is directly against the Jerusalem Temple while the Sibyl's is a critique of the Jewish Temple by implication.

2.3.3. Criticism of the Cult: Conclusion

Other examples of criticism of the cult from this period could be assembled and discussed. The critiques considered here are those taken to be the most representative and which have the most seriously implications for the status of the Jerusalem Temple. By examining the nature and implications of the criticism of cult found at Qumran, in *Sibylline Oracles 4*, and Acts 7, we can draw three conclusions. First, the existence of a criticism of the cult does not denote a rejection of it, either in practice or principle. In the first section of this chapter we noted how integral the Jerusalem Temple was to Jewish

---

[115] Barrett 1991:361.

society. With an institution so central, significant, and influential, disputes are bound to arise. At the same time, such an institution is not easy to abandon. We must keep in mind that,

> in a world in which sacrifices on altars were seen as the natural way to worship the gods, and within a religious system which relied on a sacred text which not only enjoined all Jews to perform such sacrifices but gave precise instructions, based on a divine mandate, as to how this is to be done, the Temple cult was not lightly abandoned.[116]

Second, rather than suggesting rejection, many of these criticisms actually reinforce the notion of the indispensability of the Temple cult. If the standard picture is correct, the Qumran sect's formation was wholly on account of their concern for the Temple to be administered properly. The Dead Sea scrolls themselves are simultaneously the most critical of the Temple and representative of one the most Temple-centric variations of Judaism in the period.

Third, in *Sib. Or.* 4 and Acts 7, we observe that it was not impossible to reject the notion of Temple and sacrifice in principle. The radicalness of these positions, however, is in stark contrast to the criticisms observed a Qumran and help to differentiate their targets and implications. In his survey of Diaspora texts, Tuval concludes,

> Apart from two radical Diaspora writings that took the lack of interest in the Temple and preference for more spiritual worship to a polemical extreme, we have not detected any categorical rejection of the Temple and its cult…. this is not surprising.[117]

Similarily Sanders,

> Thus, while we may grant that there were some radicals who opposed the temple service as such, it is more important to emphasize that most Jews – who believed the bible, in which commandments about the temple figure very large – accepted the sacrificial system as a principal aspect of the true worship of God.[118]

---

[116] Goodman 2010:269-70.
[117] Tuval 2012:238.
[118] Sanders 1992:54.

These criticisms serve as the exceptions that prove the rule that cult criticism demonstrates concern for proper performance of cult. Therefore, the existence of criticisms of the cult in the Second Temple period does not represent a new, enlightened stage of religious evolution but rather a deep concern for the proper administration of this divinely authorized institution.

2.4. The Temple as Concept in Second Temple Jewish Thought

We have seen how the Temple in Jerusalem occupied an essential place within Jewish thought and practice. Since the Temple was so esteemed, we can also conclude that it was generally well understood. Many Jews in Palestine would have first-hand experience of its workings and for those who lived apart from it, its operations were outlined in and could be known through study of Torah. Its history and functionality was known and has been recorded by not only priests such as Josephus, but also Diaspora Jews like Philo and those who lived well after its destruction, such as the rabbis.[119]

In this section, we proceed from how the Temple was understood, to how other phenomena could be understood in terms of it. We have seen how metaphorical conceptualization is based in everyday experience, how common and highly delineated conceptual domains (source) are mapped onto and used to structure more abstract ideas (target). Since the Temple was such a recognized, well-defined conceptual category, we

---

[119] It is for this reason that we also know so much about the Temple. Goodman 2005:459 notes that , [t]he Jerusalem Temple is in fact, or at least should be, much better known than any other temple system in the ancient world precisely because these later Jews and Christians preserved so much evidence about the way the Temple operated. For no other temple does there survive a record of sacrifical ritual as detailed as the lengthy discussions in the Mishnah and Tosefta. For no other temple do we have a long first-hand description by a priest who had known the cult from the inside, as Josephus did."

should not be surprised that it also served as an important cognitive tool with which other things could be comprehended. Indeed, this type of conceptualization is so common, that it would be impossible to survey it exhaustively. Here we focus on one type of conceptualization, where the Temple itself serves as the source domain. Furthermore, we limit our discussion to the two collections of text most regularly considered: the Dead Sea Scrolls and Philo. While neither sets of texts should be considered paradigmatic nor comprehensively representative, their provenances are diverse, Palestine and the Diaspora, and they are illustrative of the spectrum of possible implications these mappings can have. The aim here is not to identify and explicate parallels for our examination of Paul's Temple metaphors, but rather to observe how these conceptualizations function in some Jewish texts, the contexts in which they are formed and the questions which they seek to answer.

2.4.1. Temple Metaphor in the Dead Sea Scrolls

A characteristic much discussed and widely attributed to the Qumran community is that the community defined itself as a Temple. Due to the criticism observed earlier, the community separated from the Jerusalem cult and sought substitutions in their own communal practices. The classic account of this position is provided by Gärtner. He claims the sectarians "transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem Temple to the community", and thus "came to replace the temple of Jerusalem; they themselves 'the new temple'."[120] This thesis, made early in the study of the Scrolls, remains well supported to this day. While this position takes into account discussion of prayer,

---

[120] Gärtner 1965:18, 16.

sacrifice, and priesthood in the Scrolls, it largely centers on explicit statements conceptualizing the community as a Temple. These shall also be our subjects and we will investigate why these conceptualizations are made, what they highlight, and what they imply.

The most important evidence for this Temple conceptualization comes from the *Community Rule* (1QS) and 4QFlorilegium (4Q174). At the outset, however, it is worth noting that this understanding of the status of the community does not appear in the texts observed above where specific grievances are made against the Temple. It is nowhere found in 4QMMT. On CD, Klawans writes "the terms 'sanctuary' (מקדש) is used nine distinct times in CD… with at least one additional usage in the 4Q manuscripts… If the author(s) of CD wanted to say that the community was truly a temple, why not use that word?"[121] A polemical use of Prov 15.8 is found in CD 11.20-21, which may suggest the substitution of Temple practices. However, this is clearly used in the context of offering at the altar and presupposes such activity.[122] One way to explain the absence of this concept in 4QMMT and CD, as we have seen, is to place them earlier in the community's development. Kapfer presents an argument that CD is prior to 1QS based purely on this notion. For CD, she writes "[i]t seems at this state in the development of the sect, the notion of the community as a temporary substitute for the profaned Temple had not yet coalesced."[123] The notion is similarly absent from the *Temple Scroll*. Here we find discussion of the current Temple, a new Temple, and a final eschatological Temple, but

---

[121] Klawans 2006:165-66.
[122] Davies 1983:137 notes this "furnishes an ideal text for any community wishing to claim that the Temple could be dispensed with by those who lived righteously. But the text is not used that way at all. It is, on the contrary, used to specify the need for absolute purity in all matters concerted with sacrifice. " See Hempel 1998:37.
[123] Kapfer 2007:172.

not the community as the Temple. Furthermore, while 1QS can speak of the need to separate from unjust men (5.1), it does not list criticisms about the Temple nor discuss the historical development of the community.[124] Thus the connection between the community's specific grievances against the Jerusalem Temple and their communal identity as a Temple substitute is an intertexual construct, which draws on and combines several different sectarian texts. This does not mean this construct is incorrect, but simply that if we are to understand the community's self-identity as a Temple in light of texts such as 4QMMT and CD, then we must also understand it in terms of the *Temple Scroll,* the *War Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem* texts, where the desire for alternative and new concrete Temples can be found.

2.4.1.1. The Community Rule

The *locus classicus* for the sectarians' conceptualization of their community as the Temple is found in 1QS 8.5-11ff:

> When these are in Israel, the Council of the Community shall be established in truth. It shall be an Everlasting Plantation, a House of Holiness for Israel, an Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron. They shall be witnesses to the truth at the Judgment, and shall be the elect of Goodwill who shall atone for the Land and pay to the wicked their reward. It shall be that tried wall, that *precious-cornerstone*, whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their place. It shall be a Most Holy Dwelling for Aaron, with everlasting knowledge of the Covenant of justice, and shall offer up sweet fragrance.

The target of this conceptualization is עצת היחד, a technical designation for the sectarian community. The source domain is constructed through the phrases בית קודש לישראל, and סוד קודש קודשים לאהרון, "a house of holiness for Israel" and, literally, "an assembly of the

[124] Baumgarten 1977:48.

holy of holies for Aaron".[125] Schmidt has argued that these two terms present a bifurcated picture of the Temple as two courts.[126] However, this depiction would be inexact, lacking the third court, and it is more likely the terms are basically synonymous. It is clear that these terms refer to the Temple, and thus we observe a Temple source domain activated here. What is less clear is why the text "make[s] use not of the more specific word for sanctuary (מקדש) but the more ambiguous and multivalent term, 'house' (בית)."[127] The phrases do appear somewhat circumlocutionary. This could be a stylistic choice, in line with other obscure sectarian sayings, or it might suggestion some hesitation in claiming an exact identity of the community with the sanctuary. This is perhaps supported by the presence of multiple source domains in the conceptualization. As well as being the Temple, the community is also מטעת עולם, an "eternal planting".[128] The metaphorical mapping from a source to a target domain is always partial; it highlights certain aspects of the target and hides others and thus the need for multiple metaphors. It is perhaps inconsistent to claim a one-to-one identity of the community with the Temple when, "[n]o one expects… the comparison between the community and a plant to be exact."[129] This is not to deny that a Temple metaphor is present here, only to caution against overstatements about it.

The central correspondence fixed in this Temple metaphor is the community's ability to enact atonement for the land. The concept of the community atoning for the

---

[125] A similar phrase to the latter here appears below: מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון, "a dwelling of the holy of holies for Aaron".
[126] Schmidt 2001:162.
[127] Klawans 2006:165. On the use of the Greek term οἶκος to refer to the Temple in 1 Pet 2.5, see section 4.2.
[128] This metaphor is found elsewhere in 1QS 9.8, 1QH^{a} 14:15.
[129] Klawans 2006:166.

land is first introduced in 1QS 5.6, where a Temple metaphor is not used. The theme is then continued in 9.4-5 where atonement is made and loving-kindness achieved "without the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice". Baumgarten comments, "the communal institutions of the sect are here held to have expiatory value and are considered to be more acceptable than standard forms of sacrifice."[130] However, both the translation of this passage and it implications are unclear. It has also been translated "by means of" burnt offerings.[131] If this does refer to atonement "without" animal sacrifice, the implications are still not immediately clear. Does this indicate that atonement cannot be achieved with animal sacrifice, that animal sacrifice is deficient and in need of supplementation, or that the two methods of atonement are complementary? The tone of these passage indicate that there is some need for atonement, thus suggesting the third option is unlikely. However, there is nothing in the text that suggests, as Gärtner does, "blood sacrifices have been replaced indefinitely by 'spiritual sacrifice'."[132]

A further entailment of the conceptualization of the community as a Temple is the requirement for stringent purity regulations. For Schiffman, the purity regulations can "only be understood if the sect itself was regarded as a Temple, and therefore, it was obligatory to maintain Temple purity laws within the context of the life of the group."[133] These are evidenced throughout the scrolls and follow the logic of the metaphor. In order to enact atonement, the community conceived itself as a Temple and therefore had to maintain Temple purity. However, maintaining Temple purity outside of the Temple was

---

[130] Baumgarten 1977:43.
[131] Wise, Abegg, and Cook 2005:139.
[132] Gärtner 1965:111.
[133] Schiffman 1999:100.

not a practice exclusive to Qumran,[134] and the purity requirements expressed here in 1QS not only do not match any known Temple requirements, but also go well beyond them. Also connected with this entailment is the need to separate from unjust men. Klawans suggests that this separation into the desert is not in fact anti-Temple, but "[s]trongly suggests a temporary, provisional situation."[135] It is not obvious that this combination of separation and the need for atonement indicates a total abandonment of Temple participation. The Essenes in *Ant.* 18.19 are barred from the Temple precincts and perform sacrifice with different purity regulations, but still send votive offerings to the Temple.

The Temple metaphor of 1QS 8 is constructed around the need for atonement and the accompanying purity requirements. Consequently, the metaphor requires separation and implies the insufficiency of atoning activity elsewhere, but does not explicitly criticize or permanently replace cultic activity. Nor does speaking of this self-identification as a metaphor imply that the Qumran sectarians did not believe themselves to be the Temple. Metaphors can serve as the fundamental means of conceptualizing certain phenomena. Recognizing that TIME IS IN MOTION is a metaphor does not imply the belief that time is actually static. At the same time, metaphors are partial and incomplete, the target is not fully described by the source, and thus the source is never fully utilized in the mapping. As an example of the latter, surprisingly absent from the Temple metaphor of 1QS 8 is any strong doctrine of the dwelling of the divine presence of God. This doctrine was strongly articulate in the Temple theology of 11QT when referring to concrete Temples, and while the notion may be implicit in the conceptualization of the

---

[134] See Philo's *Contempl.* on the Therapeutae.
[135] Klawans 2006:165.

community as a Temple, it is not highlighted. Thus again, it is unclear whether the sectarians believe the divine presence had departed the Jerusalem Temple and dwelled with them. Similarly, it is equally unstated that this Temple conceptualization represents the new, final, eschatological Temple. If so, this would present a very different picture than other sectarian texts. All signs point to this communal understanding as a temporary reaction and response to contemporary cultic insufficiencies.

While the Temple metaphor of 1QS 8 is often cited as evidence for a community that is ready and willing to dispense with the Temple, it rather points to the necessity of Temple. The community's need to conceive of themselves as a Temple demonstrates their inability to conceive of obeying the law and honouring God without one. Even if there is a substitution of material Temple practice with communal here, this is not the result of a rational flight from the inherent flaws of ritualism. Temple metaphors conceived out of a lack of access to the cult, whether geographical or theological, do not necessarily denote the desire to displace it but may indicate the indispensability and centrality of the notion of a Temple in Jewish practice and belief.

2.4.1.2. 4QFlorilegium

The other text considered crucial for this discussion is 4QFlorilgeium (4Q174). This is a collection of texts that present a *pesher*-like interpretation of biblical passages, in particular 2 Sam 7.10-14. For Vermès the purpose of the collection is "to present the sectarian doctrine identifying the Community with the Temple, and to announce the coming of the two Messiahs…"[136] The important text is found in the first column:

---

[136] Vermès 2004:525.

> He commanded that the Sanctuary of men (מקדש אדם) be built for Himself, that there they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the Law (4Q174. 1.6-7).

Unlike 1QS, the term for "sanctuary/temple", מקדש, is present here. In fact, this is the only text used as evidence for the Temple as community doctrine that explicitly uses this term.[137] In this passage, three Temples are cited: מקדש אדני, מקדש ישראל, and מקדש אדם.[138] The מקדש אדני and מקדש ישראל are clearly different, with the identity of the Temple-builder, God and humans respectively, and the prohibition of foreigners being their distinguishing features. The identity and meaning of מקדש אדם depends upon how the phrase itself is parsed and how it relates to the other Temples mentioned.

The prevailing view of מקדש אדם, particularly prior to the publication of 11QT, was that of Gärtner, as reflected in Vermès' translation, that "the theme of the text, as far as the expression *miqdaš 'ādām,* is that the eschatological temple is to be made up of the community."[139] In this interpretation, מקדש אדם is understood as "a Temple of men", as in a non-physical "Temple consisting of men", and is identified with the מקדש אדני. However, this is far from the only interpretive possibility. The term can also be understood as a non-physical "Temple consisting of men" but a distinct intermediary Temple. The phrase could refer "a Temple built by men" and could be identified with the מקדש ישראל, or a third Temple. For example, Schwartz argues that this is Solomon's Temple, a man-made sanctuary among the people.[140] The phrase could simply refer to "a Temple among men" and thus could refer to any of the three options. Yadin, the publisher of 11QT, had already claimed that this phrase refers to a physical sanctuary

---

[137] Schwartz 1979:83-84.
[138] For a useful table, cf. Wise 1991:108.
[139] Gärtner 1965:35.
[140] Schwartz 1979.

built by God which will stand "*among* the people".[141] Finally, אדם could refer be a collective noun referring to "men", or a proper noun referring to "Adam" and thus a future Edenic Temple.[142]

If the text should be rendered as a metaphor, TEMPLE OF MEN as in a Temple consisting of men, then its metaphorical structure is different than Temple metaphor found in 1QS. The source in this conceptualization would be אדם, while the target would be מקדש. Just as in the metaphor THE HEART OF A LION, the concept of LION is mapped onto that of HEART, so here it is the notion of a collection of MEN that is mapped onto TEMPLE, and thus the TEMPLE is conceptualized as MEN rather than MEN as a TEMPLE. This implies that not only is the community understood in terms of the Temple but the Temple itself is understood in terms the community. This would mean the metaphor within the Scrolls is bidirectional and results in a clearer statement of Temple substitution. If this "Temple of men" were then viewed as the final eschatological Temple, it would further suggest that God's plan ultimately was to do away with physical Temple and material cultic worship.

Since מקדש אדם is not self-interpreting, its meanings and implications are derived from whether it is read along side other sectarian texts and how those texts are prioritized. This passage is mostly read in concert with 1QS 8, as both suggest a Temple identity for the community. We have noted that the metaphorical structuring of these two texts is different. The *Community Rule* envisions a sort of stopgap strategy, which may suggest that 4QFlorilegium be read likewise, as a third distinct Temple comprised of men. If 1QS is read in light of 4QFlorilegium, both can then be read as eschatological Temples of

---

[141] Yadin 1959.
[142] Brooke 1999.

men. However, this would put them at odds with 11QT and 1QM, which envision historical rebuilding and reclaiming the Temple respectively, as well as a future Temple built by God. If read in light of these texts, מקדש אדם more likely refers to a Temple built by or amongst men. We must also be open to the possibility that there is not a unified position on or doctrine of the Temple in the Scrolls. Whether due to temporal development or differences in provenance, these texts may present varying viewpoints on this subject. The ambiguity of this text perhaps suggests that it should not be utilized as strong evidence one way or the other. If we are to read them collectively, it seems better to read 4QFlorilegium in light of those texts with better attestation, to move from the less to the more ambiguous formulations, rather than *vice versa*. Therefore, it is unlikely that the מקדש אדם of 4QFlorilegium is the final and promised Temple of God understood as the Qumran community in their present form.

Rather than qualifying them as a "Gemeinde ohne Tempel", the use of Temple metaphors in the sectarian texts of Qumran reveals an unwillingness to do away with the notion and necessity of the Temple. This conceptualization is premised on perceived deficiencies in the mandatory performance of atonement in the Temple of Jerusalem. It is not the case that these deficiencies are derived from the sectarian conviction that they are the true Temple, but rather the community is required to perceive of itself as the Temple to compensate for the currently ineffective sanctuary in Jerusalem. Thus, one of the defining characters of the Qumran community is not their separation from the Temple, but, more fundamentally, their deeply held conviction that there must exist a Temple functioning in accordance with the will of God to enact atonement. Since the Temple structure is required to be in Jerusalem, and will be again in the future, the community

must take on the identity of the Temple and make atonement for the land until that day should come.

2.4.2. The Temple in Philo of Alexandria

Turning our attention to the writings of Philo, we move from Palestine to Alexandria, from Hebrew texts to Greek, and from a sectarian perspective to a philosophical one. One of the difficulties with addressing Philo is the question of how idiosyncratic his thinking is. The debates between Goodenough and Wolfson are certainly not settled; the former arguing that Philo is a singular example of Hellenized Judaism, not evidenced elsewhere, and the latter that Philo is a forerunner for the rabbis.[143] Philo was a prolific and complex writer, and most generalizations about his thought can easily be undermined by reference to other parts of his corpus. For our purposes, Philo is useful not as a representative of Diaspora Judaism *in toto*, but in being *a* representative of a possible way in which at least one Diaspora Jew could conceptualize the Temple cult. Since Philo's corpus is so large and this thought so intricate, what we provide here is simply a sketch of his basic presentation and interpretation of the Temple.[144]

In section 2.2, we observed Philo's general posture towards the Temple. He encourages pilgrimage, having made the journey to Jerusalem at least once himself, and the payment of the Temple tax. Most significantly, during the Gaius crisis, he changes his agenda prioritizing the sanctity of the Temple over the suffering of his Jewish community in Alexandria. Tuval, referencing the unpublished thesis of Martin, claims

---

[143] Goodenough 1935, Wolfson 1948.
[144] For fully works dedicated to this subject, see Laporte 1989, 1991, Hayward 1996, Leonhardt 2001, Klawans 2006:116-123.

Philo's concern for the Temple was solely on a political and communal level. He argues, "[t]he Temple was thus important for Philo since – and insofar as – it symbolized Roman recognition and protection of Judaism."[145] However, both his participation in the events above, and, as we shall see, his understanding of the cult do not support this conclusion. As Leonhardt states, "[i]n spite of Philo's strong interest in the spiritual importance of the cult, these passages disprove that Philo is not interested in the actual city of Jerusalem with the man-made Temple and its cult."[146]

Fortunately, Philo's view of the Temple need not be gleaned only from his actions. Philo is well known for his philosophical and allegorical interpretations of the Jewish law, and discussions of the Temple and sacrifice are found throughout his works. In particular, his *Special Laws* contains a sustained discussion of cultic matters. However we begin outside this text in order to outline an important hermeneutical principle for the interpretation of cult. Philo is clearly interested in the symbolic meanings of texts and ritual, and criticizes, sometimes snidely, literalists who only pay attention to the letter of the law.[147] At the same time, in *Mig.* 89-90, he addresses those who treat the literal sense of the law (τοὺς ῥητοὺς νόμους) with "easy going neglect". For Philo, this approach is equally erroneous, since, regarding symbolic and literal sense, "they ought to have given careful attention to both aims, to a more full and exact investigation of what is not seen and in what is seen to be stewards without reproach." An anthropological analogy is provided, as these people are like disembodied souls, detached from any physical or social contact, "overlooking all that the mass of men regard, they explore reality in its

---

[145] Tuval 2012:191.
[146] Leonhardt 2001:213.
[147] For example *Mut.* 60-62.

naked absoluteness" (90). Following an application of this principle to various rites, including the Temple cult:

> Why, we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the Temple and a thousand other things, if we are going to pay heed to nothing except what is shewn us by the inner meaning of things. Nay, we should look on all these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul. It follows that, exactly as we have to take thought for the body, because it is the abode of the soul, so we must pay heed to the letter of the laws. If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols; and besides that we shall not incur the censure of the many and the charges they are sure to bring against us (92-93).

On this Borgen writes, "[t]he symbolic, though higher and more important, practically never invalidates the literal."[148] However, Philo's argument is stronger than this. Not only is the literal valid, but it is necessary as it allows the inner, symbolic meaning to be more clearly and distinctly known (ἀριδηλότερον).[149] The pursuit of reality in its naked absoluteness will always bear incomplete results.

Furthermore, Philo's argument here is not simply that his readers ought to pay heed to the sanctity of the Temple, but rather he asserts that by seeking only symbolic meaning, neglect of the Temple is what necessarily follows. This resulting disregard of the Temple, and other rites, is argument enough against this interpretive perspective. The structure of the argument implies and even requires those he is attempting to persuade to have an existing investment in such matters. At the same time, the argument also implies the existence of at least some Jews who greatly diminish the literal reading and practical adherence to the law. The identity of these "radical allegorizers" is, for our purposes, less important than the fact that they represent a possible posture towards the law and the cult in this period, though one with which Philo strongly disagrees.

---

[148] Borgen 1984:261.

[149] Leonhardt 2001:118, "the literal meaning of the rites is not replaced, but enriched by the symbolic interpretation of every kind of worship as ultimately expressing the gratitude of the creation towards the Creator."

Having examined some of Philo's interpretive principles, we now turn to his actual depiction of the Temple. The section of *Special Laws* discussing the cult begins with his most general assessment of the Temple: "The highest, and in the truest sense, the holy temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe, having for its sanctuary the most sacred part of all existence, even heaven […]" (*Spec. Leg.* 1.66). This conceptualization of THE UNIVERSE IS THE TEMPLE is part of Philo's larger program to demonstrate that "the Jewish laws… correspond to the universal cosmic order, and thus the rites have universal relevance."[150] From this initial understanding, he is able to fix further correspondences and draw further entailments. The Jewish high priest does not serve only his own nation, but "makes prayers and gives thanks not only on behalf of the whole human race but also for parts of nature […]" (*Spec. Leg.* 1.97).[151] This representative function is ascribed not only to the high priest but the whole Jewish nation. When the sheaf is present as the first fruits, it demonstrates that, "the Jewish nation is to the whole inhabited world what the priest is to the State" (*Spec. Leg.* 2.162). This priesthood within the cosmic Temple can be ascribed to the Jewish nation because they carry out the rites of purification, obey the divine laws, and obey the one true God. The concept of the Temple allows Philo to give a particular conceptual structure to his view of the universe within which the Jews occupy a select role, precisely because of their literal adherence to and participation in the law.

A similar Temple conceptualization is presented in *Somn.* 1.215:

---

[150] Borgen 1984:273. Cf. Hayward 1996:109.

[151] A similar role is ascribed to the high priest in *Mos.* 2.133. Here and elsewhere (*Quest. Gen.* 2.107-124) Philo embarks on an allegorical interpretation of the priestly vestments, a popular theme in the Second Temple period. Cf. *Arist*. 99; *Sira* 45.6-22; 50.1-24; *Wis. Sol.* 18.24; Jos. *Ant*. 3.183-87.

> For there are, as is evident, two temples of God: one of them this universe, in which there is also as High Priest His First-born, the divine Word, and the other the rational soul, whose Priest is the real Man;

In this passage, the concept of the Temple is simultaneously mapped onto two targets: the universe (κόσμος,) and the rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχή). Thus THE UNIVERSE IS THE TEMPLE and THE RATIONAL SOUL IS THE TEMPLE. The first metaphor is familiar, though the High Priest of this universal Temple is Philo's λόγος (cf. *Mig.* 102).[152] The mapping in the second metaphor introduces a different target. This may appear inconsistent, that Philo is mixing his metaphors, as this dual mapping of the Temple appears to transgress the principle of one Temple for one God (*Spec. Leg.* 1.67). However, just as literal practice cannot be reduced to symbolic interpretation, so too can it not be reduced to a single meaning or used to understand a single phenomenon. Similarly, Lakoff and Johnson suggest, "the connections between metaphors are more likely to involve coherence than consistency."[153] By this they mean there need not be a point-by-point correspondence between metaphors, but they "have a major common entailment". There is for Philo conceptual coherence between the λόγος and the soul: "it is fitting that the rational soul of man should bear in it the type of the divine Word" (*Quest. Gen.* 2.62). The Temple then becomes a suitable conceptual tool for understanding both the κόσμος and the ψυχή, as the Temple is the place where the λόγος is especially operative. This is seen in the depiction of Aaron in which the ascription of reason to the intellect pertains,

> to that which exercises its priesthood and offers sacrifices in purity, that of Aaron, and not even to this always, for many a time it turns and fails, but when it continues free from turning, when it enters into the Holy Place, when the reasoning faculty enters in together with holy resolves and does not abandon these. (*Leg. All.* 3.125)

---

[152] This has parallels with *Sira* 50, where the high priest Simon embodies Wisdom.
[153] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:44.

Aaron's, and thus the high priest's, duties are enacted in accordance with reason. Furthermore, this rational status is limited to the times of actual participation in the Temple service.[154] Thus Temple practice as essentially rational provides a concrete conceptual model for understanding the universe and the soul.

Nevertheless, the status of the cosmos and soul as Temple does not negate the need for an earthly sanctuary:

> There is also the temple made by hands; for it is right that no check should be given to the forwardness of those who pay their tribute to piety and desire by means of sacrifices either to give thanks for the blessing that befall them or to ask for pardon and forgiveness for their sins (*Spec. Leg.* 1.67).

At first blush, however, several aspects of this depiction appear depreciatory. The term χειρόκμητον, is similar to the term χειροποίητος in Acts 7:48 and 17:24 which we observed has connotations for idolatry. Although it can also simply mean man-made (*Deus 25*), Philo uses this term to categorize idolatry: "the lawgiver is teaching us that no manufactured god (χειρόκμητος) is a God for sight and in reality" (*Post.* 166; cf. *Spec. Leg.* 1.22). In this description of the Temple in *Spec. Leg.* 1.67, it is clear that χειρόκμητον is not describing the object of worship, but rather the facilitation of worship and thus the term is likely used to distinguish this Temple from the divinely made cosmos. Yet, this description of the Temple's facilitation seems to suggest that the physical Temple is a means of concession to human ritualistic desires.[155] If this were the case, however, rites could be performed in individual households, which Philo here

---

[154] Leonhardt 2001:229, "even the priests are purely rational only when they enter the Temple to do God's service, and only the High Priest is completely focused on God, when he enters into the presence of God in the holy of holies."

[155] This could sound vaguely reminiscent of Justin's view of the temple in *Dia.* 22: "For indeed the temple, which is called the temple in Jerusalem, He admitted to be His house or court, not as though He needed it, but in order that you, in this view of it, giving yourselves to Him, might not worship idols."

explicitly rejects. The singularity of the Temple in Jerusalem "bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple" and is "the severest test to their dispositions" which requires a "religious spirit (εὐαγῶς)" (*Spec. Leg.*1.68). The Temple is thus not a concession, but provides training for and proof of true Jewish piety.

Spec. Leg. 1.67 lays out a dual function for the Temple: to give thanks for blessings and gain forgiveness for sins. This mirrors Philo's comments regarding the purpose of his journey to Jerusalem as "offering prayers and sacrifices" (*Prov.* 2.64). However, in one passage Philo seems to subordinate sacrifice to prayers and praise:

> for each of the virtues is a holy matter, but thanksgiving is pre-eminently so. But it is not possible genuinely to express our gratitude to God by means of buildings and oblations and sacrifices, as is the custom of most people, for even the whole world were not a temple adequate to yield the honour due to Him (*Plant.* 126).

It has been argued here that prayer can be viewed by Philo as a substitute for sacrifice.[156] This passage does not represent a polemic between sacrifice and thanksgiving, as we have seen the two usually go together and in most cases, "the prayer defines the sacrifice."[157] It is clear that for Philo the external performance of sacrifice is not enough to guarantee an act of worship: "[t]he symbolic meaning is just this and nothing else: that what is precious in the sight of God is not the number of victims immolated by the true purity of a rational spirit in him who makes the sacrifice" (*Spec. Leg.* 1.277).[158] This closely reflects the prophetic critique of cult, with the emphasis on internal intention rather than external expression. Thus gratitude towards God, the aim of worship, is best

---

[156] Wolfson 1948:241-247.
[157] Leonhardt 2001:275.
[158] Cf. *Plant.* 164: "For we may venture to say that there is not a single bad man who really performs a sacrificial act, even though he lead to the altar in unceasing procession ten thousand bullocks a day.

expressed, “by means of hymns of praise, and these not such as the audible voice shall sing, but strains raised and re-echoed by the mind too pure for eye to discern” (*Plant.*126). However, cultic activity, rightly oriented, is a fundamental means of expressing this rational intent.

While sacrifice is a way to honour God, it also benefits the offerers themselves (*Spec. Leg.* 1.195). Philo delineates these benefits through an allegorical interpretation of the sacrificial process.[159] The sacrificial animals are scrutinized to discern “the innocence of those who offer them” (*Spec. Leg.* 1.167; 1.260). The laying on of hands further demonstrates a good mind and a blameless character (*Spec. Leg.* 1.202-204). The washed entrails of the victim symbolize purification from lust (*Spec. Leg* 1.206-207), and the Passover represents the passing over of passions (*Spec. Leg.* 2.145-150).[160] Consequently, the devotee, not the victim, is “the true object of sacrifice.”[161] Philo puts it, “though the worshippers bring nothing else, in bringing themselves they offer the best sacrifices, the fully and truly perfect oblation of noble living” (*Spec. Leg.* 1.272).

Philo is the Jewish author in this period who enjoys the most license when it comes to different modes of discussing the Temple. However, in terms of both explicit hermeneutical prescriptions and his personal activity, we see he was also deeply committed to the Temple and its continuing practice. Although the Temple could be allegorized and used to understand other facets of reality, it is clear that Philo was profoundly invested in the perseverance of its existence and functioning. While it is

---

[159] Allegorical interpretation differs from metaphorical mapping, as the domain of sacrifice is not used to conceptualize other phenomena, rather aspects of sacrifice are imbued with deeper symbolic meaning.

[160] Laporte 1989:38, organizes these sacrifical functions under two headings: "self-knowledge" and "purification".

[161] Leonhardt 2001:238.

difficult to know how representative Philo is of the perspective of other Jews towards the Temple, he is representative of the fact that various symbolic appropriations and applications of the concept of the Temple need not suggest any abandonment of it. At Qumran, we observed Temple imagery utilized in a way that pertains to the sect's critical view of the present Temple administration. In Philo, we observe a Jew in Alexandria, who had limited access to the Temple itself but felt he could participate in its service through pilgrimage and taxation and appeals to it as a powerful conceptual tool with which he could understand phenomenon as vast as the universe and as personal as the human soul.

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, we have observed the various ways in which Jews of the Second Temple period could interact with and discuss the Temple in Jerusalem. The aim of this was not to discover direct parallels to Paul's Temple discussions or metaphors, but rather to attempt to establish the basic historical assumptions we should bring to the question of what a Jew in the first century CE could believe about the continuing relevance of the Temple. To this end, we observed that cultic worship at the Temple in Jerusalem was not diminishing in this period. The mass attendance at festivals, the ubiquity of the payment of the Temple tax, the defense of the Temple in 40 and 70 CE, as well as the refusal to accept its disappearance after its destruction, all evidence a flourishing and near universally supported religious institution. To restate Petropoulou, in her discussion of

sacrificial worship in Greek, Jewish, and Christian practice, "Christianity emerged unexpectedly from the well-functioning Jewish religious environment […]"[162]

The presence of various forms of criticism and symbolic or metaphorical appropriation of the Temple do not inherently suggest a deviation from this norm. In most cases, these types of discussions about the Temple indicate its importance rather than its dispensability. While it was possible for some to reject the idea of sacrifice or Temple, or to forgo the literal wholly for the symbolic, these positions are exceptional in this period, if not also ambiguous in their intended discontinuity, and should not be taken as the standard.

Therefore, as we turn to Paul, a Jew writing in the first century CE and before the destruction of the Temple, the burden of proof will be on those who wish to claim that the apostle deviated from the widely held position of adherence to and support for the Temple. While Paul certainly deviated from his Jewish compatriots in a multitude of ways, explicit evidence of departure from this basic Jewish belief will be required in order to demonstrate a Pauline supersession of the Temple.

---

[162] Petropoulou 2008:291.

CHAPTER THREE:
PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Thus far, we have observed a variety of ways in which a sample of Paul's Jewish contemporaries could engage with, discuss, and conceptualize the Jerusalem Temple and its accompanying cultic practices. We concluded that the overwhelming majority of Jews respected and supported the Temple and we argued that this position of adherence should serve as a basic assumption when assessing any first century Jew's view of the Temple. The aim of the present chapter is to evaluate whether Paul's particular use of Temple metaphors, 1 Cor 3.16-17, 1 Cor 6.19-20, and 2 Cor 6.14-7.1, represents a deviation from this stated norm. Do these Temple metaphors ask the question of Paul's view of the Temple?

While Paul's explicit Temple metaphors are the primary object of inquiry, they are not self-interpreting. Thus, this discussion will be prefaced by an analysis of Paul's direct statements about the cult (Rom 9.4; 1 Cor 9.13-14, 1 Cor 10.18) to ascertain whether these references can guide our inquiry into Paul's view of the cult and to observe how Paul derives principles from these practices and uses them as conceptual tools. From there, we shall examine the Temple metaphors found in Paul's letters using the tools provided by the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). We have identified metaphor as "*understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.*"[1] Metaphor is the result of the interaction of two conceptual domains, a source domain mapped onto a target domain. A Temple metaphor can then be defined as understanding and

---

[1] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:5. On CMT, see section 1.3.2.2.

experiencing one kind of thing in terms of the Temple, and is identified when we can observe a Temple source domain mapping onto a different target domain. The meaning of a cultic metaphor results from the correspondences that are fixed between these domains and the entailments derived through the hermeneutical act of construal.

Having outlined the structure of these metaphors, we investigate the correspondences and entailments that can be observed and drawn from these mappings. The correspondences will be identified through historical and rhetorical analysis. Historical reconstruction of the source domain can bring to the fore the likely elements which Paul uses to conceptualize the target. A rhetorical analysis highlights the correspondences which Paul explicitly and specifically fixes in his use of the metaphor. The entailments refer to how metaphor allows us to reason within its conceptual structure and what it may suggest beyond its particular instantiation. Thus we are searching for the linguistic bounds to place around what these metaphors could imply. These take the form of either indications of the possible directions they could be interpreted or constraints upon them. Taking the conclusions of CHAPTER TWO as our baseline, we ask whether Paul's Temple and accompanying cultic metaphors suggest a deviation from the Jewish norm of support for and adherence to the Jerusalem Temple.

Awareness of these texts' language as metaphor demonstrates the difficulty in indentifying their implications. Since Paul's view of the Temple can only be inferred from his metaphorical mappings and the meaning of metaphor is partially dependent on the interpreters' hermeneutical act of construal, any assessment of the full implications of Paul's cultic metaphors for the Jerusalem Temple will itself be an act of construal. Therefore, we must take into account how these metaphors *have been* construed,

particularly by those in closer temporal and cultural proximity than ourselves, in order to understand their hermeneutical potential and to situate ourselves better as interpreters of them. Ephesians 2.11-22 occupies a unique position in this study as it is found within the Pauline corpus, and thus treated under this chapter heading, and is also an early instance of the effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. Our examination of this passage will function as a bridge to and model for the three subsequent case studies in the following chapters. We shall introduce a series of questions that will allow us to examine whether Eph 2.11-22 draws upon the conceptual structure of 1 Cor 3.16-17 and how the Ephesian author applies this structure to their own particular occasion. As a result, we observe that while Paul's language does not offer sufficient evidence to demonstrate a belief in the supersession of the Temple, his metaphors do provide the conceptual and linguistic tools with which such a position could begin to be constructed.

3.2. Paul and The Temple

We begin our investigation with the texts in which Paul speaks directly to the Temple cultic practices to examine whether Paul states anything outside of his metaphors that might suggest deviation from Temple adherence or provide a guide as to how his metaphors are to be interpreted. As to external evidence, we noted in our discussion of Stephen's speech that in the book of Acts, Luke "almost bends over backwards to show Paul in a conciliatory mood towards the Temple".[2] On several occasions, Paul participates in Temple activities (Acts 18.18; 20.16; 22.17; 24.17), which culminate in Acts 25.8 where he declares, perhaps in contrast to the charges brought against Stephen

---

[2] Dunn 2006:64-65. On the Temple in Acts, see section 2.3.2.2.

(cf. Acts 6.13), "I have in no way committed an offense against the law of the Jews, or against the temple (οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερόν), or against the emperor." While this depiction may simply indicate political expediency on the part of Luke, it does present Paul behaving towards the Temple in a manner we would expect of any first century Jew. We search here to see whether there are any instances where Paul does indeed speak against the Temple, in contrast to the Lukan picture. From these texts we shall also begin to observe how these cultic practices provide a model for Paul from which he can derive principles and map them onto other phenomena.

3.2.1. Romans 9.4

A possible direct reference to the Jewish Temple cult is found in the introduction of the highly disputed Romans 9-11.[3] In 9.4-5, Paul presents a list of various privileges bestowed on the Israelites. Amongst these is ἡ λατρεία, "the worship/service". Most commentators see in this term a reference to the Jewish cultic service.[4] The *EDNT* notes that the term's cognate verb, λατρεύω, "appears only rarely in Greek literature and appears in the LXX almost exclusively in the religious and cultic sense of Israel's worship of God."[5] The noun, though less common, appears in similar contexts. In Exod 12.25-26, λατρεία is used to describe sacrificing at Passover. In Jos 22.27, an altar is constructed with the express purpose of λατρεύειν λατρείαν κυρίῳ, which is explicitly defined as "burnt offerings and sacrifices and offerings of well-being". However, the Pauline use of

---

[3] For a recent and extensive compilation of current debates on these chapters see Wilk and Wagner 2010

[4] Käsemann 1980:259, Dunn 1991:527-528, Fitzmyer 1993:547, Moo 1996:564, Schreiner 1998:484

[5] Heinrich Balz, *EDNT* 2 1991:344.

this word may not carry this cultic sense. With reference to Rom 1.9 and 1.25 in particular, Jewett challenges this position, concluding that "it seems clear on other grounds that λατρεία would be understood by the Roman audience as referring to worship in general, including temple sacrifices, home services, the observation of Sabbath, the recitation of the Shema." [6] In a subsequent footnote he asserts "[n]one of the commentators advocating this interpretation… provides an explanation of why the Jewish maintenance of temple worship would be relevant at this point in Paul's argument."[7] Thus for ἡ λατρεία to be a reference to the Jewish cultic system in Rom 9.4, it must be demonstrated that this is to what the term refers and that this reference makes sense within Paul's argument.

While Rom 1.9 uses the verb in a general sense, the phrase ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει in 1.25 could refer to concrete, albeit idolatrous, cultic practice. Additionally, Paul's only other use of the noun λατρεία outside of Rom 9.4 is Rom 12.1, a crucial text which complements our understanding of 9.4. Rom 12.1 serves as a transition out of Rom 9-11 and as an introduction to the next section of Paul's letter. The οὖν in 12.1 indicates that the following is firmly based on what preceded and the phrase διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ harkens back to major themes in the previous section, particularly 9.15-23 and 11.30-32, which suggests some correlation between the sections and their introductions. Here the use of the term λατρεία is explicitly cultic. Paul exhorts the Romans "to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship". As Jewett notes, the phrase τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν λατρείαν "stands in

---

[6] Jewett 2007:565. In agreement with Jewett is Longenecker 2016:786-787.
[7] Jewett 2007:564-565 n.115.

apposition to the entire preceding clause"[8] and can be identified with it. Thus λατρεία is equated with the offering of a sacrifice, θυσία.[9] The triad of adjectives that characterize this sacrifice, ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον, also suit a cultic context. The latter two terms are clearly prerequisites for proper sacrifice. Zῶσαν implies a sacrifice without blood, without the death of a victim. This differentiates this activity from standard sacrifice and likely explains the adjective λογική which qualifies λατρεία. Moule translates the term "spiritual", which is also found in the NRSV, in contrast to what is literal or material.[10] The term also has parallels in Stoic and Hermetic literature, meaning "rational", in line with universal law.[11] We have also observed the use of this term in Philo to depict genuine worship and sacrifice.[12]

Putting aside the precise sense of λογική for the moment, in Rom 12.1 there is clearly a metaphorical use of the terms θυσία and λατρεία. Finlan agrees this is a sacrificial metaphor, which, in his characterization, is "level-four spiritualizing."[13] However, since the sacrificial source is conceptualizing activity which is explicitly somatic, the dualistic rendering of spiritual or *spiritualization* is poorly suited. Daly deems this "incarnational *spiritualization*" which we have noted seems to indicate the deficiency of the term.[14] Since what is required is the offering of their σώματα (12.1) and the renewal of their νοῦς (12.2), both body and mind, concrete and rational existence, it

---

[8] Jewett 2007:730.
[9] The term παρίστημι, meaning "present" or offer" is not found in the LXX, but is used as a technical term for offering sacrifices in Greek texts. See Cranfield 1985:293.
[10] Moule 1950:34.
[11] Cf. Epictetus, *Diss* 1.16.20; 2.9.2; *Corp. Herm.* 1.31; 13.18-19.
[12] *Spec. Leg.* 1.201, 272, 277. See Dunn 1991:711.
[13] Finlan 2011:86.
[14] Daly 1978:8. On Daly see sections 1.2.1. and 1.2.2.

appears the implication is rightly oriented, holistic worship.[15] The presence of ζῶσαν and λογική clearly distinguish this activity from material sacrifice, but is there a negative contrast? A possible interpretation of this metaphor is that all other forms of worship, including the cult at Jerusalem, are not λογική and thus unnecessary. So also Dunn, "[t]he implication is that Paul was thereby attempting to redefine cultic markers of the covenant people, which were no longer to be understood in terms of or focused in the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem."[16] *Contra* Dunn, Paul clearly still understands worship *in terms* of the sacrificial cult, as he employs a sacrificial metaphor, which by definition, understands its target, worship, in terms of its source, sacrifice. However, agreeing with Dunn, this metaphor conceptualizes behaviour not focused on the cult in Jerusalem but distinguished from it. Is Paul here supplanting sacrificial forms of worship at the Jerusalem Temple? As Rom 12.1 has aided in the interpretation of 9.4, 9.4 may equally supplement our understanding of 12.1.

Since Rom 12.1 is explicitly connected to the preceding section, in which 9.4 is introductory, we can posit some connection between the use of the terms λατρεία in both passages. Thus, it is likely that λατρεία, if not exclusively at least primarily, refers to cultic worship in 9.4. So how does Jewish Temple worship fit into Paul's argument in Romans 9, and how does it relate to 12.1? In the introductory 9.1-5, Paul appeals to his audience "to share his profound and anxious compassion *for the Jews* who have not yet embraced the fulfillment of what is properly *their* destiny."[17] The concern is whether

---

[15] Cf. Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:177.
[16] Dunn 2006:106. Similarly Käsemann 1980:329, "[p]aradoxically the cultic vocabulary which he uses here serves a decidedly anti-cultic thrust… Christian worship does not consist of what is practiced at sacred sites, at sacred times, and with sacred acts."
[17] Elliott 1990b:263.

"Paul's theology require[s] the abandonment of Israel?"[18] Of great significance here is that Paul not only uses the term Ἰσραηλῖται rather than Ἰουδαῖοι, but also that it is used in the present tense, εἰσιν. Dunn suggests that the term is "deliberately chosen by Paul to evoke his people's sense of being God's elect, the covenant people of one God."[19] But more than that, by speaking in the present tense, Paul "evokes the blessings (v. 4b) that were given to the people in the past and reinforces the abiding validity of their place as the people of God."[20] The present tense also governs the ὧν, thus indicating existing and ongoing possession of these privileges by Israel. As an example, Jewett argues that the first privilege on the list, ἡ υἱοθεσία, belongs first and foremost to Israel and "[a]ccess to this status… is therefore valid only if Israel's sonship remains intact."[21] Otherwise, Jewett states, Paul's argument falls apart as the promises of God have failed (Rom 9.6) and Israel has been abandoned (11.1).

It is readily demonstrable that the worship of God at a cultic center is an intrinsic part of the covenant and Israel's identity. On the list of privileges Dunn observes,

> It is worth pausing to note that in the last four words Paul has summed up the four most distinctive features of first-century Judaism, as perceived and noted both by Jews themselves and by non Jews: monotheism…; Israel as God's covenant people; the law of Moses as the charter for the covenant people; the temple with its cult ensuring atonement and forgiveness.[22]

He further cites the famous saying of Simeon the Just in *m. Abot* 1.2, "[b]y three things is the world sustained: by the Law, by the [Temple-]service, and by deeds of loving kindness." The term translated "the [Temple-]service", הָעֲבֹדָה, is the same as is found in

---

[18] Jewett 2007:557.
[19] Dunn 1991:526.
[20] Horst Kuhli, *EDNT* 2 1991: 205.
[21] Jewett 2007:563.
[22] Dunn 1991:528.

Jos 22.27, where it is translated λατρεία. At the very least, Rom 9.4 suggests that Paul saw cultic worship as a unique privilege and honour given to Israel by God. Consequently, there is no suggestion of Paul having any issue with cultic principles as seen in Acts 7 and *Sib. Or. 4* and as will be seen in *Barn.* 16. Furthermore, if Paul is arguing that these attributes, such as sonship, which are bestowed upon Israel are not invalidated, it is unlikely that cultic worship represents the sole exception. Just as access to sonship is contingent on the validity of God's adoption of Israel, Christian worship must also rely on the gift of the cult to Israel. Thus Rom 12.1 does not invalidate the gift of worship described in 9.4. While the λογική λατρεία does not require the Temple and may even be viewed as superior to material cultic worship, it is still fundamentally modeled on the Temple cult and need not suggest that God cannot be worshiped and served in Jerusalem's Temple, which was bestowed upon the people of Israel as a unique covenant privilege.

3.2.2. 1 Corinthians 9.13-14

1 Corinthians takes up cultic themes more than any other Pauline letter, particularly chapters 8-10, and within this epistle we discover a further reference to cultic procedures. However, since chapters 8 and 10 take as their central discussion the eating of idol meat, chapter 9 initially appears as a segue or aside. Here Paul discusses the rights and freedom he enjoys as an apostle and explains his decision to relinquish them. In 9.3, Paul introduces the passage as his ἀπολογία for those who would examine him. V.13 is found in the first section of this chapter, where Paul attempts to establish his right to benefit materially from the gospel. This passage is dominated by rhetorical questions, including

v.13. After the initial questions of vv.1-2, and the introduction of v.3, there is a comparison of Paul's rights (ἐξουσία) with those of the other apostles in vv.4-6. The following verse introduces three analogies which demonstrate this right: the soldier, the vintner, and the shepherd (v.7). Moving on from these examples from secular life, Paul backs up his claim by appeal to three different religious authorities: Moses (Deut. 25.4) in v.8, Temple servers in v.13 and a saying of Jesus (Matt. 10.10; Lk. 10:7) in v.14. Paul's argument is pre-emptively stated in v. 12b and then restated in v.15. Thus Paul's right to material support from his preaching the gospel is established by comparison with the other apostles, secular employment, and religious authority.

The scene referred to in v.13 is undeniably cultic in character. Paul employs a series of terms drawn from the cultic domain (τά ἱερὰ, τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ) and describes an activity that can only be associated with cultic service. The less obvious question is to which cult does Paul refer, as this practice is common to both pagan and Jewish altars.[23] Many commentators see the distinction as unimportant here and this is a strong candidate for the "common ground" approach of Vahrenhorst.[24] The οὐκ οἴδατε certainly suggests a practice with which the Corinthians should be familiar.[25] Fitzmyer has argued due to Paul's claim in 10.20, a reference to pagan cultic activity is doubtful.[26] Ciampa and Rosner argue that the οὕτως καί bases this principle in the teaching of Jesus, who was more likely to have had the OT practice in mind, though Jesus' saying contains

---

[23] For the Jewish practice see Lev 2.10, 5.13, 6.9-11, 18, 22-23, 7.6-10, 14, 30-34; 10.12-13; *Ant.* 3.224-236.
[24] See section 1.2.3.
[25] Garland 2003:414. For more on this phrase, see 3.3.1. below.
[26] Fitzmyer 2008:365, "[g]iven what Paul writes in 10:20 about pagan services, it is not likely that he is thinking so much of Greek or Roman ministers"

no reference to cult.[27] Hogeterp mounts a defense of the Jewish background for this passage by examining the term θυσιαστήριον.[28] Not only does this term for altar not appear in pagan texts, but it is explicitly contrasted with the pagan βωμός by Josephus in *Ant.* 12.253.[29] Thus, both the context and terminology of the passage suggest a reference to Jewish practice but one equally familiar to his gentile readers.

In 1 Cor 9.13, Paul discusses the activity of Jewish priests in the Jerusalem Temple in order to establish his rights as an apostle. That positive principles can be derived from the Temple service suggests, for Hogeterp, that the cult functions as a normative model for Paul.[30] While we cannot say that Paul endorses the cult here, any more than he is endorsing how soldiers are paid, vineyards planted, or sheep milked, neither do we find any criticism of how the Temple service is conducted, as we found in the Scrolls.[31] Similarly, there is no suggestion here that Paul is supplanting the role of priests. Rather, he is providing structure to a concept, apostleship, which was sorely lacking it; something unfamiliar is conceived of in familiar terms to create conceptual clarity. While we would not identify 1 Cor 9.13 as a metaphor in that there is no direct conceptualization or mapping, this positive appraisal of priestly principles may be further demonstrated where such a conceptualization occurs, Rom 15.16. This provides another example of how Paul draws upon cultic concepts and uses them to conceptualize other phenomena.

---

[27] Ciampa and Rosner 2010:412.
[28] Hogeterp 2006:349-352.
[29] *Ant.* 12.253: ἐποικοδομήσας δὲ καὶ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ βωμὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς σύας ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατέσφαξε, θυσίαν οὐ νόμιμον οὐδὲ πάτριον τῇ Ἰουδαίων θρησκείᾳ ταύτην ἐπιτελῶν.
[30] Hogeterp 2006:384.
[31] See section 2.3.1.2.

In Rom 15.14-27 Paul discusses his commission to the Gentiles and how it relates to his future travel plans and in particular to the delivery of the collection to Jerusalem. V.16 contains a concentration of cultic terms which "can be neither unintentional nor casual."[32] The first term, λειτουργός, can have secular or cultic connotations (cf. Rom 13.6; Phil 2.25), while the second term, ἱερουργοῦντα, is certainly drawn from the cultic domain. The latter term seems synonymous with the substantive participle phrase in 1 Cor. 9.13 οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι, but in Rom 15.16 we have a more readily identifiable metaphorical conceptualization: PAUL'S MINISTRY IS PRIESTLY SERVICE. The final clause completes the cultic picture as Paul delivers ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν, which he hopes is εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. While the final two adjectives clearly describe the appropriate state in which a sacrifice may be offered, there is debate as to whether the τῶν ἐθνῶν, should be taken objectively or subjectively. If seen as an objective genitive, the offering consists of the gentiles themselves, indicating some sort eschatological pilgrimage of the gentiles to Jerusalem or an attempt by Paul to provoke the jealousy of Israel and thus the eschaton (Rom 11.11-16).[33] The subjective reading qualifies the offering of the gentiles as the financial collection and is favoured by Downs who rejects the eschatological interpretation.[34] The collection in 15.31 is similarly described as εὐπρόσδεκτος, strengthening the subjective position. However, there is no reason the ambiguity of the genitive may intentionally capture the idea that the collection is symbolic for the Gentiles themselves and thus is representative of them as an offering.

---

[32] Dunn 1991:867.
[33] Munck 1977, Davies 1994:202.
[34] Downs 2008:151, "[t]aking τῶν ἐθνῶν as a subjective genitive would then indicate that Isaiah 66 does not figure in the background of Rom. 15.16, despite the speculations of a number of scholars."

There are a number of important correlations between Rom 15.16 and 1 Cor 9.13. Paul refers to this priestly activity in both passages in the context of material support. Fee notes the very close similarity between Rom 15.27 and 1 Cor 9.12, where spiritual endowment results in material benefit.[35] Where 1 Cor 9.13-14 makes a direct reference to the cultic service, then draws an analogy from it, Rom 15.16 directly conceptualizes Paul's ministry in terms of that service. In both cases, the underlying model creates the same correspondences and maps in the same way: Paul is priest; the Corinthians/Gentiles are his priestcraft/offering; this religious activity results in material benefit. As with 1 Cor 9.13-14, there is no reason to view Paul's ascription of priestly principles to his own ministry as depriving in anyway the priests from whom those principles are derived. Thus 1 Cor 9.13-14 is instructive, not only as one of the few references Paul makes to literal cultic activity, and a positive one at that, but also as a demonstration of how such an understanding of cultic principles can structure his subsequent metaphorical conceptualizations, such as Rom 15.16.

3.2.3. 1 Corinthians 10.14-22

A subsequent reference to the Jewish cult comes from the same section of 1 Corinthians. This passage is often read as an exposition of Paul's understanding of the Lord's Supper. However, Paul's primary agenda here is an argument against idolatry. His mention of the Lord's Supper and the Israelite cult in this sense are indirect, only brought in to advance the argument. This can be seen in Paul's initial exhortation which is both a summation of

---

[35] Fee 1987:409. 1 Cor 9.11: εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπείραμεν, μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν; Rom. 15.27b: εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς.

8.1-10.13 and programmatic for what is to come: φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας (10.14). The term διόπερ, which begins the verse, links this exhortation with what immediately preceded it. In vv.1-3, Paul draws a connection between the Corinthians' situation and the experience of Israel in the desert (10.11). Fitzmyer argues this is not detailed exegesis but rather "instances cited to address a Corinthian problem and supply premonitory instances to support his admonitions."[36] Hays, though acknowledging that there is only one explicit quotation (Exod. 32.6 in v.7), claims that "Paul immerses [his readers] in explicit and startling figurative claims; the effect of the passage is achieved through an outpouring of explicit figurations."[37] The extent to which the story of the Golden Calf continues to govern the argument of 10.14-22 determines the identity of the sacrificial practices to which Paul subsequently refers.

Following the exhortation of v.14 Paul outlines his argument's controlling principle: "The cup of blessing (τῆς εὐλογίας) that we bless, is it not a sharing in the blood of Christ (κοινωνία… τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)? The bread that we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ (κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)?" (v.16) Some early manuscripts have replaced εὐλογία with εὐχαριστίας, making the reference to the Lord's Supper explicit, though this reference is already clear. In his commentary Thiselton offers an extended demonstration of the Passover setting of the tradition regarding the Lord's Supper which Paul received.[38] However, the argument hinges on the term κοινωνία, not the identity of the cup. The *BDAG* defines the terms as "a common passion

---

[36] Fitzmyer 2008:378.
[37] Hays 1989:91.
[38] Paul's use of "the cup of blessing" seems to support this contention, though there is dispute over whether this refers to the third cup of the Passover Seder (*birkat hamaazon*) or the fourth cup (*birkat hasher*). See Thiselton 2000:756-760.

or enjoyment of something", and it rendered by the *NRSV* as "a sharing" and by Thiselton as "communal participation."[39] What is unclear in v.16, however, is whether this refers to a "vertical" participation with the Lord, or a "horizontal" participation with the other partakers.[40] Whether the references can be delineated in this way, both aspects need to be present if the argument is to be understood.

In v.18b, Paul clearly states his principle in the form of a question: "are not those who eat the sacrifices partners in the altar?" Thus eating sacrificial meat creates κοινωνία, making those who eat collectively κοινωνοί with the altar. However, earlier in v.18a, we see this principle is derived from and demonstrated by Israelite cultic activity, as Paul implores his readers to "consider Israel according to the flesh". The identity of this Ισραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, however, is obscure. Hays argues for a continued reference to Israel in the wilderness, stating that "Paul sees the Corinthian controversy about idol meat (v. 19) in double exposure with Israel's wilderness idolatry."[41] Conversely, Ciampa and Rosner note the present tense substantive participle ἐσθίοντες and present tense verb εἰσίν, which indicate contemporary Jewish practice.[42] Hogeterp notes that κατὰ σάρκα is not necessarily pejorative in Paul, so it need not refer to Israel in a sinful state.[43] If Israelite idolatry is the referent, Paul is illustrating his point negatively, whereas vv.16-17

---

[39] Thiselton 2000:761.
[40] Hauck, *TDNT* 3:805 argues the reference is to a participation with the risen Lord: "[i]n terms of the common belief in antiquity it is self-evident for him that those who partake of the cultic meal become companions of the god." Hainz, *EDNT* 2:304 emphasizes the communal partnership with other participants, but leaves the door open to both understandings. Fee 1987:468-69 argues that the reference to κοινωνία… τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ emphasizes the vertical, while κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ emphasizes the horizontal While Ciampa and Rosner 2010:473 reject this interpretation, the metaphorical association of one bread with one body in v.17 may support Fee's position.
[41] Hays 1989:93.
[42] Ciampa and Rosner 2010:477.
[43] Hogeterp 2006:356 Cf. Rom 1.3; 4.1; 9.3, 5.

demonstrate how this principle functions positively. Nevertheless, the tense of the question does not immediately point to the current Temple. As we have seen, the use of the present tense for the cult can be found in both historical accounts and current descriptions. Whatever the referent, Paul is articulating a timeless principle, one that transcends any particular historical instantiation, not that eating sacrificial meat is inherently idolatrous, but that is there is an inextricable link between the consumption of the sacrifice and participation with the altar on which that sacrifice was offered. Thus, even if Ισραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα refers to the wilderness period, the principle would equally apply to current Jewish sacrificial practice.

Issues of this referent's identification continue into v.20. Following an ontological clarification in v.19, Paul writes: "but what they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God." The subject of θύουσιν is not specified and could refer to: (i) gentiles who provide the Corinthians with sacrificial meat; (ii) the Israelites in the wilderness; (iii) contemporary Jews in the Jerusalem Temple**.** In several important early manuscripts τὰ ἔθνη appears as the subject of θύουσιν and thus solves this problem, but has come to be viewed as an early gloss.[44] This interpretation is possible without the gloss, and would suggest that Paul has returned his attention to the current matter at hand, first introduced in 8.1. Hays, who supports (ii), argues that this understanding "muffles the wit of Paul's trope."[45] He views an allusion to Deut. 32.16-17. This would further support the identification of Ισραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα as Israel in the wilderness, and has the benefit of contextual continuity beginning in 10.1. Option (iii) seems the most unlikely. This

---

[44] The *NRSV* provides a similar gloss, translating 1 Cor 10.20: "No, I imply that what pagans sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God. I do not want you to be partners with demons."
[45] Hays 1989:93.

interpretation depends on v.18 referring to contemporary Jewish practice, but further equates this sacrificial activity with idolatry.[46] Not only is there no basis for this kind of critique found elsewhere in Paul, but it would be incongruent with Rom 9.4. Paul's words here seem consistent with the Jewish critique of pagan cults, which would cohere with (ii) but more immediately appears to refer to (i).[47]

As with 1 Cor. 9.13-14, in 10.14-22 we observe Paul deriving a principle from the Jewish cult. Here too, Paul maps that principle onto a new phenomenon, though this time within the same rhetorical context. In order to persuade the Corinthians of the impossibility of partaking in the Lord's Supper and sacrifices to demons, Paul asks his readers to reflect on the Israelite sacrificial system and conceptualizes the Lord's Supper in terms of the cultic act of sacrifice. Furthermore, it is precisely through this conceptualization, fixing a correspondence between κοινωνία… τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ and κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, that Paul is able to appeal to the ideal of Israelite cultic exclusivity and demonstrate the impossibility of partaking in the Lord's Supper and pagan sacrifice.

It might be argued that this is not a metaphor, because THE LORD'S SUPPER IS A SACRIFICE is an *intra*-domain mapping, understanding one cultic event in terms of another, rather than a cross-domain mapping. 1 Corinthians itself demonstrates that there was misunderstanding concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper (cf. 11.17-34). To an outsider, the meal would not have looked like a cultic event. There is no temple, no altar, no priests, no sacrifices or offerings. Rather, Ciampa and Rosner remind us:

---

[46] Hogeterp 2006:357, "[i]t is therefore hard to imagine how Paul could equate the sacrificial Temple cult with idolatry in 1 Cor 10:18, since idols and the Temple of God exclude each other in Paul's cultic imagery (cf. 2 Cor 6.16)."
[47] Ciampa and Rosner 2010:479.

> Christian worship, in which a meal was shared by a group sharing fellowship in someone's house (with bread, wine, singing and theological discussion), would, in many ways, have looked and seemed more like a large social event than a formal pagan cultic meal where animals were sacrificed and then eaten in the presence of the god.[48]

Once more, by conceptualizing the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, Paul is providing a conceptual structure which highlights certain aspects of its theological significance. We must continue to recognize that metaphorical conceptualization is a tool that can deliver true insight into a phenomenon, in this case that "[y]ou cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons."

3.2.4. Paul and the Temple: Conclusion

What is perhaps most noteworthy when examining Paul's references to the Temple is not their implications, but rather the paucity of their occurrences. Paul has surprising little to say about the Temple in Jerusalem. Though it is still standing at the time of his writing, "there is no direct or even practical link to the Jerusalem Temple in the authentic Pauline Epistles."[49] There are two possible explanations of this. First, Hagner writes that "[i]t is fully to be expected that Paul would find little significance in the temple after the cross."[50] This may be the case, though it is difficult to substantiate, as Paul does not state explicitly this lack of significance and, to the contrary, seems to uphold its significance in Rom 9.4. Here Paul's use of λατρεία suggests he views cultic worship as a blessing to Israel and, in Rom 12.1, as a model for Christian worship. We observe similar moves

---

[48] Ciampa and Rosner 2010:475.
[49] Frey 2012:461.
[50] Hagner 2007:115-116.

being made in 1 Cor 9.13-14, where cultic practice is appealed to positively as a model for Paul's activity. 1 Cor 10.22 is more obscure, but once more, sacrifical practice, particularly the relationship between offerer and altar, structures Paul's argument concerning idolatry and the Lord's supper. Missing from these references is any criticism of cultic principles or practice and any statement of the Temple's "redundancy".[51]

A second explanation for the absence of reference to the Temple is the location and identity of Paul's audience. As Frey notes, the Temple in Jerusalem, "could never practically affect the religious identity of Gentile sympathizers with Judaism (or of Gentile Christians) in their everyday lives."[52] As such, the Temple, unlike the law, was not a pressing issue and could even serve as a distraction for Paul's gentile mission and thus Paul need not dedicate time and explanation to its relevance. Again, this could suggest the irrelevance of the Temple for Paul, but it need not. Like other Diaspora Jews, the Temple may have held immense theological importance without daily engagement.[53] As a result, Paul's relative reserve when discussing the Temple may be wholly significant or entirely inconsequential in terms of reconstructing his own view of the institution. However, since we are examining a first century Pharisaic Jew, the burden of proof is on the former. Thus we turn to the most illustrative texts, Paul's Temple metaphors, to observe if they speak to this silence.

---

[51] Hagner 2007:115. However, Hagner 2007:116, "[y]et at the same time, it was only the temple and its ritual that made the death of Christ comprehensible, and it was only in its terms that the meaning of Christ's death could be described."
[52] Frey 2012:460.
[53] Cf. Tuval 2012.

3.3. PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS

Thus far, we have observed that when Paul directly discusses Jewish cultic practice it is in order to derive and apply principles from it. In this section, we turn to specific instances where Paul takes the concept of the Temple as a source domain and maps it onto different target phenomena. While examining these passages many of the issues in the exegesis of Paul's cultic metaphors come to the fore. A survey of the relevant literature generates a series of typical questions: can these images be identified as metaphors? What is the essential background of these images and subsequently, to what does ναός refer? Finally, and of particular interest, what are the implications of this cultic image for the Temple in Jerusalem? These questions will be both addressed and problematized in our survey of 1 Cor 3.16-17, 6.19-20, and 2 Cor 6.14-7.1.

3.3.1. 1 Corinthians 3.16-17

1 Corinthians 3.16-17 stands as the centrepiece of most discussions of Pauline cultic language. Rhetorically, 3.16-17 is situated within the wider section of 3.5-17 and the wider argument of 1.10-4.21, where Paul is addressing the issues of factions in the Corinthian church. Following the discussion of wisdom, Paul directly addresses the Corinthians in 3.1-4, in stark contrast to his initial introduction of them in 1.2. After this disarming preface, in 3.5 Paul returns to the slogans first reported in 1.10, in particular the issue of his role respective to that of Apollos. What follows is an argument based on three intersecting images neatly summarized in 3.9, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε, and in 3.16, ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε. Many, however, doubt the metaphorical identification of these images, particularly in vv. 16-17. Thiselton states that Paul "illustrates and applies

the principle in terms of three analogies, the first two of which are metaphors."[54] Newton suggests that here we have more than "just a metaphor",[55] and Strack insists that this is "literal speech".[56] Vahrenhorst, summarizing the relevant literature, states, "again it is, of course, controversial in what sense we may speak of metaphor here at all."[57] It is noteworthy that for the most part those who argue most strongly for a Jewish background for the referent ναός (i.e. Gärtner, McKelvey, Newton, Strack) are also those most uncomfortable with the characterization of this language as metaphor, as though such an ascription would diminish the theological import of such statements. The assumption is that if the community in Corinth is *metaphorically* the Temple of God, then it is not *really* the Temple of God. The language must denote an *ontological* transference or substitution if it is to be substantive.

In v.16, there is not the direct juxtaposition of images as there is in v.9. The introductory formula οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι, used in v.16, which we observed in 9.13, adds to commentators' doubts over the continued metaphorical structure of the passage. McKelvey suggests it indicates a total shift in Paul's thought.[58] Others have argued that it indicates the Temple conceptualization was part of Paul's earlier teaching in Corinth.[59] The phrase is characteristic of 1 Corinthians, appearing ten times within the letter and only once outside (1 Cor 3.16; 5.6; 6.2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9.13, 24; Rom 6.16). Several

---

[54] Thiselton 2000:297.
[55] Newton 2005:54.
[56] Strack 1994:408, "eigentliche Rede".
[57] Vahrenhorst 2008:12, "[f]reilich ist wiederum umstritten, in welchem Sinne man hier überhaupt von Metaphorik sprechen darf."
[58] McKelvey 1969:99-100.
[59] Weiss 1910:84, Moule 1950:39, Gärtner 1965:57, McKelvey 1969:99, Conzelmann 1975:77, Vahrenhorst 2008:146, "[d]as spräche dafür, auch hier den Hinweis auf eine der Gemeinde schon bekannte Tradition zu sehen."

aspects of this list are noteworthy. First, this phrase often introduces passages that contain cultic content (3.16, 5.6-7; 6.19; 9.13). Second, while the metaphorical status of 3.16, 5.6, 6.15, and 6.19 may be doubted, the phrase clearly does not affect the metaphorical identification of 9.24: "Do you not know that in a race the runners all compete, but only one receives the prize?" Finally, while some of the passages could be reflections on earlier catechesis (3.16; 6.9; 6.15; 6.19 and perhaps 6.2-3), others are more difficult to interpret this way (5.6; 9.13; 9.24). Therefore, the phrase need not affect the metaphorical nature of the language it introduces, nor must it necessarily refer to an earlier teaching, as it may in some instances but certainly does not in others. Of course Paul could be using the phrase in a variety of ways, however, Fee's conclusion seems correct, that its aim is "to point to a reality, that they should know by the very nature of things … and it is clear from their behavior that they do not."[60]

Thus there appears no rhetorical reason for denying these images' metaphorical status. In fact, as we saw in v.9 and v.16, these images can be formulated into succinct metaphorical predicates: THE COMMUNITY IS A FIELD (3.5-9), THE COMMUNITY IS A BUILDING (3.9-15), and THE COMMUNITY IS A TEMPLE (3.16-17). In all three instances we can clearly see a source domain (agricultural, architectural, cultic) being mapped onto a target domain (the Corinthians). Each source highlights some aspects of the target while hiding others, exemplifying the partial and unique nature of such mappings.[61] The specific source then provides a unique set of correspondences and thus a unique perspective on its target. Paul lays out the specific correspondences and the metaphorical

---

[60] Fee 1987:146.
[61] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:10-13.

entailments being made between source and target, revealing the unique mapping each source provides.

The metaphor of THE COMMUNITY IS A FIELD creates a conceptual structure within which Paul can delineate the division of labour between himself and Apollos, as planter and waterer. This highlights their roles as *facilitators* of growth, while maintaining God as the *source* of growth. In 3.9b-15, Paul shifts his focus from a process in which God is ultimately responsible to one that highlights the responsibility of those who follow the apostle. The shift in source domain to THE COMMUNITY IS A BUILDING, from an organic to a manmade process, provides the appropriate correspondences and inference patterns. Conceptualizing Christ as foundation, himself as architect, others as builders, and activity as building materials, Paul demonstrates how these ἄλλοι can contribute to what has already been established, by building on the foundation which is has been laid. Finally, the inhabitation of the Spirit fixes a correspondence between the community and the Temple, which allows further entailments to be drawn from the sanctity of the Temple to unity of the community, from the damaging of the Temple to the fate of one who causes disunity. The third metaphor makes emphatic and more consequential the themes of apportioned responsibility, unity, and reward and punishment that have run throughout the passage but uniquely connects them to the idea of holiness.

Viewing 1 Cor 3.5-17 in this way can give us unique insight into its conceptual structure. We observe a single target domain conceptualized in terms of three source domains, each allowing Paul to highlight a particular aspect of the target, the community, and each providing him with distinct conceptual structures and sets of cognitive tools with which to reason about these aspects. There is conceptual coherence found among

these metaphors in the role of God as basis and possessor of the community which is seen in an almost Trinitarian formulation where God is the source of growth in the field, Christ is the foundation of the building, and the Spirit dwells within the Temple.[62]

Our understanding of metaphor also gives us insight into the rhetorical function of these metaphors in this context. If what the Corinthians needed was an overhaul of their self-conception as a community, as can be gleaned from 3.1-4, one can think of no better means than metaphorical reorientation. Earlier we observed how metaphor, more than just a linguistic trope, fundamentally frames our view of reality. Here we can appeal to Ricœur's notion of "semantic impertinence", that a metaphor's logical incongruence breaks down our existing conceptual structure and forces us to "remake" or "redescribe" reality.[63] In 1 Cor 3.5-17, Paul offers the Corinthians a series of conceptualizations with their accompanying correspondences and inference patterns so that they may redescribe and reorient their view of community and leadership which has led to divisions.

However, in observing the central rhetorical function of these metaphors our task is not complete. As noted above, "when we say that a concept is structured by a metaphor, we mean that it is partially structured and that it can be extended in some ways but not others."[64] So to what extent can these metaphors, and for our purposes 3.16-17, be extended and construed beyond their most basic correspondences outlined above? Most studies seek to address this construal problem by attempting to identify and reconstruct the essential background of the metaphor with which they can identify the structure and limits of the mapping. It is thought that by establishing the referent for ναός and

---

[62] Lakoff and Johnson argue for the need for metaphorical coherence, but not necessarily consistency, Lakoff and Johnson 2003:94-105.
[63] Ricœur 1977:229, 271. On Ricœur, see section 1.3.1.
[64] Lakoff and Johnson 2003:13. See section 1.3.2.2.

selecting a parallel usage, the meaning and implications of Paul's temple metaphor can be extracted.

The term ναός clearly is drawn from the domain of cult. Indeed, it appears as the altar or sanctuary around which the associated activities that comprise this domain are focused. The term ναός is often contrasted with ἱερόν, with the latter referring to the whole Temple enclosure and the former to the inner sanctuary.[65] Gupta has noted also that it is possible for ναός to stand metonymically for the Temple whole.[66] However, in Paul's formulation the Corinthians are the ναός insofar as they are the dwelling place of the Spirit, which seems to suggest an inner sanctum.

In his assessment of the cultic conceptualization of Paul's collection, Downs has argued that Paul's cultic metaphors "should not be narrowly defined" since "the dichotomous categories of 'Jewish' and 'Greek' [are] increasingly recognized as problematic among interpreters of Paul."[67] Vahrenhorst argues that cultic language provides a "common ground" between Jews and Gentiles.[68] It seems true that Jewish and Greek cultic domains would not be completely discrete. Indeed, as we have seen, the logic of Paul's argument in 10.14-22 is somewhat contingent on the parallel structure between these domains. However, in that passage Paul argues specifically against participating in pagan altars, thus making Paul's conceptualization of the Corinthians here as such an altar less likely.

---

[65] So Thiselton 2000:315, Newton 2005:54.
[66] Gupta 2010:66.
[67] Downs 2008:157.
[68] See Vahrenhorst 2008:154 in section 1.2.3. Similarly, Lanci 1997:5, "[m]y thesis is that, rather than inviting the Corinthians to understand themselves as a new temple replacing the one in Jerusalem, Paul uses a metaphor, which both Gentile and Jew could understand, to present and then anchor the motif of community upbuilding which runs throughout the letter."

Furthermore, the Temple is constituted by the indwelling (οἰκεῖ) of τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ rather than an ἄγαλμα, the statue of the deity.[69] In the Hebrew Bible it was the "name" of God which dwelt in the temple (cf. MT 1 Kgs 8.20ff - הַבַּיִת לִשְׁמִי; LXX - τὸν οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου). Josephus interprets this in terms of God's Spirit.[70] We have already observed this principle as central to the *Temple Scroll*'s theology of the Temple.[71] Käsemann has identified this as one of the New Testament's "sentences of holy law" with reference to prohibition notices at the Herodian Temple.[72] Vahrenhorst also notes in the *Leges Sacrae* one who injures the protective provisions of the sanctuaries must face penalties.[73] To a certain extent, one's preface of background depends on whether an author-oriented (Hogeterp) or the audience-orientated (Shanor, Lanci, Vahrenhorst) perspective is being emphasized, with the former identifying a Jewish ναός and the latter one of the many ναοί found in Roman Corinth. The fundamental correspondences of this metaphor (the Temple of the indwelling Spirit), the entailments drawn from it (the holiness that results from that indwelling), and the epistle's discouragement of participation in pagan cults, make a Jewish referent more plausible. However, the particular background cannot be verified with certainty. It is most likely that here Paul articulates a Jewish theological concept drawn from the Temple in Jerusalem, but one which his gentile addressees could readily comprehend.

---

[69] Cf. Hogeterp 2006:322 n. 79.
[70] *Ant.* 8:114: "Beside these things I entreat you also to send some portion of your spirit to dwell in the temple (μοῖράν τινα τοῦ σοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀποικίσαι), that you may seem to us to be on earth as well. For you the whole vault of heaven and all of its host is but a small habitation – how much less this poor temple! Nonetheless, I pray that you guard it forever from sacking by our enemies, as you own temple, and to watch over it as your own possession."
[71] 11QT 45.12-14; 46.4, 8; 47.3-4, 10-11, 18; 51.7-10. See section 2.3.1.2. Cf. Klawans 2006:155.
[72] Käsemann 1969.
[73] Vahrenhorst 2008:154.

So what sorts of models of interpretation do these various backgrounds entail? Shanor and Lanci place this language against the background of ancient architecture. Shanor compares Paul's language to the technical language found in the Arcadian Tegea inscription from fourth century BC.[74] This lists a series of conditions incumbent on any of the contractors and individual workmen participating in the construction and repair of the temple of Athena and allows Shanor to reinterpret important terms in this passage.[75] Lanci examines the archaeological remains of temples in Corinth and allows for Paul's language to have a Hellenistic influence, focusing on temples as a centring image.[76] As mentioned, Vahrenhorst endorses a dual background (both Jewish and Hellenistic) and argues, like Lanci, that this language serves as a bridge between the biblical presuppositions of the apostle and his non-Jewish addressees.[77] The focus on Graeco-Roman temples shifts the conversation away from being solely concerned with Paul's view of the Jewish cult and rightly focuses more on the function of Paul's language. As argued earlier, it seems unlikely that the pagan temples were the primary source for Paul's intended metaphorical mapping, though they likely provided resources for the Corinthian interpretation of it. If pagan temples are indeed the metaphorical source, this passage tells us little about Paul's perspective on the Jerusalem Temple.

Wenschkewitz, writing before the discoveries at Qumran, found parallels in Hellenistic-Stoic discussion of cult, and characterized Paul's language as

---

[74] Shanor 1988.
[75] For example μισθός and ζημιόω are taken to refer to "wages" and "loss of wage" while φθείρω refers to "damage" rather than destruction.
[76] Lanci 1997:134, "[t]he temple metaphor, and the allusions to cultic imagery that are its afterimages, summon the community to function in a way similar to the way some temples in Corinth functioned: in each case, a deity's temple was a powerful symbol of unity of the temple who worshipped that deity."
[77] Vahrenhorst 2008:154.

spiritualization.[78] Gärtner retained Wenschkewitz's spiritualization model, but this time found the background in what he saw as the substitutionary language at Qumran, particularly 1QS 8.1-16 and 4QFlor.[79] Finlan remains the most recent and strongest proponent of this interpretation.[80] Klinzing and Schüssler Fiorenza both examined NT cultic language in light of the Scrolls but came up with alternative models, "*Umdeutung*" and "*transference*" respectively.[81] These positions have much in common in terms of background and implication. For these positions, the passage in 1QS 8.1-16, which we examined at length in CHAPTER TWO is seen to be of particular importance. Certain parallels are obvious. We observe a community being conceptualized in agricultural, architectural and cultic terms. The primary entailment is the holiness (קודש) of the community. In the previous chapter we discussed some of the difficulties in describing this passage as spiritualization. We further note in relation to Paul, that while the source domain (בית קודש, ναός) and target domain (עצת היחד, ὑμεῖς) are shared, the correspondences drawn between the two do not completely overlap. In 1QS the image is connected twice by the idea of atonement (כפר): "and [they] shall be the elect of Goodwill who atone for the Land and pay to the wicked their reward… [a]nd they shall be an agreeable offering, atoning for the Land and determining the judgment of wickedness, and there shall be no more iniquity" (1QS 8:4, 10). Paul predicates his Temple metaphor solely on the indwelling of the Spirit and there is no indication of any correspondence between the community and atonement. While these mappings are not inconsistent, the

---

[78] Wenschkewitz 1932. On the *spiritualization* model see section 1.2.1.
[79] Gärtner 1965:58, "the implication being that God's Shekinah no longer rests on the Jerusalem temple, but has removed to the Church."
[80] Finlan 2004:64. See also Finlan 2011.
[81] Klinzing 1971, Schüssler Fiorenza 1976.

two metaphors highlight different aspects of their targets and are not used in the same way.[82]

It is equally unclear how any of the models used to interpret the Qumran passage (*spiritualization*, reinterpretation, transference) apply to the Pauline passage. All three of these models assert some sort of ontological realism to Paul's language, though reinterpretation and transference attempt to avoid the dualistic implications of *spiritualization*.[83] Paul's language of Temple certainly cannot be seen as dualistic, as he uses it to reaffirm the physicality of the body in 1 Cor 6.19-20 (see 3.3.2.) and we have already argued against simply placing Paul within the evolutionary narrative that *spiritualization* purports. In 1 Cor 3.5-17, significant reinterpretation (*Umdeutung*) does occur. However, it is the reinterpretation of the community not the Temple that is Paul's primary task. The Temple is only found in the source domain, never in the target and thus the community is understood in terms of the Temple not *vice versa*.[84] Metaphorical mapping is not symmetrical.

Common to these three positions is that Paul's metaphor is not simply a conceptual mapping or transfer but an ontological or substantive one. So Finlan: "[w]hen Paul says 'you are God's temple and 'we are the temple'… he is *transferring* God's presence from sanctuary to believers."[85] Paul certainly did believe that the Spirit dwelt amongst the community and so this assertion is possible. However, this transference is not the necessary interpretation. As Sanders rightly notes, "Jews did not think that God

---

[82] See Gärtner 1965:16.
[83] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:159.
[84] On the asymmetry of metaphors, see the discussion in section 1.3.2.2. and the conclusion below in 3.5.
[85] Finlan 2011:70 Cf. Rowland 2005:475.

was there [in the temple] and nowhere else, nor that the temple in any way confined him."[86] Furthermore, Paul's central aim here is to give the Corinthians a conceptual model to assure them of the presence of the indwelling Spirit. Paul is readily able to discuss the indwelling Spirit without conceptualizing the community as a Temple (1 Cor 2.10-16; Rom 8.9-11). This conceptualization does not require the invalidity of the Temple.[87] This metaphor is not found within a polemical context, nor is it connected with any critique or hint of separation from the cult. Klawans argues that this language actually "affirms many of the fundamental theological tenets" of the Jewish cult,[88] though this is not necessarily the case either. If the ναός here is indeed the Jerusalem Temple, the limits and implications of any entailments we draw beyond Paul's central argument are not designated.

The multiplicity of accounts of this language is a testament to the richness of Paul's metaphor but also highlights our central problem. According to our earlier discussion, we can clearly observe Paul conceptualizing and understanding the community in terms of the Temple and thus the metaphor THE COMMUNITY IS A TEMPLE. De Lacey captures the idea of the cognitive structure this source domain provides when he writes, "the Temple-image provided an ideal instrument for defusing the situation and

---

[86] Sanders 1992:71.
[87] *Contra* Finlan 2011:80, "[s]acrificial metaphor does indeed show sacrifice to be 'meaningful and symbolic' but also to be inadequate, or there would be no need for the changed condition [...]" Wardle 2010:5 goes further and places this language in light of the "harsh critique that often surfaced in this period against the priestly overseers of the Jerusalem temple" and should be compared with the construction of rival temples in contemporary Judaism.
[88] Klawans 2006:245. So also Hogeterp 2006:384, "[t]herefore, metaphorical levels of thought about the Temple and cultic symbolism are not necessarily in tension with the institution of the concrete Jeruslaem Temple in contemporary Jewish traditions."

developing his argument."[89] This generally aligns with Böttrich who characterizes this language as "positive Anknüpfung",[90] and Hogeterp describes Paul's Temple language as a "normative model"[91], both of which emphasize how this language models Paul's argument rather than its possible negative implications for the Temple. We observed how this source domain, interacting with other domains, provided unique correspondences and inference patterns with which Paul could explicate and clarify the nature of the church community and its leaders.

Böttrich is also correct that while the metaphors of the body and plantation can generally be understood by modern readers, the concept of the Temple must be historically reconstructed.[92] We have observed that most studies have attempted to interpret Paul's metaphors by engaging in this task. However, we have also observed the twofold limitation of this activity. First, multiple backgrounds and models fit the text and result in different interpretations and thus not one of them can be identified with certainty. Second, even when a background is preferred, the implications of Paul's metaphors do not become self-evident. The entailments drawn from understanding the community in terms of the Temple, beyond those which Paul highlights explicitly, are not to be found within the text.

---

[89] De Lacey 1991:407.
[90] Böttrich 1999:423.
[91] Hogeterp 2006:384-5.
[92] Böttrich 1999:411, "muß bei „Tempel" das intendierte Assoziationsgefüge erst mühsam durch die historische Rückfrage erschlossen werden."

3.3.2. 1 Corinthians 6.19-20

A second Temple metaphor, applied in a different context with a different target domain, does much to supplement our understanding of the structure and function of Paul's mappings. 1 Cor 6.19-20 belongs within the larger discussion of 6.12-20.[93] There are several features that make this section distinct: the thematic emphasis and repetition of the terms πορνεία and σῶμα, the change of focus from the church's overall reaction to indiscretion and to individual sin. Paul also does not seem to be writing in reaction to a specific incident (cf. 5.1; 6.1). Nevertheless, the passage contains elements that are found in other parts of the letter.[94]

The issue of πορνεία, first mentioned in 5.9, still appears to be at the forefront of Paul's mind.[95] While no specific case is mentioned, the tone of Paul's language and the analogies with his treatment of idolatry indicate that πορνεία is more than just a hypothetical problem.[96] His argument addresses a series of maxims: in 6.12-14 Paul addresses the slogan(s) directly, in 6.15-17 he attacks the theological basis of such behaviour, and in 6:18-20 he provides a strong prohibition against πορνεία.

Whatever the origin of 6.13, the basic thrust of Paul's argument is that there is no analogy between κοιλία and σῶμα or likewise between βρῶμα and πορνεία. The idea τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν cannot be extended to issues of sexual conduct. For as God raised Christ, he will also raise the Corinthians (6.14, cf. 15.12-14). The body is not destroyed but is rather redeemed and thus has eschatological significance and should be honoured in the present. The second part of the argument

---

[93] Hogeterp 2006:336-338 argues that 6:18-20 should be viewed independently from 6:12-17.
[94] Garland 2003:220.
[95] Fee 1987:250.
[96] Cf. 1 Cor 6:18 and 10:14.

begins with the familiar rhetorical question οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι again exposing the Corinthians' ignorance. Here he introduces the metaphor μέλη to demonstrate the incongruity of being in Christ and visiting prostitutes.[97] The man who binds himself to a prostitute (κολλάομαι), engages in the dynamic described in 7.4 where the man has authority (ἐξουσιάζει) over the woman's body and the woman over the man's. Since Paul has asserted that he will be mastered (ἐξουσιασθήσομαι) by nothing, by implication neither should the Corinthians. Paul invokes Gen 2.24 with the implication that oneness with a prostitute is incongruous with oneness with Lord. The issue is one of fidelity as much as carnality. One's body cannot be "for the Lord" and joined with a prostitute.

This leads Paul to a strong prohibition in 6.18: φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν. This passage contains two metaphors. In the first, Paul appeals to the Spirit and highlights the sanctity and holiness of the body and warns against its desecration by conceptualizing it as the Temple (ναός). Through the conceptual framework provided by this metaphor Paul can argue that πορνεία damages the body and is thus sacrilege against God. There is some question as to the referent of τὸ σῶμα, whether it is the individual's physical body, or the church as a corporate body.[98] The argument follows that if Paul is referring to the bodies of individuals he would have used the plural form of σῶμα (Rom 12.1). Gupta notes that the singular can be understood distributively, "the body of each of you", as in Rom 8.23, 2 Cor 4.10 and Phil 3.21.[99] The corporate reading further seems to be an attempt to harmonize 6.19 with 3.16, which is unnecessary once we read these as source domains in a metaphor that can potentially be mapped onto multiple targets. Paul's

---

[97] Thiselton 2000:465. Cf. Martin 1995:176.
[98] Cf. Newton 2005:74.
[99] Gupta 2010:74.

second image is ancillary. The verb ἀγοράζω and the genitive of price τιμῆς evoke the image of a slave auction. The picture is not of a slave freed, but of the changing of hands or transferring masters.[100] Like 3.16, we have multiple metaphors interacting and, as with the image of the field, building and the Temple, there is a strong assertion of God's ownership. The primary metaphorical entailment here is that the Corinthians should do with their bodies what the Temple has always done, glorify God.

The function of 6.12-20 is to display the gravity of sexual sin. Through πορνεία one dishonours the body, which has eschatological significance because of the resurrection, and thereby detaches oneself from Christ. The individual body, like the community, is God's possession and dwelling place and is not to be desecrated. As noted above, there are striking similarities here with the way in which Paul treats idolatry in 10.14-22.[101] There are specific linguistic parallels. Paul faces both with a strong exhortation: φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν (6.18) and φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας (10.14). The same theological principles are also at work in both sections. In 6.12-20, one cannot be bound to a prostitute and to the Lord. In 10.21b, οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων. Πορνεία and εἰδωλολατρία have similar negative effects. A connection between the two sins is made explicit by Paul in 1 Cor 10:7-8 and elsewhere (Rom 1.22-25). Notably, Paul uses cultic imagery in both instances to combat these activities (6.19; 10.14-22). The adverse affects of sexual sin on the cult can be seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. CD 12.1; 4QMMT 1.11-12) and suggests that sexual sin can be considered a cultic issue.[102] Therefore, the Temple again appears the

---

[100] Thiselton 2000:477, Garland 2003:329.
[101] Garland 2003:221. See section 3.2.3.
[102] See section 2.3.1.2.

appropriate metaphorical source for addressing this issue, though the application of the Temple to the physical body is unparalleled in Jewish texts. Through the conceptualization THE BODY IS A TEMPLE, Paul effectively draws together and intertwines ideas of sexual immorality, idolatry, cult, holiness and fidelity creating a powerful and clearly delineated set of correspondences with which to combat the Corinthian indiscretion.[103] The application of ναός to two distinct target domains in 3.16-17 and 6.19 suggests that Paul is using the term as a conceptual and heuristic tool rather than as a means to denote ontological transference. Thus, when Paul needs to discuss sanctity and the negative consequences of transgression, the Temple provides the ideal source domain. Whether these are two distinct metaphorical conceptualizations or one is a *species* of the other is unclear. Both metaphors are predicated on the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Corinthians midst. The extent to which this designates a divine presence relocated from the Temple's sanctum is again not specified by Paul. Thus, while the verse clearly articulates a conceptualization, the principle on which that mapping is made may result in unresolved theological tension between the Temple of Jerusalem and the body as a Temple.

3.3.3. 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1

3.3.3.1. The Authenticity and Integrity of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1

The final Temple metaphor found in the undisputed epistles of Paul is itself complicated by a number of factors. 2 Corinthians in general, and this passage in particular, raise

---

[103] This idea is supported by Hogeterp 2006: 385, but due to his separation of 6.18-20 from the rest of the passage he fails to make the connection here.

some serious questions regarding integrity and authenticity.[104] Two questions have arisen concerning 2 Cor 6.14-7.1: was this text written by Paul, and does it belong in this context? Solutions have answered these questions in various combinations: an Essene interpolation[105]; an anti-Pauline interpolation[106]; a Pauline interpolation of non-Pauline material[107]; a second edition of the letter;[108] a part of a previous letter.[109] From the outset it is important to note that there is no text-critical evidence of an interpolation so the argument for one is entirely contextual.[110] Lambrecht, who supports the passage's authenticity, provides five arguments against the integrity of this passage: "(1) disruption of the context, (2) *hapax legomena*, (3) peculiarities in the chain of quotations (vi 16b-18c), (4) points of contact with the Essene writings, and (5) un-Pauline theology."[111]

It is clear that the command ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται in 2 Cor 6.11-13 is closely related to χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς in 7.2. In light of this, 6.14-7.1 appears as a disruption. Fitzmyer suggests that it "radically interrupts the chain of thought."[112] Thrall, followed by Murphy-O'Connor, argues that this simply represents a digression.[113] In this configuration, the χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς of 7.2 can be seen as resumptive. In addition, Thrall has identified a series of connections between 6.14-7:1 and the preceding chapters which

---

[104] Heil 1996:727-29 cites 24 authors who contest integrity and 30 authors who support it, Brooke 2013:5, however, believes there is still a slight majority for those voting against integrity.
[105] Fitzmyer 1961, Gnilka 1963, Kuhn 1992.
[106] Betz 1973.
[107] Furnish 1984.
[108] Collange 1972.
[109] Hurd 1983.
[110] Walker 2001, 2002 explains this away in light of the a priori probability of the existence of interpolations in the Pauline corpus.
[111] Lambrecht 1994:77.
[112] Fitzmyer 1961:271.
[113] Thrall 1978:146, Murphy-O'Connor 1987:272-275.

speaks for its location in the text.[114] Similarly, Lambrecht argues that this is an interjection and that 6.11-13 and 7.2-3 function as an envelope to enfold the interruption.[115] Liu views 6.14-7.1 as "an integral part underscoring Paul's reconciliation motif" which is the larger context.[116] Brooke suggests that these approaches may concede too much that challenges their own position, as these arguments appear as an *apologia* for the undeniable awkwardness of the passage.[117] However, the largest failing of theories of interpolation is to explain how and why 6.14-7.1 is found here in the text. Some argue for the accidental displacement of this passage,[118] though Fee contends against the idea that 2 Corinthians was originally in codex form.[119]

Scholars have also doubted the authenticity of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 because of the presence of a large number of *hapax legomena*, as the words ἑτεροζυγέω, μετοχὴ, συμφώνησις, Βελιάρ, συγκατάθεσις, ἐμπεριπατέω, εἰσδέχομαι, παντοκράτωρ and μολυσός appear nowhere else in Paul.[120] Even when those found in the citations are taken into account, this is a high proportion. However, 2 Corinthians itself contains a high number of *hapax legomena*,[121] and there are several other Pauline passages that contain a high number of *hapax legomena.*[122] The use of unique words is to be expected in rhetorical flourishes such as this and may just indicate the author's search for

---

[114] Thrall 1978:146, "[i]t is worth noticing that each verse of the passage reveals at least one parallel to something Paul has already said." She cites 2.15-17 for the contrast between believer and unbeliever; 4.3-6 for the contrast between light and dark; 5.11 speaks of the fear of the Lord; 5.17 and 6.2 use OT citations about restoration.
[115] Lambrecht 1994:534-535.
[116] Liu 2013:197.
[117] Brooke 2013:5.
[118] Corsani 2000:116, Schmeller 2006.
[119] Fee 1977.
[120] Fitzmyer 1961:271, Fee 1977:144, Furnish 1984:376, Thrall 1994:29.
[121] Martin 1986:191 counts around fifty hapaxes in 2 Corinthians.
[122] 1 Cor 4:7-13 contains six *hapax legomena*; 2 Cor 6:3-10 contains four.

synonyms.[123] Secondly, Fee has pointed out that while the words themselves are unique, cognate forms of many of them can be found within Paul.[124] Thus, the presence of *hapax legomena* itself is not determinative for the question of authenticity.

The series of biblical quotations used in this passage is often seen as pre-Pauline, even by those who assert the authenticity of the passage as a whole.[125] The passage cites three texts, Lev 26.12, Isa 52.11, and 2 Sam 7.14, which are subtly conflated with Ezek 37.27, 20.35, and Isa, 46.3, respectively. The introductory formula, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι, is unique in Paul and is found elsewhere only in the *Damascus Document*.[126] These texts are not found elsewhere in Paul, but 2 Sam 7.14 is cited in 4QFlorilegium. Furthermore, the combination of texts is peculiar and its nearest parallel are the *testimonia* found at Qumran. Lambrecht has shown that none of these on their own demonstrate a non-Pauline origin and that if the rest of the passage can be shown to be thoroughly Pauline, a Pauline origin can be presumed for the catena.[127] The concentration of seemingly "un-Pauline" elements, while not decisive for deeming the passage "non-Pauline", are certainly striking and may suggest, at the very least, the adaptation of pre-existing material.

The similarities with the sectarian compositions at Qumran are not limited to the catena. Proponents of Pauline authenticity likewise "cannot deny the affinities between 2 Cor vi 14-vii 1 and the Qumran documents."[128] Hultgren lists six sets of similarities: (i)

---

[123] Thrall 1994:29.
[124] Fee 1977:145.
[125] Hogeterp 2006:372-373.
[126] Fitzmyer 1961:215-216 Both CD 6.13 and 8.9 use the formula, אמר אל.
[127] Lambrecht 1994:541-545 He argues that the introductory formula cannot be qualified as un-Pauline, and has parallels with ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπῶν in 2 Cor 6.6.
[128] Lambrecht 1994:548 n. 43.

the dualisms of righteousness/lawlessness, light/darkness, and Christ/Beliar; (ii) the issue of idolatry; (iii) the distinction of the community and its separation from others; (iv) the related topics of the cleansing of the flesh and perfection in holiness; (v) the citation formulae and the chain of scriptural quotations; and (vi) the notion of the community as a Temple.[129] While many of these aspects are articulated in a manner somewhat foreign to Paul, there are parallels and therefore they need not be seen as "non-Pauline" or "anti-Pauline". Scrolls specialist Brooke suggests these parallels "could also be used to demonstrate the way in which Paul was heir of a rich diversity of Jewish tradition and variously used it to make his arguments work in a range of contexts."[130]

There are a series of features in the text that have been deemed non-Pauline.[131] Various list have been compiled, but in general scholars refer to Paul's use of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, his exhortation to cleanse oneself (καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς), and the implication that God's promises are dependent on human obedience.[132] Thrall has demonstrated that Paul is capable of using σάρξ and πνεῦμα according to their common meaning,[133] that cleansing from defilement is not a foreign idea in Paul,[134] and that God's promises are not contingent upon human obedience but are to be viewed rather in the context of Paul's "already-not yet" eschatology. This passage has also been read as theologically inconsistent with Paul statements in 1 Cor 5.9-13 and 7.12-14. In the former, Paul states that they should not judge or separate from those outside and, in the latter, that the

---

[129] Hultgren 2003:41.
[130] Brooke 2013.
[131] Fitzmyer 1961:272, Furnish 1984:376, Thrall 1994:29.
[132] Furnish, 376.
[133] Cf. 1 Cor 6.16: ἔσονται γάρ φησίν οἱ δύο εἰς *σάρκα* μίαν (Italics mine).
[134] Thrall 1994:489, "[t]he general idea of pursuing the perfection of holiness may be characteristic of Qumran but is scarcely foreign to Paul himself." Cf. Rom. 6.16 and Phil. 3.12-16.

believer sanctifies the unbeliever through marriage.[135] The meaning of ἑτεροζυγοῦντες is difficult to understand. Fee interprets it in terms of sharing temple meals with pagans,[136] whereas Thrall sees it in a more general sense pertaining to marriage or business association.[137] It is possible that Paul here is making a general point whereas in 1 Corinthians, he was responding to specific instances. It is also possible regarding marriage that 1 Cor 7.12-14 deals with an existing situation whereas 2 Cor 6.14 could regard future prospects. Reactions to his instructions in 1 Corinthians may also have required Paul to take a different stance here. Lambrecht suggests that many of the arguments against Pauline authenticity assume that Paul's views are "too monolithic and one-sided".[138] While sympathetic to Lambrecht's position, the peculiarities of this passage do give us pause. We proceed with the assumption of authenticity, while noting that the strongest arguments regarding this passage's supersessionist stance are often premised upon its aspects that also appear the most un-Pauline.

3.3.3.2. The Temple Metaphor in 2 Cor 6.14-7.1

The Temple metaphor in this passage is clearly articulated in 6.16b: ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος. At first blush, this construction bears much in common with 1 Cor 3.16-17. The source domain, ναὸς θεοῦ, is mapped onto the target as the predicate of the verb εἰμί. Here, however, the source is not simply ναὸς θεοῦ but ναὸς θεοῦ… ζῶντος and Paul

---

[135] For this reason, some such as Hurd, believe that 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 is the letter Paul refers to in 1 Cor 5:9. However the lack of any mention of "sexual immorality" makes this unlikely. See Hurd 1983:235-237.
[136] Fee 1977:143-144 While this position is illuminating, it is unlikely temple meals is the sole purpose of this passage if only because they are not mentioned.
[137] Thrall 1994:473.
[138] Lambrecht 1994.

includes himself in the target, using the first person (ἡμεῖς… ἐσμεν).[139] As with 1 Cor 3.16-17 and 6.19-20, the Temple metaphor is constituted around the concept of the indwelling of God. This notion is articulated not by Paul, but demonstrated in the joint quotations of Ezek 37.27 and Lev 26.12 in v.17: ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μου λαός. Neither text in the LXX has the term ἐνοικήσω, which is never used of God in the LXX at all,[140] but rather both texts speak of God walking "among" and being "with" his people. Whether or not this alteration of the text is by Paul or his source,[141] there is clearly an emphasis on *in*dwelling here. The indwelling is not specifically enacted by τὸ πνεῦμα as in 1 Cor 3.16-17 and 6.19-20, though in 2 Cor 3.3, the only other text outside of a quotation where Paul uses the phrase "living God", Paul speaks of the πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, which may suggest the distinction is not important.

The metaphorical conceptualization of the community as a Temple structures the argument of 2 Cor 6.14-7.1. The purpose of this passage is not to articulate the Corinthians' Temple identity, but rather to demonstrate their incompatibility with idols. The thesis of the argument is clearly stated in 6.14a: μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις. This is followed by a series of contrasting rhetorical questions, which culminates in v.16a: τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῷ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων. This question presents a standard Jewish perspective on idolatry and the sanctuary, similar to the principle we viewed in 1 Cor 10.21. There Paul claimed their eating of sacrificial meals created κοινωνία, and the Corinthians cannot be κοινωνοί with both the Lord's supper and idolatrous practice.

---

[139] In P^{46} the metaphor is presented in the second person "for *you* are God's temple". Brooke 2013:6 n.19 suggests this could be "an assimilation towards 1 Cor 3:16."
[140] McKelvey 1969:95.
[141] As Wardle 2010:213 claims.

Conceptualizing the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice allowed him to apply Jewish monolatrous principles. In this passage, the community is conceptualized as a Temple so as to demonstrate its incompatibility with idolatry. In response the community is to cleanse itself of all physical and moral defilements, imagery probably drawn from the Temple image of 16b. As in 1 Cor. 6:19-20, the issue is monotheistic fidelity. There is no reason to "spiritualize" the idols of 16a, as Gärtner does.[142] Conversely, we need not limit the whole issue specifically to cultic meals as Fee does.[143] The Temple metaphor is the premise of the argument, the basis of Paul's whole appeal in the text, not its conclusion. Thus this passage does not aim at the replacement or displacement of the Jerusalem Temple.

Perhaps here Paul is presuming that the Temple has been replaced when he appeals to this metaphor. The basis for this line of argument is the chain of quotations, in particular the use of Lev 26.12. Not only does the text add the term ἐνοικήσω, but also the "emendation of the second person… to the third person… suggests that he is reading Leviticus 26:12 through the lens of Ezekiel 37:27 and its vision of God's eschatological dwelling with Israel in a new sanctuary."[144] Thus, "these passages all have an eschatological bent, infusing the early Christian understanding of the community as a temple with eschatological significance."[145] Thus, unlike 1 Cor 3.16-17 or 6.19-20, this passage is explicitly eschatological, suggesting the community is the fulfilment of Temple promises, a term which Paul himself uses to describe these citations (ἐπαγγελία).

---

[142] Gärtner 1965:52, "[a]gain, I do not believe that the 'idols' referred to are in fact images; they symbolize the paths of the unfaithful outside the bounds of the Law."
[143] Fee 1977.
[144] Wardle 2010:213.
[145] Wardle 2010:214.

While this interpretation is clearly possible, it is not the only position available. Brooke, speaking of the use of these passages in Qumran, notes that, "it is quite likely that the juxtaposition of Ezekiel 37 and Leviticus 26 was so obvious that it could have come to mind independently in each case."[146] However, a relevant parallel to the use of these passages in Philo is equally instructive:

> In the understanding of those who have been purified to the utmost the Ruler of the universe walks noiselessly, alone, invisibly, for verily there is an oracle once vouchsafed to the Sage, in which it is said: "I will walk in you, and will be your God": but in the understanding of those who are still undergoing cleansing and have not yet fully washed their life defiled and stained by the body's weight there walk angels, divine words, making them bright and clean with the doctrines of all that is good and beautiful. It is quite manifest what troops of evil tenants are ejected, in order that One, the good one, may enter and occupy. Be zealous therefore, O soul, to become a house of God, a holy temple, a most beauteous abiding-place (Philo, *Somn.* 1.148-49).

Here Philo quotes Lev 26.12 and combines it with the second person perspective of Ezek 37.12, περιπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός. The citation is referred to as an oracle (θεοπρόπιον) and is viewed as presently fulfilled. The text is utilized within the context of the need to purify oneself and separate from evil. Finally, this culminates in Philo's understanding of the soul as the Temple of God: σπούδαζε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, θεοῦ οἶκος γενέσθαι, ἱερὸν ἅγιον, ἐνδιαίτημα κάλλιστον. Once more, Philo functions as a counter example to our presumed interpretation of the implications of cultic language. Unlike what is proposed for Paul or the sectarians, Philo can appeal to the same texts in order to construct a similar metaphor that does not imply the insufficiency of the Temple or any need for its substitution.[147] This is not to argue for any identity in meaning or function of the Philonic passage and the Pauline, but to demonstrate that these citations and

---

[146] Brooke 2013:11-12.
[147] Philo also cites Lev 26.12 in *Somn.* 2.248 and alludes to it in *Praem.* 142.

conceptualizations do not by necessity denote a replacement or supersession of the Jerusalem Temple.

2 Cor 6.14-7.1 is nowhere combined with any criticism or claims of insufficiency of Temple practice or principles. It articulates a well-represented Jewish Temple theology using often combined biblical texts. Furthermore, it metaphorically maps those theological entailments onto other phenomena to conceptualize the presence of God amongst his people and encourage purity, in line with Paul's contemporaries. This text certainly appears more supersessionist than Paul's other Temple metaphors, though it is the elements that are most supersessionist that lead some scholars to argue a non-Pauline origin. Thus, while it remains possible that Paul, or his source, is articulating a doctrine regarding the community as the eschatological Temple of God, if we take Jewish Temple adherence as standard assumption, there is still insufficient evidence here to claim that Paul has fully and finally replaced the Temple.

3.4. EPHESIANS 2.11-22

3.4.1. Introduction

Thus far we have examined Paul's Temple metaphors in their historical setting using the tools provided by CMT. We have demonstrated that Paul uses a conceptual structure drawn from the Temple in order to reason about the community and the body. While there is nothing inherently supersessionist about these conceptualizations, we also noted many of the possible implications and entailments of these metaphors are not fully expressed or realized. In the remainder of this chapter we examine a further Temple metaphor: Eph 2.11-22. This passage occupies a unique position in this study. As a

Temple metaphor found within the Epistle to the Ephesians, it belongs to the Pauline corpus, and thus is addressed in this chapter. However, here we assume some slippage between the undisputed letters of Paul, such as 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians, that Ephesians is best understood as an interpretation and adaptation of Paul's thought. Therefore in this chapter, we aim to establish that Eph 2.11-22 is the earliest and most proximate effect of Paul's Temple metaphors. In the chapters that follow, we shall demonstrate how Eph 2.11-22 becomes particularly *effective* within the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. In this way, Eph 2.11-22 functions as both a model for and a bridge into our subsequent case studies into this effective history

We approach Eph 2.11-22 by examining the nature of its relationship with Paul's other Temple metaphors, particularly 1 Cor 3.16-17. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate the utility not only of metaphor theory, but also of the effective-historical approach in understanding Paul's metaphors. Establishing this relationship is complicated both by issues of pseudonymity and the presence of Temple metaphors in other contemporary texts.[148] However, even those who claim a Pauline authorship agree that the Temple metaphor is more developed in Ephesians, thus making much of what we say still applicable.[149] What we seek to identify is whether the Ephesian Temple metaphor and its underlying model draws upon the conceptual structure provided by 1 Cor 3.16-17, its source and target domains, correspondences, and entailments. Our inquiry into the relationship between these two texts will proceed with reference to the following questions: (i) is it likely the author had access to the proposed source? (ii) are there conceptual and verbal correspondences? (iii) is the proposed source the most likely

[148] For a strong argument for the dependence of Eph 2.19-22 on Qumran see Smith 1989:201-217.
[149] McKelvey 1969:117, Hoehner 2002:404.

source? (iv) can we explain the differences between the texts while maintaining one as the source? Having discussed this relationship, we shall attempt to characterize it in light of our discussions of metaphor and effective-history. Thus we shall observe how this metaphor develops and how this development may contribute to a better understanding of the Corinthian passage and ourselves as its interpreters.

3.4.2. Ephesians and 1 Corinthians

If Paul did author Ephesians, the question of the Ephesian author's access to 1 Corinthians becomes unnecessary. However, if Ephesians was not authored by Paul, the epistle's claim to Pauline authorship and the persuasiveness of this claim in the history of interpretation suggest the author had some access to Pauline traditions or documents. The letter to the Colossians is often cited as this author's primary source of Pauline theology.[150] Van Kooten further argues regarding the strength of this dependency, "[i]f the primary text of *Col* accounts sufficiently for a passage in a particular part of *Eph*, one need not resort to supplementary passages as well."[151] This, however, does not eliminate 1 Corinthians as a possible source text for Ephesians and our particular passage. Van Kooten identifies Eph 2.11-22 as one of three passages which do not have Colossians as their primary source (see also Eph 4.1-16, 6.10-17). While this passage does employ "supplementary parallels" drawn from Col 2.8-3.4, the metaphor of the Temple is not one of them and thus its presence must still be explained.

Van Kooten also recognizes a connection between 1 Corinthians and Ephesians and even states, "[the author of Ephesians] is undoubtedly familiar with *1 Cor* and *2*

[150] For an argument for this, see Van Kooten 2003. For an argument against, see Best 1998:20-25.
[151] Van Kooten 2003:226.

Cor."[152] Mitton finds 45 parallels between 1 Corinthians and Ephesians.[153] He lists as strong examples: (i) the image of the body and its members in Eph 4.11, 5.30 is most similar to 1 Cor 12.12, 28; (ii) Paul's self description as "the least" in 1 Cor 15.9-10 is restated and exaggerated in Eph 3.8; (iii) Eph 1.22 restates the non-LXX form of Ps. 8.7 found in 1 Cor 15.27; (iv) the use of the term "building" for the idea of growth is found not only in Eph 2.11-22 but also in Eph 4.12, 16 and 1 Cor 14.3, 5, 12, 26. Van Kooten adds to this list: (i) subjection of the principles and powers in 1 Cor 15.23-28 and Eph. 1.21-23; (ii) the interrelationship between Spirit, ecclesiastical body and baptism in 1 Cor 12.13 and Eph 4.4-5; (iii) the enumeration of apostles, prophets and teachers in 1 Cor 12.28-29 and Eph 4.28; (iv) the notion of becoming tired after labouring with one's hands in 1 Cor 4.11-12 and Eph 4.28; (v) warnings against certain offenders that they will not inherit the kingdom of God in 1 Cor 5.11, 6.9-10 and Eph 5.5.[154]

This list is not exhaustive, but it strongly supports the possibility that the author of Ephesians, if he is not Paul, had access to materials in 1 Corinthians. The nature of this access is difficult to discern. Van Kooten suggests a literary dependence with 1 Corinthians,[155] though this need not be the case. Whether the dependence is literary, oral or recollective, it seems likely that the author of Ephesians had knowledge of Paul's theology in 1 Corinthians and was able to utilize it for their own ends.

---

[152] Van Kooten 2003:231-2.
[153] Mitton 1951.
[154] Van Kooten 2003:230.
[155] Van Kooten 2003:230, "[t]here seems to be a literary dependence at least on the Corinthian correspondence."

3.4.3. Conceptual and Verbal Correspondence

3.4.3.1. Ephesians 2.11-13

Arguably, the passages containing the most correspondence between these letters are 1 Cor 3.5-17 and Eph 2.11-22,[156] with verbal correspondences appearing in particularly high concentration from Eph 2.19-22. There are, however, significant differences as well. We shall limit the analysis to those aspects which relate to the metaphor of the Temple.

The most noticeable difference between Eph 2 and 1 Cor 3 is in the scope of their discussions. 1 Corinthians in general, but this section in particular, addresses problems found within this specific local congregation while Ephesians addresses the church universal.[157] So Gese: "[w]ährend Paulus die Ortsgemeinde als Tempel beschreibt, hat der Verfasser des Epheserbriefes ausschließlich die Gesamtkirche im Blick."[158] The change in scope leads to a change in subject under discussion. In 1 Corinthians, the metaphor of the Temple is used to speak to the ethics of unity and the problem of factions. Ephesians tackles a more general and fundamental division within the church, between Jews and gentiles. The latter discussion is likely not sparked by a specific situation, again differentiating it from 1 Corinthians' more contextualized approach.[159] The author of Ephesians addresses a gentile audience from a Jewish Christian perspective (2.11),[160] exhorting them to recall their former lives by producing a list of four gentile

---

[156] Schnackenburg 1991:121, denies literary dependence here but admits the two texts are "close".
[157] This is typical of this Ephesians' ecclesiology. Cf. McKelvey 1969:108.
[158] Gese 1997:205.
[159] Faust argues that this section deals with relations between Jews and the Romans state following the Jewish War, but Muddiman is correct in noting that since there is no discussion of the state in the ethical section of 4.1-5.20 this seems unlikely. Cf. Faust 1993, Muddiman 2001:121.
[160] Whether this address is historical or fictive is extremely difficult to determine. Cf. Muddiman 2001:117.

disadvantages (2.12). The theme of Eph 2.11-22 is reconciliation and it is expounded through a series of contrasts: "peace" (2.14, 17) and "enmity" (2.14, 16),[161] "now-then" (2.11-13, 19), "near-far" (2.13, 17).[162] The term reconciliation appears in v.16 in a compound form, ἀποκαταλλάσσω.[163] This reconciliation is defined both horizontally and vertically and which of the two is being discussed is not always clear. The reconciliation of opposing groups, the horizontal, results in "one new humanity",[164] and appears prior to the reconciliation with God, the vertical. Both kinds of reconciliation are explicitly effected by the death of Christ in vv.13, 14 and 16.[165]

Thus far, while we have observed little verbal correspondence between Eph 2.11-13 and 1 Cor 3.5-17, the underlying ambitions of the two passages are not far removed. Both deal with how the community's newfound identity overcomes division. Ephesians addresses the issue as manifest in the universal church through doctrinal exposition, 1 Corinthians the local congregation through ethical exhortation. The distinction in subject and manner, however, does not create a contradiction in the underlying intentions of the two passages, which, indeed, are quite close.

---

[161] Schnackenburg 1991:112 argues this is a Christian reading of Isa. 9.6 and 52.7.

[162] This third contrast is probably drawn from Isa 57.19, cf. Barth 2008:260, Schnackenburg 1991:111, Best 1998:236. Lincoln denies the use of Isaiah in Eph 2.13 but this seems unlikely in light of 2.17, Lincoln 1990:138 .

[163] The term is found only here and, with a slightly different nuance, in Col. 1.20, 22. Best 1998:265 argues that the difference in use means there is no reason to see dependence on Colossians here. Hoehner 2002:383 argues that the coining of a new term is an argument against pseudonymity The απο-prefix most likely points to completed action rather than a former state. Cf. Barth 2008:266.

[164] εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. Cf. Gal 6.15. See Schnackenburg 1991:111.

[165] ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 13, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ in v. 14, and διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ in v. 16. Best 1998:266 notes that v. 16 is the only place in Ephesians where the manner of Christ's death is mentioned. Barth 2008:267 sees these as references to Christ's sacrificial death and role as both high priest and victim. This is by no means evident.

3.4.3.2. Ephesians 2.14-18

Many have posited the use of a Christian hymn in 2.14-18.[166] However, we agree with Schnackenburg here that "both style and progression of thought point to [the author's] own hand."[167] In this section, we shall discuss two images that may relate to the Temple metaphor: τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ in v. 14, and προσαγωγή in v. 18. The referent for the "middle wall of partition" in v. 14 is hotly debated. Suggested candidates are: (i) the Temple balustrade as described by Josephus (*War* 5.193-4; 6.124-6), the Mishnah (*m. Mid.* 2.3) and inscriptions (*CIJ* 2.1400);[168] (ii) the Law as a fence, described in *Arist.* 139 and *m. Avot* 3.18[169]; or (iii) simply a metaphorical wall denoting separation.[170] While no one argument may entirely rule out the others,[171] we shall put forward an argument for the Temple balustrade being most likely.

The balustrade we refer to is the chest-high wall in the Temple separating the court of the gentiles from the inner court, an area reserved only for Jews.[172] A warning notice in Greek from the wall has been found and 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."[173] There are three arguments against identification of the wall in Eph 2.14 with the Temple balustrade. First, Josephus never

---

[166] This is due to the presence of several *hapax legomena*, seeming conceptual conflicts and the mention of hymns in Eph. 5.14, 19. Cf. Lincoln 1990:127-30, Muddiman 2001:115 Best 1998:257-49 argues against it Barth 2008:262 claims it is possible but not certain Schlier 1930 argues for the use of a Gnostic hymn For arguments against this see Best 1998:247-49.
[167] Schnackenburg 1991:107.
[168] Muddiman 2001:126-29.
[169] Schnackenburg 1991:114.
[170] Best 1998:256-7, Hoehner 2002:371.
[171] Barth 2008:287.
[172] Sanders 1992:61.
[173] Sanders 1992:61. See also Deissmann 1910:75.

uses the phrase τὸ μεσότοιχον but rather δρύφακτος... λίθινος. Second, it is unlikely the audience of Ephesians would have had any knowledge of this wall. Third, there is consideration of the status of the Temple at the time of writing. Best argues that this reference is unlikely because the Temple had been destroyed.[174] Hoehner, upholding Pauline authorship, argues it is unlikely because the Temple is still standing. However, none of these arguments hold.

The term τὸ μεσότοιχον is rare, found sparingly in classical literature and not once in the LXX. We may question whether Josephus' rendering is a technical term requisite for description of this balustrade. It is also evident why the author of Ephesians may want to use a term that emphasizes the divisive function of this wall while Josephus may want to minimize it. Second, the audience of Ephesians is difficult to reconstruct, let alone their pre-knowledge. Nevertheless, the episode of Acts 21.29 shows on-going knowledge of this balustrade post 70 CE.[175] From Best and Hoehner, we see that the third argument can be stated in contradictory terms. While the existence or destruction of the Temple may change the tone of the reference, it in no way denies the possibility of it. Finally, the mention of ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι and ξένοι in v.12, προσαγωγή in v. 18 and ναός in v.21 seems to indicate a consistent metaphorical structure, as this was the *wall* that prevented *access* to *foreigners* in the *Temple*. Thus, if the audience did have knowledge of this wall, which is certainly possible, it seems the most obvious and coherent referent. Though remaining tentative, it seems possible that there is a reference to a piece of Temple apparatus here which is absent from the Corinthian passage.

---

[174] Best 1998:254.
[175] This counter example is drawn from Muddiman 2001:128.

Moving to the second image, the ὅτι beginning v.18 likely states the result of v.14-17. *Because* the *wall* has been destroyed (v.14), the *law* nullified (v.15) and the *enmity* killed (v.16), both have *access* (προσαγωγή) in one Spirit to the Father (v. 18). This noun appears elsewhere in Eph 3.12 and Rom 5.2 and can have a transitive meaning "introduction", or an intransitive meaning "access". In all three New Testament examples it bears the latter meaning.[176] Although the noun itself is absent, the cognate verb προσάγω is ubiquitous in the LXX, particularly in the book of Leviticus, often denoting an approach to the altar. [177] In Ephesians the context of worship in conjunction with the idea of "one Spirit" seems to point to the cultic interpretation. Barth and McKelvey see this in light of the eschatological hopes of the nations worshipping at Zion.[178] The possible allusion to Deutero-Isaiah may support this interpretation, though it is not explicit and would imply a highly realized eschatology. The more explicit implication is that the reconciliation of Jews and gentiles allows them both as one people to have access to the worship of God. The horizontal leads to the vertical. If this is correct, we can observe a coherent and highly developed Temple metaphor beginning at Eph 2.14.

3.4.3.3. Ephesians 2.19-22

In Eph 2.19-22 the parallels with the Corinthian passage become much stronger. Gese argues, "[d]ie direkte Wortwahl ließ darüber hinaus schon die literarische Abhängigkeit

---

[176] Best 1998:273-4, Schnackenburg 1991:118. For an argument for a transitive connotation see Barth 2008:268.
[177] Cf. Lev 1.2, 3, 10; 3.1, 3, 7, 12; 4.3, 4, 14; 5.8; 6.7; 7.8, 14, 16, 25, 35; 8.13, 14, 18, 22, 24; 10.19; 14.2, 12; 16.1, 6, 9, 11, 20; 19.21; 22.20, 22, 24; 23.8, 18, 25, 27, 36. The phrase can also refer to the approach of a ruler. For the cultic interpretation see Barth 2008:267-8, Best 1998:274, Muddiman 2001:138.
[178] Barth 2008:287, McKelvey 1969:112.

von 1Kor 3,9-17 erkennen."[179] Both 1 Cor 3.5-17 and Eph 2.11-22 are characterized by their use of οἰκ-cognates. The verb ἐποικοδομέω occurs four times in 1 Cor 3, twice in close connection with θεμέλιος. Thus, the image of the building and the Temple in Eph 2.20 begins with a close verbal parallel to 1 Corinthians. However, there is perhaps also a conceptual contradiction.[180] In 1 Cor 3.11, Paul lays a foundation "which *is* Jesus Christ". In Eph 2.20, the church is built upon the "foundation *of* the apostles and prophets". These are likely genitives of apposition and therefore refer to a foundation *consisting* of the apostles and prophets, in seeming opposition to the Pauline configuration.[181] Another difficult clause follows: "with Christ himself being the ἀκρογωνιαῖος". The meaning of this term as "cornerstone", drawn from Isa 28.16 was challenged by Jeremias, who was followed by commentators such as Barth.[182] Jeremias, drawing from the *Testament of Solomon* 22.7-23.4 and Symmachus' translation, renders the word "capstone/keystone" which fits better with the idea of Christ as head of the body (Eph 4.15; 5.23). McKelvey has argued against this position, noting the late dating of *Testament of Solomon* and the verbal inaccuracy of Symmachus.[183] The rendering "cornerstone" seems to better account for the use of Isa 28.16 in the Targums, Qumran, and 1 Pet 2.4-8.[184] It also makes better sense of the relationship between Christ and the

---

[179] Gese 1997:200.
[180] Here we reject, as most commentators now have, Nauck's thesis that Eph. 2.19-22 is based on a baptismal hymn.
[181] The NEB attempts to circumvent this problem and translates this "the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets". For arguments against this cf. Best 1998:280, Hoehner 2002:399 In light of 1 Cor 12.29, Eph. 3.5 and 4.11 and the order of the words here in 2.20, it is likely that apostles and New Testament prophets are in mind here, cf. Best 1998:281-4, Hoehner 2002:397-404, Schnackenburg 1991:122.
[182] Jeremias 1925, 1930, 1937, Barth 2008:317-19.
[183] McKelvey 1962:352-359 See also McKelvey 1969:195-204.
[184] On the use of this term in1 Peter, see section 4.4.2.1.

apostles and prophets. [185] If arguments in favour of the cornerstone are accepted, there is also less conflict with 1 Corinthians than first appeared.[186] With Christ as cornerstone, he still provides the fundamental grounding for the building. From there, it is not a conceptual stretch for an author a generation later to include in this foundation the apostles who laid it.[187] Finding McKelvey's argument most persuasive, we see in this parallel high verbal correspondence as well as conceptual correspondence, which though perhaps more developed, need not be seen as contradictory.

In 1 Cor 3.9, Paul juxtaposes agricultural and architectural metaphors. While the church is never explicitly described as God's γεώργιον in Ephesians, it is pictured similarly as growing, αὔξω (2.20).[188] While the verb is used actively in Ephesians, the passive participle συναρμολογουμένη, and passive verb συνοικοδομεῖσθε, denote the primacy of God's activity in this process, which is the primary entailment of the metaphor in 1 Cor 3.6-7. Here it is an οἰκοδόμη that is depicted as growing. This word means "building", both in terms of a process and a structure, an ambiguity utilized in both texts.[189] These two metaphors, agriculture and architecture, known in combination from other Jewish texts, uniquely flow into one another in both passages.[190] However, in 1 Cor 3.10 the building materials are the *behaviour* of the congregation, later revealed

---

[185] Cf. Schnackenburg 1991:122-4.
[186] Best finds this problem insoluble and opts for the translation "angle-stone", Best 1998:286.
[187] Best 1998:282, Muddiman 2001:141, Barth 2008:271.
[188] The verb αὔξω is synonym of αὐξάνω, both denoting organic growth. Cf. 1996:277.
[189] πᾶσα οἰκοδόμη though anarthrous, refers to the whole church, not separate congregations like that in Corinth. For the interpretation of "whole building" rather than "every building" cf. Hoehner 2002:408.
[190] Cf. Jer. 1.10; 24.6; Sir. 49.7; 1QS 8.4ff. Conzelmann 1975: 93; Fee 1987: 133; Hogeterp 2006: 317-18. Smith argues that this connection is drawn directly from Qumran, see Smith 1989:201-17 For arguments against see below. However, McKelvey claims this is the first time that the temple and building images are fused, see McKelvey 1969:110.

and tested by fire (3.13), whereas in Ephesians the congregation *themselves* are the building material and are passively built upon the foundation. This difference in nuance could simply denote the generational gap and corresponds with the focus on the ethical exhortation in 1 Corinthians and the doctrinal definition in Ephesians. Furthermore, the identification of an individual with their activity is not a conceptual leap and is similar to association between the apostles *laying* the foundation and *being* the foundation.

In 1 Cor 3.16 and Eph 2.21, this οἰκοδόμη turns out to be a ναός, the inner sanctuary of the Temple.[191] This Temple, comprised of the community, is described in both passages as ἅγιος, a holiness constituted by the God who possesses and dwells in it.[192] 1 Cor 3.16 uses the verb οἰκέω whereas the cognate noun κατοικητήριον is found in Eph 2.22.[193] The latter appears 21 times in the LXX with most references denoting God's dwelling in heaven or in the Temple.[194] It appears elsewhere in Rev 18.2 to describe the dwelling place of demons, seen in contradistinction to the dwelling place of God. In 1 Cor 3.16, it is the Spirit of God that dwells in the Temple. In Ephesians, the Temple is the dwelling place of God ἐν πνεύματι (2.22). This phrase can be taken to indicate the nature of the Temple, "a spiritual Temple ", the manner in which the Temple is built, "spiritually built", or the manner in which the Temple is the dwelling place of God thus "in/by the Spirit". [195] The third option is the most cogent grammatically, due to the phrase's close

---

[191] For a discussion of ναός and of ἱερόν, particularly with reference to Ephesus see Hoehner 2002:410-11 See also our discussion of ναός in section 3.3.1.
[192]McKelvey 1969:117.
[193] The prefix κατα- suggests downward movement and the suffix -τηριον, place. Cf. Hoehner 2002:413.
[194] For heaven see 1 Kgs 8.39, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6.30, 33, 39; 30.27; Ps 33.14. For Temple see 1 Kgs 8.13, Ps 76.2. Cf. Hoehner 2002:413.
[195] Barth 2008:274.

proximity to the κατοικητήριον, and conceptually, due to nature of the Temple image.[196] Thus in both passages we have a community constituted by the indwelling Spirit of God and viewed as a theologically defined Temple.[197]

While there are many differences between the two passages, both verbal and conceptual, we have seen these are largely due to the different targets and contexts of the metaphors, the universal church doctrinally defined rather than the local church ethically constituted, and also due to conceptual development. Where correspondence occurs, it is precisely in places where the metaphorical mapping and its correspondences are being constructed. The church is founded on Christ, grows like a field, is a building, a Temple, which is holy and constituted by the indwelling of God's spirit and based on these indicatives, whether seen as exhortative or doctrinal, there is to be no division. If metaphor functions as a heuristic lens, it appears the author of Ephesians is observing a different object through a remarkably similar lens.

3.4.4. Ephesians 2.11-22 and The Dead Sea Scrolls

The other proposed candidate as a source for Eph 2.11-22 is the Temple metaphor we have already examined in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[198] Though a popular view since the work of Gärtner, this position has been strongly restated by Smith.[199] Smith argues that both the Scrolls and Ephesians evidence a unique complex of imagery that must suggest dependence. The most important text in Smith's argument, predictably, is 1QS 8.4ff. The parallels with Ephesians, however, are more significant than those with the Corinthian

---

[196] Hoehner 2002:141, Lincoln 1990:128.
[197] Barth 2008:273.
[198] See section 2.4.1.
[199] Gärtner 1965, Smith 1989 For criticisms see Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:159-177.

passage. There is the juxtaposition of plantation, with building and dwelling; the mention of a foundation and a cornerstone.[200] Nevertheless, these parallels appear more of a mirage than an oasis.

To begin, the lines of contact between Ephesians and the Scrolls, texts written mostly in Hebrew and confined mostly to Palestine, are often assumed but difficult to establish historically. As a result, dependence is based solely on conceptual correspondences, which in this instance can be misleading. In Smith's citation of the Qumran passage, he tellingly excises all mention of the atoning responsibilities of the community as a Temple (1 QS 8.4, 10). As we have seen, among the Scrolls, the Temple identity of the community is predicated primarily on the need to fulfil these legal obligations, a cultic idea not found in the Corinthian and Ephesian metaphors. Furthermore, if 1QS and CD are harmonized, this need comes about because the Temple has been defiled by the wicked and is connected with prohibitions of gentile offerings in CD 12.9. Thus, while the Scrolls and Ephesians both exhibit communal Temple metaphors, their functions are at odds. At Qumran, the metaphor of the Temple is explicitly sectarian and is used to denote the exclusivity of Temple purity, even from the elect of those who were once included, the Jerusalem priesthood, whereas in Ephesians we see it being used to denote the inclusion of those who were once excluded, the gentiles.[201]

Smith is correct that Eph 2.11-22 and 1QS 8.4ff evidence a similar complex of ideas surrounding the Temple, which may point to the prevalence of this metaphor in this context. This complex may have influenced the creation of this metaphor in Paul and

---

[200] Smith 1989:213-16.
[201] Schüssler Fiorenza 1976:173.

continued to influence its later development, particularly in the addition of the cornerstone. When we place Eph 2.11-22 alongside 1 Cor 3.5-17 and 1QS 8.4ff, its correspondence with the Pauline passage is significantly more persuasive. We observe some similarities in the structure of the metaphorical sources in Paul and Qumran, but entailments are at odds. The strong possibility of access to 1 Corinthians, plus the verbal and conceptual correspondences, which are closer and present in both the source and the entailments, strongly suggest that if there is direct dependence in Eph 2.11-22 it is on Paul not Qumran.

3.4.5. The Development of Paul's Temple Metaphor

Having addressed the many similarities between 1 Cor 3.16-17 and Eph 2.11-22, both in form and function, we now turn to the notable differences, to which our discussion of CMT serves as a useful resource. We have observed that metaphors not only structure concepts but subsequently license further exploration and facilitate further extension.[202] In CMT, metaphors create a fixed set of correspondences between the source and the target domain that provide conceptual structure to the target. Once these correspondences have been established, the metaphorical model may be extended to identify more commonplaces, which in turn may better articulate the entailments of the mapping. In Stiver's example, *seeing* the brain *as* a computer facilitates *seeing* further aspects of the brain *as* hardware, software, and programming and these extensions may contribute to a

---

[202] Cf. Soskice 1985:51, Stiver 1996:119-20.

better understanding of the brain itself.[203] Metaphorical mapping both facilitates and stimulates this development.

Though we have observed much correspondence, both verbal and conceptual, between the Temple metaphors in 1 Cor. 3.16-17 and Eph. 2.11-22, we have also seen some significant differences. We have noted the addition of τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ in v.14, προσαγωγή in v. 18, and ἀκρογωνιαῖος in v. 20. We have also noted the change of addressee, the church universal, which leads to a change of the discussion, the doctrinal definition of the church rather than ethical admonition. Gese views these as developments in light of the author of Ephesians' interest in addressing a new generation and more developed eschatological and ecclesiological views.[204] Within this context, however, our discussion of metaphor can help further account for and interpret this development.

The initial correspondence which Paul creates between church and Temple in 1 Cor 3.16-17 appears to be the indwelling presence of the Spirit.[205] In applying this metaphor to a different context, we can see how this source facilitates the creation of further commonplaces. When the author of Ephesians applies the source domain of the Temple to the church universal it no longer addresses simply the ethical issue of factions, but the doctrinal issue of the identity of the people of God as a co-polity of Jew and gentile. Further aspects of this unity are identified with further aspects of the Temple. Thus we may say there is new "hardware" in τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ (2.14), denoting the breaking down of ethnic barriers, new "software" in the mutual προσαγωγή

---

[203] Stiver 1996:131.
[204] Gese 1997:205.
[205] Gese 1997:197, "Gottes Einwohnung ist das entscheidende Motiv für das Verständnis der Gemeinde als Tempel."

to God now available (2.18), and new "programming" in the explicit reconciliation (ἀποκαταλλάσσω, 2.16) of Jews and gentiles. The metaphor of the Temple provides a way of understanding the community that facilitates this conceptual development, which in turn highlights and articulates the entailments. Paul himself seems to license the possibility of such development. As a wise architect he laid a foundation with the intention that others build upon it (1 Cor. 3.10), a task the author of Ephesians appears to have taken up. Thus we agree with Gese that the author of Ephesians has both received and developed "the Temple metaphor encounted in Paul."[206]

3.4.6. Ephesians 2.11-22 as Effective-History

In answer to our four questions: (i) it appears likely that the author of Ephesians had access to material in 1 Corinthians; (ii) verbal and conceptual correspondences are both present and significant; (iii) due to issues of access and correspondence, the material of 1 Cor. 3.5-17 is more likely source of Eph. 2.11-22 than the strongest alternative, 1QS 8.4ff; and (iv) when viewed as a metaphor, the differences between the two texts can be explained and understood in terms of the author's need to address a new context and of metaphorical development. Thus, we conclude that it is probable that Eph 2.11-22 is a distinct actualization of Paul's Temple metaphor as formulated in 1 Cor 3.16-17 and can be understood as part of its effective-history.

To recall, we are attempting to catalogue and consciously bring to light the web of historical effects that stand between the text and us as interpreters in order to construct an appropriate horizon for our own inquiry. For Gadamer, a text is understood when it is

---

[206] Gese 1997:205, "die bei Paulus anzutreffende Tempelmetaphorik."

applied, or even performed, in an interpreter's situation.[207] We have argued this is uniquely the case with metaphor. To return to the characterization of metaphor as a heuristic lens then, we can imagine how viewing different objects through the same lens might help to clarify the prescription of that lens, precisely how it affects our seeing. In the same way, viewing different actualizations of a metaphor can bring into focus the differences between its initial instantiation and later renditions. Eph 2.11-22 as an actualization of 1 Cor 3.5-17, written within the Pauline tradition, in close temporal and cultural proximity, provides a useful model of this process.

As we have noted, commentaries on 1 Cor 3.16-17 often cite as significant or controversial Paul's use of the Temple metaphor whilst the Temple still stands in Jerusalem.[208] However, in the previous chapter we noted this was not the case, that Jews in the period were able to think critically and abstractly about the Temple without insinuating its supersession. It is worth noting that Ephesians' use of this Pauline metaphor, perhaps the earliest documented and likely occurring after the destruction of the Temple, contains no explicit invective against the Jewish people or their Temple. Once more the Temple remains as the source in these metaphors, not the target, and thus the Temple is not primarily under discussion but rather frames the discussion. The destruction of the middle wall, if taken to be the Temple balustrade, could be taken as anti-Temple. However, as Muddiman says, τὸ μεσότοιχον is the wall that "could be removed entirely without causing the collapse of the building."[209] In Eph 2.11-22, it is precisely the addressees' exclusion from Israel's commonwealth and covenant that is the

---

[207] Gadamer 2004:306-9.
[208] Hays 1997:57, "[i]n order to grasp the full audacity of this claim, we must remember that when Paul wrote to the Corinthians the Temple in Jerusalem was still standing and active."
[209] Muddiman 2001:127.

chief problem of this passage. The Temple metaphor is used to addresses this problem and does not suggest the exclusion of Israel but the incorporation into it of those formerly excluded from it. It models how those who were formerly ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι (2.11) have become συμπολῖται (2.19). Most significantly, however, those who are now included are not simply rival sectarians or liminal Jews but *gentiles* (τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί, 2.11). These gentiles, who were forbidden from entering the inner courts of the Temple, now constitute the inner sanctuary of that Temple, the dwelling place of God.

This is equally the case when Paul writes to the Corinthians, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ το πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; (1 Cor. 3.16). However, since 1 Corinthians is addressed exclusively to gentiles and discusses internal dissension, this point is obscured. It is when this metaphor is actualized in the context of Jew/gentile relations that this significant implication comes to light. Ephesians, both through applying the metaphor to this context and extending it to include the destruction of the wall and mutual access, highlights what is perhaps the most important implication of Paul's initial metaphor: that gentiles can now constitute the Temple of God.

This is not to argue for the exact identity in form or function of 1 Cor. 3.5-17 and Eph. 2.11-2, nor that the latter is the hermeneutical key for the former. Indeed, the Ephesians metaphor highlights moves that Paul does not make in 1 Corinthians. The inclusion of Isa 28.16, which would become a common aspect in future Temple metaphors, suggests a sense of eschatological fulfilment. Similarly, the application of the Temple source to a target beyond the local church in Corinth universalizes the entailments of the metaphor. Both of these, while not inherently supersessionist, further facilitate the possibility of such a reading. Thus, by viewing Eph 2.11-12 as an

application of 1 Cor 3.16-17, we may observe how Paul's Temple metaphor was first received and used. This early application by those in closer historical proximity, may provide insights that help us frame our own analysis of the text's implications. In this case, we see it as significant for our interpretation of 1 Cor 3.16-17 that the author of Ephesians decided to apply and develop Paul's Temple metaphor in the context of Jew/gentile relations within the church and used to it demonstrate not some parting of the ways, exclusion of Jews, or obsolescence of the Temple, but rather the inclusion of gentiles into the commonwealth and covenant of Israel.

3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter we examined the nature, function, and implications of Paul's Temple metaphors in order to assess his view of the Temple in Jerusalem. To do so, we built on our discussion of Jewish appraisals of the Temple and the bounds of Jewish Temple adherence. We examined statements where Paul seems to speak explicitly to the Temple cult. In these, the Temple is never criticized or explicitly rejected. In fact, cultic worship is depicted as a privilege from God from which Paul is able to derive important theological principles. We also began to observe how Paul is able to map metaphorically these principles onto various targets including Christian worship and his own ministry.

This exposure to Paul's conceptualization of cultic concepts, as well as a technical understanding of the analytical categories of CMT further aid our understanding of the construction and logic of Paul's Temple metaphors. We observe how Paul uses metaphor to give conceptual structure to targets domains that may lack it. This is particularly evident in 3.5-17, where Paul delineates his metaphor for us. The community in Corinth,

the primary target of these metaphors, is a historically unprecedented and thus also conceptually undelineated phenomenon. By conceptualizing it metaphorically, Paul provides himself with resources with which to reason and make arguments regarding the community's nature and function. This understanding of domains also helps remind us that all metaphorical mappings are asymmetric; the correspondences only go in one direction. To map A onto B is not the same as mapping B onto A, or to use Black's example, to say "Man is a Wolf" will create a different set of correspondences than to say "Wolf is a Man". This kind of analysis allows us to see that cultic concepts are found exclusively in the source domain of Paul metaphors, not the target. The Temple is not what is being directly discussed or conceptualized. Thus we should not be too quick to jump to symmetric configurations of these metaphors, i.e. THE COMMUNITY IS THE TEMPLE thus THE TEMPLE IS THE COMMUNITY. Although we should also heed Black when he states once the metaphor is constructed, and you see Man is a Wolf, you do not look at men or wolves the same way.[210]

The result of our attempt to answer the question of Pauline cultic supersessionism, however, remains somewhat ambiguous. While it is possible Paul saw no need for the Temple in Jerusalem, unless one places Paul's language within a narrative in which literal cultic practice gives way to spiritual and moral practice, the claim does not appear demonstrable. However, if in asking this question of Paul's metaphors we foreground a general Jewish adherence to the Temple, Paul's language appears less controversial. To begin with, these metaphors do not appear within the context of a criticism or rejection of the cult. Though explicit reference to the Temple is rare, nowhere is the cult spoken of

---

[210] Black 1962:41. On Black see section 1.3.1.

negatively, thus there is no reason to interpret these metaphors in this way. The only cultic practices condemned are those offered by pagans precisely because "they sacrifice to demons and not God" (1 Cor 10:20a). Nothing Paul states would imply that sacrifices *to God* are inappropriate. Furthermore, nowhere is the Temple explicitly replaced. Due to the lack of any criticism, we have little reason to think that such a move was necessary. Paul's theology is never explicitly set up in opposition, contrast, or in place of the Temple. Finally, Paul's metaphors are within the hermeneutical limits and compatible with those of his Jewish contemporaries who maintain the continuing relevance and adherence to the Temple. These interpretations are not intended to diminish the cult, but rather preserve and maintain its sanctity and significance. Though they may appear to create tension, it is a tension Jews of the period appear much more comfortable with than modern scholars.

This understanding of CMT also helped us navigate the various models employed in contemporary scholarship to resolve the tension created by these Temple metaphors. We observed how there is no consensus concerning how any one Temple metaphor should be construed or the implications that result. Again, this could be especially seen in our analysis of 1 Cor 3.16-17 where there was a proliferation of conceptual models drawn from various posited backgrounds. We could also see that these models were contingent upon the background canvas against which the language is placed. Thus by attempting to reconstruct the source domain in a particular way, scholars hope that the metaphorical construal will become self-evident. However, the precise background cannot be verified, nor if it could, could these metaphors construe themselves. Indeed, all of these models are themselves construals of the metaphors. The meaning and implications of these

metaphors cannot simply be identified through the historical reconstruction of their source domains. The understanding and resolution of such implications and tensions requires a hermeneutical act of construal and emerges not on the page but in the mind of the interpreter. As a result, we argue that a full historical understanding of a metaphor will take into account how it *has been* used and understood historically, particularly by those in closer temporal and cultural proximity than ourselves.

Therefore, we concluded the chapter by turning to the earliest interpretation and use of Paul's Temple metaphor, Eph 2.11-22. Examining this passage as part of the effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors, both in where it is applied and how it is extended, provides insight into how it was initially understood and can help guide our own interpretations. Though likely composed after 70 CE, in Eph 2.11-22 we observe that Paul's Temple metaphor was not initially used in a polemical context. In fact, the passage restates and highlights the central entailment of Paul's metaphor, unity. It does this by extending the correspondences and broadening the target of the mapping. However, this results in a more universalized and eschatological articulation of the metaphor, which does not explicitly suggest supersession, but lends itself to such an interpretation. Reading Eph 2.11-22 in this way demonstrates the need for not only a reconstruction of the historical setting of metaphor's source domain but an awareness of how it has been construed. Such an approach shapes our hermeneutical horizons by indicating the right questions to ask of a text, thus helping us to highlight the central correspondences and entailments of the metaphor. Following this model, we now turn to texts outside the Pauline corpus which may give further insight into Paul's Temple metaphors and our interpretations of them.

CHAPTER FOUR:
EARLY EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS (1):
1 PETER 2.4-10

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as the first of three case studies investigating the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. To recall from the introduction,[1] these texts have been selected based on the temporal proximity and likelihood of their connection to Paul and their impact on the history of interpretation and thus the modern hermeneuntical horizon with which we approach Paul's metaphors. The aim of these studies is to observe how Paul's Temple metaphors are interpreted and actualized by those most historically and culturally proximate. By doing so we can discern which metaphorical correspondences and entailments are maintained, highlighted, and developed in these subsequent uses, as well as ways in which these mappings are distinct from the apostle's. This then allows us to reflect upon what interpretations we may have unconsciously inherited and to readjust the questions which we bring to Paul's texts.

The first Temple metaphor to be examined outside the Pauline corpus is found in 1 Pet 2.4-10. Our primary investigation is into the nature and origins of this metaphor, articulated succinctly in 1 Pet. 2.5, and how it relates to the structure of Paul's Temple metaphors and affects our understanding of them. However, due to the absence of the term ναός or even ἱερόν in 1 Pet 2.5, the classification of the metaphor in this verse as a Temple metaphor has been questioned and it is with this issue that we begin.

---

[1] See section 1.5.

This approach also raises a number of critical issues regarding the identification of Pauline influence in 1 Peter. Our aim is not to contribute a new approach or set of criteria to this debate, but to engage with the prevailing understanding on this subject and provide a critique of some of the more restrictive aspects of the current procedures, both their criteria for identification and the implications of such influence. We shall argue for the possibility of Pauline influence here, be that direct or indirect, without definitively claiming it, and the implications of both conclusions will be discussed. Thus in 1 Pet 2.5 we either have the first use of Paul's Temple metaphor outside of the Pauline corpus or its most historically and conceptually proximate parallel, both of which are instructive for our interpretation of Paul.

The procedure here will be similar to that followed in the investigation of Eph 2.11-22. The discussion will be guided by an analysis of the nature of the parallels between 1 Pet 2.4-10 and Pauline material, particularly with Romans and Ephesians. The scriptural citations of 2.6-10 will be examined first, before addressing structural and conceptual parallels between these metaphors under five headings: Christ the Cornerstone, Building and Growing, The Spiritual House, Holy Priesthood, and Race, Nation, People. In doing so, we will observe a metaphorical mapping whose verbal components, conceptual correspondences, and hermeneutical entailments bear striking similarities to Pauline metaphorical structures. Subsequently, we shall ask whether Pauline influence is a possible explanation for these similarities, whether Pauline influence is the mostly likely explanation with respect to other possible sources, and whether the differences between the metaphors can be explained while maintaining Pauline influence.

4.2. Is there a Temple Metaphor in 1 Peter 2.5?

The metaphors in which this study is interested are those in which a community of people (the target domain) is understood in terms of, or conceptualized as, a Temple (the source domain). Or, to put it another way, where the conceptual domain of the Temple is mapped onto the conceptual domain of the community, thus THE COMMUNITY IS A TEMPLE. The aim of such mappings is to use the conceptual framework of a highly delineated domain to structure and explain an understanding of a less delineated one. So we ask whether in 1 Pet. 2.5 the conceptual framework of the Temple is being employed to provide a structured understanding of the community.

1 Pet 2.5 follows a metaphor in v. 2 in which the members of the community are understood as new born infants (ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη) yearning for spiritual, pure milk (τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα) in order to grow into their salvation (ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν). In 1 Pet. 2.4, the Petrine author changes the metaphor from that of growth and food to that of stones and in v.5 states:

> καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The identification of a Temple metaphor in this verse depends on whether οἶκος πνευματικὸς, the source domain of v.5, refers to the Temple. Historically, this has often been assumed. However, in 1966, prominent 1 Peter scholar John H. Elliott presented an argument against this interpretation, which he followed up in later books and commentaries.[2] He argues the term is best understood as the "spiritual house(hold)", as in

---

[2] Elliott 1966, 1990a, 2000.

a collection of people or family which excludes the possibility of a reference to the Temple. He presents four arguments against the Temple interpretation.

First, as he states in *The Elect and Holy*, "[n]either οἶκος nor οἶκος πνευματικός is a technical designation in the NT for 'temple'."[3] Elliott specifically means that never, outside the context of an OT citation or allusion, does οἶκος refer to Temple in the NT. Mk 11.17/Mt 21.13/Lk 19.46/Jn 2.1 and Acts 7.49 all occur within citations, Mk 2.26/ Lk 11.51; Acts 7:47 within allusions, and Jn 2.17 within the context of an OT statement. Elliott continues, "[i]f our author had intended to portray the believers as constituting a new "temple" of God, *naos*, the frequent term for temple would have been more appropriate."[4] He continues with the assumption that the Petrine author cannot be using a Temple metaphor since there is no evidence of a polemic with the Jerusalem Temple in the epistle.[5]

Second, and subsequently, when the term οἶκος is used in the NT, it is to refer to household[6] or metaphorically to family.[7] Since this is more common, the term οἶκος is more naturally understandable as a household than a Temple.

Elliott's third argument stems from his interpretation of βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα in v.9. For Elliott, the concepts and terms of v.5 are drawn from Exod 19.5-6 and anticipate that text's allusion in v.9. Within this structure, οἶκος is paralleled with βασίλειον, here

---

[3] Elliott 1966:157.
[4] Elliott 2000:415.
[5] Elliott 2000:415, "[t]he Petrine author speaks of an *oikos*, not a *naos*, and manifests no interest in polemicizing against the Jerusalem Temple and its cult or in claiming its replacement by a new 'Temple' served by the Christian equivalent of the 'sons of Aaron.'" Here Elliott clearly has the parallel of 1QS 8 in mind.
[6] See Acts 10.2, 11.14; 16.15, 31, 18.18, 1 Cor 1.16; 1 Tim 3.4, 5, 12; 5.4; 2 Tim 1.16, 4:19; Titus 1.11; Heb 11.7.
[7] See 1 Tim 3.15, Heb 3.1-6, 10.21.

taken as a substantive meaning "royal residence". Since βασίλειον never refers to a Temple, its antecedent οἶκος, therefore, cannot do so either.[8]

Finally, Elliott considers a number of contextual factors. The οἶκος in v.5, he argues, represents a shift in metaphors and thus introduces new material. As a result "[t]his stone tradition cannot be used…for determining the meaning of *oikos* as "temple."[9] The term οἶκος was chosen for its polyvalency, to denote the shift from building (v.4) to people (v.5). If οἶκος is understood as a Temple this would create conceptual tension since "[a] priestly community might be thought of as serving within a Temple, but then it cannot also simultaneously constitute the temple itself."[10] Furthermore, the Petrine author uses a similar term in 4.17, τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ, which is according to Elliott a reformulation of 2.5, and since οἶκος does not refer to a Temple there it cannot here. He concludes:

> "*Oikos pneumatikos* (*oikos tou theou)* constitutes the root metaphor for Christian community in 1 Peter, the fundamental concept that identifies the collective identity of the Christians, their relation to God and to one another, and the basis of their behavior as a family or brotherhood."[11]

Elliott's contributions to the study of 1 Peter are unquestionably immense. His overall contention that οἶκος is a root metaphor of 1 Peter and that this passage aims at highlighing the holiness and the election of the Christian community seems to hold. However, the assertion that the phrase οἶκος πνευματικὸς cannot refer to the Temple is unpersuasive.

---

[8]Elliott 1966:50-128, 2000:416.
[9] Elliott 2000:417.
[10] Elliott 2000:417.
[11] Elliott 2000:418.

Regarding Elliott's first two points, it is not entirely clear why an OT context is required for the term οἶκος to have the technical meaning Temple. While Elliot's insight may identify the use of the term as traditional, if these OT passages and contexts were known to the authors and included in their texts, they still signify a reference to the Temple and would be readily understandable to their readers as such. It is particularly unclear how this would apply to 1 Pet 2.5, a verse found within a passage steeped in and structured by OT citations and allusion and, therefore, passing Elliott's contextual requirement. To this Best adds that within the LXX, when reference is made to the building of the Temple "the noun used in association with οἰκοδομεῖν is almost always οἶκος", noting that it occurs ten times more frequently than ναός.[12] He concludes, "[t]o a mind as saturated as Peter's was with the language of the LXX the two words οἶκος and οἰκοδομεῖν together would inevitably imply the temple."[13] As to why οἶκος is used instead of ναός, Elliott provides the answer to his own question. He states that οἶκος is "admirably suited to facilitate the shift in v 5 from the notion of believers-as-stones being built up to their identification as *house(hold) of the Spirit.*"[14] It is the double meaning, or, in Elliott's words, the "polyvalence" of οἶκος that allows the Petrine author to maintain conceptual continuity between his metaphors of the community as a family (1.14-2.3) and as a building (2.4-10). A reference to the Temple does not exclude reference to a household, but is also not limited to it. The referential versatility of οἶκος makes it a term more fitting than ναός for 1 Peter's purposes.[15]

---

[12] Best 1969:280 Best cites 3 Kgdms 5-7; 1 Chr 6, 17, 22; 2 Chr 2-6; 1 Esdr 1, 2, 5, 6; Hagg 1.8 and Zech 6.12, 15. Cf. Achtemeier 1996:156.
[13] Best 1969:280.
[14] Elliott 2000:417.
[15] Martin 1992:165.

Elliott's third argument is an exegetical house of cards. First, the word βασίλειον in v.9 needs to be understood as substantive rather than as an adjective. To this end Elliott appeals to the frequency of the substantive form in the LXX (23 times vs. 4 times), and in particular Philo's interpretation of Exod 19.6 in *Sobr.* 66 where he speaks of βασίλειον καὶ ἱεράτευμα θεοῦ. Elliott's assertion is not without merit, but has not convinced everyone. Achtemeier notes that the other phrases in the verse are all composed of a noun and an adjective.[16] Similarly, all the other terms in the phrase denote groups of people, γένος, ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος, and λαός, as opposed to places. While Philo does understand βασίλειον as a substantive, he has either received the text with or inserted a καί, suggesting the natural reading without a conjunction is adjectival. Secondly, for Elliott βασίλειον must not only be understood substantively, but also it must be seen in precise parallel with and as an explanation of οἶκος πνευματικὸς. He argues that the οἶκος is the basis for the βασίλειον in v.9, which in the history of interpretation of Exod 19.5-6 has never been interpreted as a Temple.[17] While it is clear that some of the language of v.5 has been drawn from Exod 19.5-6 and anticipates v.9, some has also been drawn from the other citations and the structural parallels are asymmetric. In Elliott's construction five concepts are mentioned in v.9, γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον, ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, whereas only three appear in v.5. λίθοι ζῶντες, οἶκος πνευματικὸς, ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον. Though there is conceptual continuity from v.5 through v.9, it seems a difficult task to ask of readers not only to separate out βασίλειον, but to precisely and retroactively connect it with οἶκος. Furthermore, if a reader does do this, it would lead to an architectural interpretation of οἶκος, which Elliott explicitly wants to avoid.

---

[16] Achtemeier 1996:165.
[17] Elliott 2000:415.

Regarding contextual issues, the relationship between οἰκοδομεῖσθε and οἶκος πνευματικός is not immediately clear. Elliott argues that οἶκος πνευματικὸς implies an elliptical phrase disconnected from the preceding verb. The phrase οἶκος πνευματικὸς thus introduces new material and is syntactically unrelated to the stones being built together. This interpretation is highly unlikely. First, most interpreters see οἶκος πνευματικὸς as a predicative nominative, a complement that fleshes out the subject of the verb.[18] Additionally, the idea that cognate terms directly juxtaposed are semantically unrelated seems improbable, even in Elliot's elliptical reading. If the οἶκος is unrelated to the λίθοι of v.5a, then why does the author continue to flesh out the idea of the stone immediately in v.6? In Elliott's reading v.5bc are an island in a sea of architectural metaphors.

Similarly, Elliott cannot explain the cluster of cultic concepts that surround the term οἶκος πνευματικὸς. This spiritual house is εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον. This phrase is somewhat syntactically obscure and as a result it is omitted in some manuscripts.[19] Most commentators, Elliot included, interpret this prepositional phrase as denoting purpose or function.[20] Thus we have a spiritual house *for the purpose* of being a holy priesthood, a house with a cultic function. The impossibility of the community being both a Temple and a body of priests represents an erroneous view about the interaction of metaphorical domains and is easily disproved by precise parallels with 1QS 8, where the community is exactly that.

---

[18] Michaels 1989:100, Achtemeier 1996:155.
[19] Notably Codex P, cf. Elliott 2000:419. Similar constructions are found in 2.7, 8, 9 (cf. 1.3, 4, 5, 7, 22, 2.14,21, 3.7, 9, 4.2, 7).
[20] Achtemeier 1996:156 describes this as telic force.

The function of this spiritual house is further fleshed out by the infinitive ἀνενέγκαι, a technical term in the LXX for offering a sacrifice, which takes as its subject πνευματικὰς θυσίας, the latter being the standard term for sacrifices.[21] Mbuvi notes, "[o]nly here, in the entire, NT, are the three elements of Temple, priesthood and sacrifices mentioned together, making the cultic context and intention unquestionable."[22] To add to this, the stones, like the cornerstone, are *chosen* and *precious* (ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον), and the cornerstone itself is placed ἐν Σιὼν, pointing to a special structure on the Jerusalem mount.[23]

Therefore, the most natural and contextually convincing referrent for the οἶκος πνευματικὸς in 1 Pet 2.5 is a Temple. This is not a static or exclusive referent; indeed the selection of the term οἶκος over ναός strongly suggests this flexibility. However, it is only with extreme effort and eclectic exegesis that one can state that no reference to a Temple is made here. As a result, we can conclude that 1 Pet 2.5 is a Temple metaphor. The community, first understood metaphorically as stones, is conceptualized as being built together into a Temple. Thus it matches our metaphorical structure of the domain of the Temple being mapped onto a group of people or a group of people being conceptualized as a Temple: THE COMMUNITY IS A SPIRITUAL HOUSE, i.e. THE COMMUNITY IS A TEMPLE. Now we are left to ask whether this Temple metaphor is related in any way to Paul.

---

[21] The implications of πνευματικός will be discussed below.
[22] Mbuvi 2007:91, Michaels 1989:100, "the 'spiritual house' of which Peter speaks is immediately said to be 'for holy priesthood,' and it difficult to imagine a house intended for priesthood as being anything other than a temple of some sort.", Achtemeier 1996:158, "[w]hile Elliot is correct that the author of 1 Peter is much more interested in the concept of Christians as a household than as a temple, one can only with great difficulty fail to find references to the temple in these places."
[23] Elliott 2000:424 notes that ἐν Σιὼν "refers specifically to the mount on which the royal palace and the Jerusalem temple were located."

4.3. 1 PETER AND PAUL

An association between 1 Peter and the Pauline corpus has been suggested since the late 19th century[24] and gained almost universal acceptance by the mid-20th century.[25] Selwyn began to challenge this position and suggested that the similarities between 1 Peter and Paul were due to a common Christian tradition.[26] The definitive statement of this position, however, was again made by Elliott in his 1976 article "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research." Elliott argues that "[t]he composition, message and import of the letter receive less than their due as long as 1 Peter is seen mainly or merely as an appendage of the Pauline corpus" and thus "suffers second-class status in the estimation of modern exegetes"[27] He famously calls for "the liberation of 1 Peter from its 'Pauline bondage'" and asserts that "the theory of a Petrine dependence upon Paul must now be rejected in favor of a common Petrine and Pauline use of a broadly varied (liturgical, parenetic and catechetical) tradition."[28]

The most rigorous attempts to demonstrate Petrine literary independence from Paul are the studies of Shimada and Herzer.[29] Shimada, who has Mitton particularly in his crosshairs, presents a set of four criteria for identifying literary dependency and applies it to Ephesians and Romans. Judgments regarding literary dependency are to be made in light of the cumulative effect of these criteria. Elliott concludes these studies have definitively demonstrated that there is no literary dependence of 1 Peter on either of these

---

[24] Dependence on Romans and Ephesians were first suggested in Seufert 1874, 1881.
[25] Cf. Foster 1913, Barnett 1941, Beare 1970, Mitton 1950.
[26] Selwyn 1946:17-24, 365-466, 1948:256.
[27] Elliott 1976:253-54; 243.
[28] Elliott 1976:248, 247.
[29] Shimada 1991, 1993, Herzer 1998.

Pauline epistles.[30] Herzer's study is even more minimalist. Herzer lists Shimada's four criteria for literary dependence and adds three criteria of his own for demonstrating influence:

1. A literary dependence is naturally present when a passage is explicitly or extensively quoted;
2. If the original and the derived passage are, from the standpoint of a contextual analysis, identical or very similar;
3. If the phrases (including word order) and words are identical or have be replaced by paronymes of equal importance;
4. The overall concept of the respective ideas are the same or very close.

1. A context analysis, that is the question of whether similar ideas are found in similar contexts;
2. A concept analysis, that is the question of whether the same or similar terms are deployed with the same meaning, including the question of comaprable word-fields;
3. The question of conscious references to particular traditions.[31]

Herzer's conclusion at every turn is "that direct Pauline influence is unlikely" and that whenever 1 Peter and Paul seem to tread similar ground, the former is indebted to common tradition rather than to the latter.[32] Following Elliott, he further argues for an independent Petrine school or circle for the composition and transmission of the epistle.[33]

While studies such as these have certainly succeeded in demonstrating the uniqueness of 1 Peter, we may question whether they are overreaching, or if such a

---

[30] Elliott 2000:22, "Shimada's extensive and meticulous analysis of the pertinent passages and his clarification of valid criteria for comparative analysis have now definitely show that a direct literary dependence of 1 Peter on Romans cannot be demonstrated... Literary dependency of 1 Peter on Ephesians… also has been cogently refuted by Shimada."

[31] Translated from Herzer 1998:13 citing Shimada 1993: 90f.

[32] Herzer 1998:244, "daß ein direkter paulinscher Einfluß unwahrscheinlich ist." Cf. Herzer 1998:17, 80, 104-5. 33-15, 30, 44, 51, 82, 94

[33] Herzer 1998:261, "[d]er 1 Petr muß als ein eigenständiges Zeugnis innerhalb der frühchristlichen Tradition neben Paulus und seine Schule wahrgenommen werden." Cf. Elliott 1976:248, "1 Peter is the product of a Petrine tradition transmitted by Petrine tradents of a Petrine circle."

binary and reductionistic perspective is required.[34] In a sense, Elliott's ideological call to arms may be to blame for this. While 1 Peter may have rightly been identified as overshadowed by Pauline influence, the metaphor of a master/slave relationship suggests that the influence is a form of domination from which liberation, through claims of total independence, is a moral imperative. There are also issues with the procedure used to establish this thoroughgoing independence. A key emphasis of Herzer's examination is a focus on observing the differences between 1 Peter and Paul. Difference, no matter how minor, *ipso facto* rules out dependency. An example of this is 1 Pet 5.14: ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης. This is closely paralleled in Rom 16.16, 1 Cor 16.20, 2 Cor 13.12, and 1 Thess 5.26. However, the Pauline ἁγίῳ is replaced in 1 Peter with ἀγάπης, which is enough for Herzer to deem that there is no connection.[35] If the focus is solely on differences, the cumulative effect of those differences will always seemingly outweigh similarities.

This type of starting point leads to a set of criteria that is far too restrictive. In particular, Herzer's additions to Shimada's criteria seem to only allow influence if the exact words are used in the same way. Herzer regularly appeals to the "content development" of a particular parallel which needs to be identical in both cases.[36] This disqualifies 1 Peter's use of the distinctly Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Pet 3.16, 5.10, 5.14) and χάρισμα (1Pet 4.10), since they are employed in slightly different ways.[37] These criteria

---

[34] Feldmeier 2008:27-28 n.15, "[e]ven if the independence of 1 Peter from the Pauline tradition with respect to the wealth of terminological references that is stressed by Herzer strikes one as somewhat forced, yet it is still his contribution to have shown by direct comparison with the Pauline tradition the frequently noted theological independence of this letter."
[35] Herzer 1998:77-80.
[36] Cf. Herzer 1998:106, 160, 246, 260, "inhaltliche Entfaltung".
[37] Herzer 1998:164-7.

represent an unnuanced perspective on how influence works.[38] It is worth considering whether or not the deutero-Paulines themselves would yield evidence of Pauline influence in the face of this examination. Equally, one wonders if the proposed common Christian tradition itself was extant, whether or not 1 Peter's dependency on it could be demonstrated with such methods. If there was such a tradition, Paul and the Petrine author are clearly able to adapt creatively it in different ways demonstrating that the signs of influence are fluid, not restricted to verbal and contextual facsimiles. It may be the case that influence is rarely a phenomenon that can simply be determined and secured scientifically through the employment of such static criteria.[39]

There are also issues with the appeal to common Christian tradition. While there is clearly much tradition for which we have no formal evidence, the category becomes universally applicable while remaining non-falsifiable. It is an explanation that is always possible but never demonstrably true. If recourse to common tradition is required, the extent of the shared use of this common tradition as well as the linguistic and conceptual similarites still place 1 Peter in such a close proximity to Paul that the independence of their access requires explanation.[40] Furthermore, there is an increasing concession that this tradition may itself have been influenced by Paul, with the evidence for this being in

---

[38] So Horrell 2013:19, "[m]any recent authors suggest that the evidence is not such as to prove literary dependence, though, as we have seen, their notion of dependence is often defined in too simple and restrictive a way, requiring extensive, precise, and explicit borrowing, and failing to acknowledge the possibility of more subtle and creative forms of intertextual relationships."

[39] Michaels' conclusions seem to suggest the difficulty of determining this. Michaels 1989:xliv, "[i]n each of these instances, the parallel between Romans and 1 Peter is consistent with a direct literary relationship between the two letters, but by no means requires it... Even where 1 Peter appears to be reflecting the thought and language of Paul, it always develops the Pauline ideas, images, or proof texts in such an independent fashion that a direct literary relationship is difficult to establish."

[40] It has been suggested that this proximity is due to the Roman provenance of 1 Peter, where perhaps, Paul's epistle to the Romans was known.

particular the use of ἐν Χριστῷ and the epistolary frame of 1 Pet 1.3-9 paralleled in Eph 1.3-14. For example Goppelt states:

> Therefore, the letter undoubtedly arose in a Church tradition influenced by the terminology and concepts of Paul. But though this tradition has been influenced by Paul, it was not determined by him. It contained Pauline components, but it did not derive from him directly. [41]

While this position can deny direct literary dependency, it necessitates the presence of Pauline influence.[42] As a result the possibilty of Pauline influence becomes extremely difficult to comprehensively deny. So Horrell: "[t]here are too many points of contact, in terms of both specific words or phrases and of elements of theology or paraenesis, to justify the view that 1 Peter is independent of Paul."[43]

A mediating position is possible, where Pauline influence need not condemn 1 Peter to being a Pauline text,[44] and where literary dependency or influence need not be a pejorative constraint that implies the insufficiency and unoriginiality of the Petrine author. The way to achieve this may not be the outright denial of Pauline influence but rather a reconceptualization of its implications. Those attempting to liberate and advocate for 1 Peter's creativity seem to underestimate it at every turn. The assumption that literary influence can only manifest itself in slavish recapitulation rather than creative utilization is the premise for denying Pauline influence on 1 Peter and the criterion used to demonstrate that every difference supports this denial. It is clear and has been well demonstrated that 1 Peter utilizes non-Pauline traditions and theologizes in non-Pauline

---

[41] Goppelt 1993:30. Elliott 2000:38 who quotes Goppelt, in part, has to concede this point, "[w]ith the possible exception of the 'in Christ' formula, few, if any of these basic christian themes were developed exclusively by Paul."
[42] Horrell 2013:13, "The author of 1 Peter may possibly not have been conscious that the tradition of Christian epistolography which he followed was decisively shaped by Paul, but that would not negate the de facto Pauline influence on the letter form."
[43] Horrell 2013:20.
[44] Wehr 1996:200, 214, Horrell 2013:19-20.

ways.[45] As such, the brilliance of the author of 1 Peter's creativity may lie in his ability to employ, adapt, and combine the traditions presented to him in the service of his own unique theological message, even if a portion of those traditions have been presented to him by Pauline texts.

4.4. 1 PETER 2.4-10 AND PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS

So then, to what extent does the Temple metaphor of 1 Pet 2.5 show signs of Pauline influence? The metaphor falls within a section that shows a high concentration of possible Pauline parallels.[46] These parallels are entirely drawn from Romans and Ephesians, the two strongest candidates for literary influence on 1 Peter.[47] Thus Roman and Ephesian influence here would be in continuity with Pauline influence elsewhere in the epistle. First we shall examine the scriptural citations of 1 Pet. 2.6-10, which are uniquely paralleled in Romans. Next, we shall examine the Temple metaphor, not simply noting verbal parallels but also the construction of the metaphor itself: the structure of its source domain, the correspondences that are fixed, and the entailments that are drawn from them. In doing so we shall weigh the similarities and differences and ask whether Paul is a possible source, the most likely source, and whether the differences here are acceptable within the parameters of literary and conceptual influence.

---

[45] Horrell 2013:20-26.
[46] Elliott 2000:22 notes possible parallels with seven Pauline texts: 1 Pet 2.4-6//Eph 2.19-22; 1 Pet 2.5//Rom 12.1; 15.16, 31; 1 Pet 2.6//Rom 9.32-33; 1 Pet 2.10//Rom 9.25.
[47] For a list of all the parallels with Romans and Ephesians cf. Goppelt 1993:28, Achtemeier 1996:16-17, Elliott 2000:22.

4.4.1. 1 Peter 2.6-10: The Use of the Scripture

The latter half of this passage is addressed first, as it is generally agreed upon that metaphors of vv.4-5, though preceding the catena of quotations, are linguistically and conceptually drawn from and anticipate these citations.[48] The citations themselves also provide one of the more interesting set of parallels with Paul. In this section there are explicit references to Isa 28.16, Ps 117[118].22, and Isa 8.14 with allusions to Exod 19.5-6, Isa 43.20-21 and Hos 2.25. Sargent, in his examination of 1 Peter's use of the OT concludes, "1 Peter 2.6-10 represents the most sophisticated and complex treatment of Scripture within 1 Peter."[49] The first half of this collection of text is built around the word λίθος. A similar catena of texts is found in Rom 9.32-33:

LXX	ROMANS	1 PETER
Isa. 28.16 διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιων λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ.	9.32 διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἐξ ἔργων· προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος, 33 καθὼς γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.	2.6 διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ· ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. 7 ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀπιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας 8 καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἳ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.
Isa. 8.14 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα, καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι· ὁ δὲ οἶκος Ιακωβ ἐν παγίδι, καὶ ἐν κοιλάσματι ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Ιερουσαλημ.		

[48] Michaels 1989:99, "[a]n interpretive framework is thus created for the quotations before they are explicitly introduced." Cf. Elliott 2000:407-408.
[49] Sargent 2015:66.

Rom 9.32-33 and 1 Pet 2.6-8 are the only two places in the NT where Isa 28.16 and Isa 8.14 are explicitly cited and in both texts they are cited in concert. However, it is not only the combination of these texts that is striking, but also the differences they have in common against known versions of the Greek Bible. Both Romans and 1 Peter omit the ἐγὼ, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια, and πολυτελῆ from Isa 28.16. Both NT texts add ἐν before Σιὼν and most notably, both texts have τίθημι for the LXX's ἐμβαλῶ. Differences are found between them as well. Romans has no reference to the ἀκρογωνιαῖον being ἐκλεκτόν or ἔντιμον, and, while 1 Peter retains these adjectives, the word order is different: ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον. Romans has the verb καταισχύνω in the future active indicative, while 1 Peter has it in the aorist passive subjunctive.

The other Pauline text that has an allusion to Isa 28.16, which we have already examined, is Eph 2.20: ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[50] The allusion here is observed in the terms ἀκρογωνιαῖον and θεμέλιον, the latter of which is missing from Romans and 1 Peter but found, without explicit reference to Isa 28.16, in 1 Cor 3.10,12 and Rom 15.20. Both 1 Peter and Ephesians connect this citation with a Temple metaphor, as does 1QS 8.5ff and *Barnabas* 6.[51] What all three NT texts share is a Christological interpretation of the ἀκρογωνιαῖον, whereas in 1QS 8 it is the community itself that is the פנת יקר.[52] Both 1 Peter and Ephesians combine Christology with ecclesiology, founding and substantiating the latter upon the former.

---

[50] On Ephesians' use of this text, see section 3.4.3.1.
[51] On *Barnabas'* use of this text, see section 6.5.2.
[52] Elliott 2000:425 n.54, "[t]he differences rule out the possibility of literary dependency, while the similarities indicate common but divergent use of a messianically interpreted OT text."

Rom 9.32-33 and 1 Pet 2.8 also share similar variants in their citation of Isa 8.14. Both texts have the qualifying genitive σκανδάλου where the LXX has the dative πτώματι.[53] Most interestingly, neither text retains the negatives οὐχ… οὐδὲ, aligning them more with the Hebrew text than the Greek, making the sentiment a predicative threat as opposed to an exhortation.[54]

Elliott notes that in the Roman version of the catena, Isa 28.16 and 8.14 are woven together as though they are one passage whereas in 1 Pet 2.7, the author inserts a citation from Ps 117[118].22 between the Isaian texts.[55] The Petrine version of this text is almost identical to the LXX, which is not cited by Paul but known elsewere in the NT (Matt 21.42; Mk 12.10; Lk 20.17; Acts 4.11) and is simiarily interpreted Christologically. The Psalm continues the meditation on the λίθος theme and has conceptual continuity with Isa 28.16 in the connection between the ἀκρογωνιαῖον and the κεφαλὴ γωνίας.

Additionally, 1 Pet 2.9 has two allusions to Isa 43.20-21 and Exod 19.5-6, texts which are nowhere utilized by Paul. These texts have important implications for the Temple metaphor and will be discussed below. In v.10, the author seems to allude to the pun on the names of Hosea's children from Hos 2.25 (cf. 1.6,8): οὐ λαὸς and οὐκ ἠλεημένοι. In 1 Peter the names are simply paraphrased and in the reverse order. Rom 9.25-26 also alludes to the names in this passage. Paul, however, quotes the second name of Israel from Hos 2.1, υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος, and changes the first name from οὐκ-ἠλεημένην to οὐκ ἠγαπημένην. Once more, these are the only two places in the NT where this

---

[53] Snodgrass 1977:98.
[54] Sargent 2015:77.
[55] Elliott 2000:431.

passage in Hosea is referenced, both authors employing it to demonstrate a change in status and a temporal contrast.

The collection of scriptural citations, once the bedrock of theories of literary dependency,[56] however, has become a prime example of 1 Peter and Paul's independent sharing of a common source. Selwyn argues that the catena was a pre-exiting Christian hymn.[57] Dodd argued for the impossibility of 1 Peter disentangling the conflated passages in Romans and supplementing them with sections of Isaiah omitted by Paul and with the psalm.[58] More convincingly, Snodgrass proposes that there was a pre-existing, pre-Christian relationship between these two texts.[59] This proposal has been supported by Moyise and tacitly by Sargent.[60] Jobes argues for a different *Vorlage* lying behind the text.[61] For Elliott, "[t]he Petrine use of Ps 117[118] here differentiates 1 Peter from Paul, who makes no reference to this psalm in his citations of Isa 28.16 and Isa 8.14… so that the Petrine formulation cannot be judged to be literarily dependent on Paul."[62] The difference between Paul and 1 Peter, in particular the additions to Isa 28.16 and the insertion of Ps 117[118].22 is seen to outweigh the similarities and the existence of external parallels in 1QS 8 seems to indicate a pre-existing tradition or at the very least problematize the idea of dependency.

Direct literary dependence in the sense that 1 Peter statically reproduces Romans is very difficult to defend. As Dodd noted, the Petrine author would have to include

---

[56] Beare 1970:40.
[57] Selwyn 1946:274-277.
[58] Dodd 1952:43.
[59] Snodgrass 1977:99, "[t]he connection of the two verses in Christian literature then is not an innovation based on theological necessity, but follows Jewish tradition."
[60] Moyise 2005:180, Sargent 2015:73-74.
[61] Jobes 2006:331.
[62] Elliott 2000:431.

omitted sections of Isa 28.17, separate the Isaian passages and insert the Psalm. The Hosean passage would then have to be placed after the Isaiah citations, and the names changed back to the standard LXX form. While none of this is impossible, it might be asking too much of our Petrine author. However, if Paul and 1 Peter are both drawing from the same tradition, the differences in their reproduction of that tradition's catena still need to be explained.

If Romans and 1 Peter are working with the same tradition, at some point deviations must have occurred. This either happened prior to the author's independent reception of the tradition, assuming they reproduced their traditions near verbatim, or it occurred at the hand of the authors themselves, Paul omitting Ps 117[118].22 and phrases from Isa 28.16, or the Petrine author adding them. The addition of the Psalm to the stone catena is easier to explain than its removal. Ps 117[118].22 already had some connection to the Jesus tradition and shares the Christological interpretation of the stone. Its placement between Isa 28.16 and 8.14 also makes conceptual and rhetorical sense as it juxtaposes thematically related characterizations of Christ as the λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον and the λίθος… ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. Likewise, the adjectives ἐκλεκτόν or ἔντιμον are particularly important in the Petrine passage, linking the Isaian passage with Exod 19.5-6 and articulating the central indicative of the passage. Thus, whether or not they are related, the tradition the Petrine author is employing appears a more developed and fully supplemented tradition than that represented by Paul.

If Snodgrass is correct that Isa 28.16 and Isa 8.14 have a pre-Christian association, and if we are correct that Ps 117[118].22 naturally connects with this tradition, what becomes harder to explain is the presence of Hos 2 in both the Petrine and

Pauline passages. The Hosean allusions have no verbal connections to the Isaian, in particular lacking any reference to a stone. They do discuss acceptance and rejection but, in this case, on the part of God rather than the world or its authorities. The verbal variants do make it unlikely that this is a direct transcription from the Roman passage, however these differences do not immediately disqualify influence as Elliott suggests.[63] Since the Isaian and Hosean passages in Romans are themselves not connected, the difference in order in the Petrine and Pauline texts similarly does not negate some connection between them.

The parallel citations in Romans 9 and 1 Peter 2 are certainly not the smoking gun for Pauline influence that they once were. Indeed if there is influence evident here, it appears to be indirect and structural. Snodgrass, who is opposed to Pauline influence, argues that all that is required to explain the citations of 1 Peter 2.6-10 is: (1) direct knowledge of the Biblical text, and (2) the adaptation of traditional material for the author's own purpose.[64] However, once we concede the possibility of the Petrine author adapting his tradition, both under the guidance of a direct knowledge of scripture and through his ability to synthesize various traditions together, it remains possible that Romans, a text that may have been known to 1 Peter and the only extant parallel of these citations' use in the NT, could form part of the tradition that was adapted and supplemented. The independent attestation of all of these elements in concert in both Romans and 1 Peter appears as more remarkable historically than the Petrine author's ability to edit texts from Isaiah and insert a thematically related Psalm. Romans certainly may not have been the primary or only source for these scriptural texts but it remains

---

[63] Elliott 2000:442.
[64] Snodgrass 1977:103.

possible it was the source for the use of these texts in combination. At the very least, these shared citations introduce us to a notable Pauline flavour in this passage and suggest if there is not influence present here what is evidenced is the closest proximity that a theory of independence can allow.

4.4.2. 1 Peter 2.4-5: The Structure of the Temple Metaphor

Although much of the language is drawn from the catena that follows, 1 Peter's Temple metaphor is given its structure and articulation in 2.4-5:

> πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Above we discussed the phrase οἶκος πνευματικός in terms of its reference. Here we are attempting to identify the metaphorical structure, its source and target domains, as well as the correspondences and entailments it creates under five headings, which will then be examined in light of Paul's own Temple metaphors.

4.4.2.1. Christ the Cornerstone

This section begins not with a communal, ecclesiological metaphor but with an individual, Christological one. The κύριος of v.3, the antecedent of the relative pronoun ὃν in v.4, is conceptualized as a λίθον ζῶντα. The term λίθος, denotes not a natural rock, but a stone that has been prepared and fashioned for construction.[65] This is the first suggestion of a building metaphor. The architectural metaphor is qualified by a present

---

[65] Michaels 1989:98, Achtemeier 1996:154.

active participle of ζάω, a term characteristic of 1 Peter's vocabulary.[66] Προσερχόμενοι, an active participle, perhaps with imperatival force, may allude to the approaching of God in the LXX as a priest, thus also an intial suggestion of a cultic metaphor.[67] The term λίθος is clearly drawn from and anticipates the stone catena of vv.6-8, particularly Psalm 117[118].22, as the metaphor is used to explicate the dynamics of rejection and election. The verse is structured around the μέν… δέ... construction, explicitly contrasting ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων with παρὰ… θεῷ. The perfect participle ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον suggests that it is not only the historical but also the continued rejection of Christ that is in mind.[68] The ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον is drawn primarily from Isa 28.16 but also connects to Exod 19.5-6, and introduces a central theme of the passage: election. This contrast provides consolation and encouragement to the readers as an association is drawn between this stone and themselves in v.5.

The anticipatory allusions in v. 4 to Ps 117[118].22 and Isa 28.16 bear a more significant corollary. As the Temple metaphor is constructed in v.5, it is clear that the λίθος ζῶν is also the ἀκρογωνιαῖον, the κεφαλὴ γωνίας.[69] Although all these stones are associated with the λίθοι in v.5, the Lord is not simply another brick in the wall. Just as a building's assembly and stability is contingent on the quality of the cornerstone, so the structure of the community is built upon and depends upon Christ.

---

[66] Cf. 1 Pet 1.3, 23, 2.24, 4.5.
[67] Achtemeier 1996:154.
[68] Achtemeier 1996:154.
[69] However, as Michaels notes, it is the quality of the stone, not its position that is emphasized here, Michaels 1989:160 Cf. Elliott 2000:425.

Goppelt notes that in the NT "[t]he only other passage in which the "cornerstone" in Isa 28.16 is connected with the edifice of the community is Eph 2.20."[70] We observed in our discussion of the Ephesian metaphor how this could be seen as an extension and development of Paul's concept of Christ as θεμέλιος in 1 Cor 3.5-17. In 1 Cor 3 Paul lays the foundation (θεμέλιον ἔθηκα) and others build upon it. The contingency and particularism of Paul's aims in this section control the structure of the metaphor. In discussing the church in Corinth specifically, Paul is conceived as the σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων and the θεμέλιος as his proclamation of the gospel.[71] Subsequent apostles and leaders are then seen as building upon Paul's foundation. In Eph 2.20, the apostles and prophets become associated with the θεμέλιος, the builders become the foundation. In a similar move, the community members themselves go from being builders to being the building material. With the addition of the allusion to Isa 28.16, Christ still fulfills the fundamental role as the ἀκρογωνιαῖον.

There are strong parallels in the conceptual structures of 1 Cor 3.5-17, Eph 2.11-22 and 1 Pet 2.4-10, and, in particular, the latter two. A communal edifice, which is revealed as a Temple, is founded on Christ. In 1 Cor 3.10, it is Paul who lays this foundation, in seeming contrast to 1 Pet 2.7's use of Ps 117[118].22, however, it is clear Paul is referring to the particularity of his gospel proclamation in Corinth. In Eph 2.20, the apostles and prophets' work of proclaiming the gospel qualifies them as the foundation. 1 Pet 2.4-10, however, appears to have no interest in foundations, as the term θεμέλιος is conspicuously absent from his citation of Isa. 28.16 and his Temple metaphor. This may be due to the Petrine author knowing Isa 28.16 in a version without θεμέλιος, as

---

[70] Goppelt 1993:119.
[71] A similar metaphor is found in Rom 15.20.

with Rom 9.32-33. Yet this absence may provide the best evidence against 1 Peter's knowledge of the Temple metaphors 1 Cor 3 and Eph 2 where the θεμέλιος is central.

There are two points worth noting. First, in the Pauline metaphors θεμέλιος is used to specify and differentiate the role and responsibilities of the apostles. 1 Peter shows no interest in that task here. Second, and related, 1 Peter's primary task is to create an association with the Lord and the members of the community as λίθοι ζῶντες. To do so, the Petrine author emphasizes the stone tradition over the foundation tradition.[72] The use of the term θεμέλιος in the Pauline metaphors is used to denote a difference of quality. In the Petrine formulation, by having the members of the community as λίθοι ζῶντες but Christ as the λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον and the λίθος… ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, the author is able to maintain the sense of the shared material quality with Christ while affording him the priority of placement. This also differentiates the Petrine metaphor from the 1QS 8, where not only is the foundation tradition present, but there is a direct identity of the community with the precious cornerstone. Thus, the Petrine and Pauline metaphors share the conceptualization of an edifice being built upon Christ, the cornerstone, while all differing slightly but understandably in their imagined blueprints.

4.4.2.2. Building and Growth

In 2.4, the Petrine author moves from a familial metaphor to an architectural one as there is a shift from the individual Christ to the corporate Christian experience.[73] The former metaphor conceptualizes Christians as newborn infants who, through the avoidance of vice and the consumption of pure spiritual milk, are able to grow (αὐξηθῆτε) into their

[72] Cf. Mbuvi 2007:100.
[73] Michaels 1989:157, Selwyn 1946.

salvation. This metaphor is connected with what follows in v.4, where the relative pronoun ὃν has as its antecedent ὁ κύριος in v. 3.[74] The organic sense of the former metaphor is similarly carried forward in the use of the participle ζῶντα. Martin notes, "growth is the common conception that links the metaphor of temple (2:4-10) with the metaphor of body (2:1-3)."[75] The combination of these metaphors creates the sense of something procedural, that building is an ongoing, emergent process.

The building metaphor is first suggested in v.4 by the metaphorical conceptualization of the Lord as a λίθον ζῶντα with which the members of the community are then associated (ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες) in v.5. The community members are likewise stones fashioned for construction. In v.5, these λίθοι are "built together". There is some debate concerning how the verb οἰκοδομεῖσθε is to be parsed, as a present middle imperative or as a present passive indicative. It is taken as a former by Goppelt, who argues that the imperative, "allow yourselves to be built", rounds off the portrayal of the essence of Christian existence and is reinforced by the indicatives in the following verse.[76] Elliott notes that this verb in a middle imperative is without parallel in the LXX or the NT.[77] Furthermore, it is clear from the context of v.4 and v.6 that the agency and initiative for this building process lies with God, for which a passive indicative is better

---

[74] There is some question whether 1 Pet 2.4 continues the allusion to Psalm 33[34].8-9 from 2.3, cf. Michaels 1989, Elliott 2000:409.
[75] Martin 1992:178 Similarly, Michaels 1989:99, "his close juxatposition of the growth metaphor with that of building, and of drinking a mother's milk with that of coming to the living Stone allows the first set of images to illuminate and enrich the second."
[76] Goppelt 1993:40-41.
[77] Elliott 2000:414 Cf. Achtemeier 1996:155.

suited than an imperative.[78] The present tense of the verb supports the procedural nature of the image, as the process is present continuous.

There is in 1QS 8.7-8 a juxtaposition between agricultural (מטעת עולם) and architectural (בית קודש) metaphors. However the entailment of this metaphorical combination is to highlight the groundedness and steadfastness of the community. They are a community established (נכונה) whose foundations "shall neither rock nor sway in their place" (בל יזדעזעו יסודותיהו ובל יחישו ממקומם). There is no suggestion of an ongoing construction process or of organic growth.

The Pauline Temple metaphors come much closer to the Petrine structure.[79] 1 Cor 3 links the ideas of a growing body (vv.1-3) with idea of field (vv.6-7) and the idea of a building/Temple (vv.9-17). And while the metaphors of both the field and the building are primarily conceived in order to delegate and subordinate the roles of Apollos and Paul to that of God, the concept of growth (αὐξάνω, vv.6-7) pervades the passage. While others plant and water, it is God that makes it grow, though others build on the foundation, the erected building is ultimately God's Temple. Even though the building verbs are in active (ἐποικοδομεῖ v.12, ἐποικοδόμησεν v.14) the passages aim to demonstrate the primacy of God's agency. The idea of the growing building is even more deeply integrated into the metaphor of Eph 2.20-22. Here, a structure that is passively built together (συνοικοδομεῖσθε), grows (αὔξει) into a holy Temple in the Lord and a dwelling place of God. While it is physically constructed, it is as a result of an organic

---

[78] Michaels 1989:99.

[79] Michaels 1989:97, "[i]t is more akin to certain formulation in Eph. 2:19-21 and 1 Cor. 3:9-17 as well as certain Gospel texts in which Jesus uses the metaphor of building either to describe what he will do (Matt 16:18) or what his disciples must do (Matt 7:24//Luke 6:47-49)."

process of growth that it becomes a Temple. The organic aspect of these Temple metaphors as buildings under construction makes them distinct and again demonstrates unique structural similarities between the Pauline and Petrine metaphors.

4.4.2.3. A Spiritual House

In the first section of this chapter, we dedicate much space to identifying the referent of οἶκος in 1 Pet 2.5 as a Temple. Here we want to discuss its accompanying adjective πνευματικός and the implications of their combination. We have seen how the term πνευματικός is an important piece of evidence for identifying the οἶκος as a Temple, but we have yet to discuss its own meaning and implications. This term is crucial to our interpretation as it appears twice in the verse qualifying οἶκος and θυσία. 1 Peter can use the cognate term πνευμα to refer to 'the inner dimension of the human being."[80] However, the *BAGD* notes regarding πνευματικός that "in the great majority of cases it refers to the divine *pneuma*: 'caused by or filled with the (divine) Spirit", which is how most commentators interpret it here. So Achtemeier, "[t]he adjective *pneumatikos* ('spiritual') is not so much symbolic or metaphoric as it is intended to indicate its nature: it is the place where the Spirit is found."[81] Mbuvi views a polemic in the use of the term here: "[i]n that case the term 'spiritual' would also suggest the meaning '*true* Temple of God' versus *'false* Temple."[82] Elliott notes that if there is any contrast here, it is certainly

[80] Elliott 2000:418.
[81] Achtemeier 1996:155-156 Cf. Michaels 1989:100, Goppelt 1993, Feldmeier 2008:136.
[82] Mbuvi 2007:94 Cf. Selwyn 1946:291, Gärtner 1965:74.

implicit,[83] as nothing in the context would suggest this. It is not the immateriality of this house that is being emphasized, but rather its creator, possessor, and resident.

However, noted less is that the adjective πνευματικός appears nowhere in the LXX, Josephus, or in the NT outside of 1 Peter and the Pauline corpus. In Paul, the term is used to describe wisdom (1 Cor 2.13, 15, 3.1; Col 1.9), the law (Rom 7.14), blessings (Rom 15.27; 1 Cor 9.11; Gal 6.11; Eph 1.3), gifts (Rom 1.11, 1 Cor 12.1, 14.1, 37), worship (Eph 5.19; Col 3.16), the resurrection body (1 Cor 15.44, 46), and the rock that was Christ (1 Cor 10.3). In all these instances, the concept qualified by πνευματικός has its source in, the quality of, or is directed towards the Spirit. The exception is Eph 6.12 where it is used to denote a spiritual plain of being. This frequency of use suggests a particularly distinct Pauline term. Furthermore, while Paul himself never uses the term in the construction of his Temple metaphors, the term πνευματικός is conceptually analogous to the central correspondence drawn in those metaphors, the indwelling of the Spirit. In 1 Cor 3.16, the community is the Temple of God because τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; in 1 Cor 6.19 the body is the Temple τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός; in Eph 2.19 the community is a dwelling place of for God ἐν πνεύματι. Although Paul never uses this term in these contexts, 1 Peter employs a particularly Pauline term to depict a particularly Pauline concept. We have already observed that the concept of the indwelling spirit is not a facet of the Qumran metaphor and thus the spiritual nature of the house aligns the Petrine Temple metaphor closer with the Pauline.

---

[83] Elliott 2000:418.

4.4.2.4. A Holy Priesthood

In an earlier section, we observed that the spiritual house of 1 Pet 2.5 is εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, with the prepositional phrase denoting the purpose or function of the building. The term ἱεράτευμα appears in the NT only here in v.5 and v.9 and in the LXX only in Exod 19.5-6 and 24.22.[84] Morphologically, it takes the form of other -ευμα nouns, which denote a collective body of people.[85] To emphasize this and move away from any concept of a priesthood of all believers, Elliott opts to translate the term less abstractly as a "body of priests".[86] We have already noted how ἱεράτευμα further suggests the idea of a Temple for οἶκος, as that term denotes a group of people set aside to serve and have access to God in the Temple. This sanctification aspect is emphasized through the use of the term ἅγιον. Elliott seems correct in stating that the Petrine author is employing Exod 19.5-6 to affirm the collective identity of the community as an elect and holy people. However, he continues, "[h]oliness, for 1 Peter, is a concept with social and ethical, rather than cultic implications."[87] This appears mistaken on two accounts. First, we observed that the context here is at least in part cultic and which suggests some cultic implications. Second, we have also observed that it is erroneous to make sharp distinctions between the social, ethical, and cultic and that there is much crossover between these domains.[88] The term ἱεράτευμα is also connected with βασίλειον in v. 9, drawn directly from Exod 19.6. This

---

[84] Elliott 2000:419 notes that the term only appears in the LXX in Exod. 23.22.
[85] Elliott 1966:64-70 cites βούλευμα, πολίτευμα, πρέσβευμα, τεχνίτευμα, στράτευμα a examples of these nouns all of which identify a (1) collectivity of (2) persons (3) exercising a specific function.
[86] Elliott 2000:420.
[87] Elliott 2000:421.
[88] See in particular section 2.2.

term, discussed above, denotes the orientation and possession of this body of priests. Thus the Christian community is a body of priests in service of God their king.

The cultic metaphor is confirmed and extended in the final clause of the verse: ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The infinitive ἀνενέγκαι continues the purposive function of the preceding prepositional clause.[89] The verb ἀναφέρω is a common term in the LXX in the context of sacrifices, confirming that the community is thought of as priests in their cultic context. Likewise, θυσία is the standard term for a sacrifice. Here, however, we find our second instance of the adjective πνευματικός, this time qualifying θυσία. There is no reason to believe that the meaning of πνευματικός has changed since its prior use in v.5. These are sacrifices inspired and characterized by the Holy Spirit. Elliott sees the term here as approximating to the notion of holy; the sacrifices have marks of the Holy Spirit.[90]

Since it is clear these are not material sacrifices, it is again easy to read a polemical intent into this term.[91] When connected with the following phrase, εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ, it appears that only spiritual sacrifices are pleasing to God. There are several problems with this interpretation. We have seen that conceptualizing proper behavior as sacrificial has a long lineage back to the Hebrew bible and can coexist with adherence to the Israelite cultic system.[92] Therefore, πνευματικὰς θυσίας, as it is used here is not only well within the bounds of common Jewish cultic parlance, but likely no different from how priests would understand their own material activity in the Temple.

---

[89] Achtemeier 1996:156.
[90] Elliott 2000:422.
[91] So Mbuvi 2007:91, "[i]t is difficult not to see a hint of polemic with first-century Judaism, especially the Jerualem temple and its priesthood."
[92] See section 2.4.

Where this does differ is that these sacrifices are offered, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is unclear if this phrase conditions the verb ἀνενέγκαι, offered through Jesus Christ, or the adjective εὐπροσδέκτους, acceptable through Jesus Christ. It is likely both:

> it would appear most appropriate to understand that it is the entire act of offering acceptable sacrifices to God that depends on the proper enablement of Christ, probably through his resurrection.[93]

Therefore, it is not simply their spiritual interpretation or non-material nature that makes the sacrifices acceptable, but their orientation towards God and their mediation through Christ. While criticism of material sacrifice is not impossible here, it certainly is not necessitated and if it is present is implicit and indirect.[94] The main point is that sacrifices are offered of the Spirit, through Christ, to God, resembling the triadic formulas of 1.2 and 1.3-12.

Unlike ἱεράτευμα, the phrase πνευματικὰς θυσίας is not drawn from the scriptural catena but is the Petrine author's own addition, though it is in agreement with the conceptualization of the community as priests.[95] Elliott argues that this clause is paralleled in v.9's allusion to Isa 43.20. This is possible as the ὅπως in v.9 may mirror the purposive infinitive in v.5, and thus both delineate the activity of the community as ἱεράτευμα. Other than this though, there are no verbal similarities between the two verses and thus an exact identity in content of the two verses is not necessitated. Clearly though, these spiritual sacrifices are related to thanksgiving and praise rather than atonement.

---

[93] Achtemeier 1996:158.
[94] Elliott 2000:418, "it is not to identify these entities as 'figurative' or 'immaterial' (in contrast to material realities) or as a contrast to Israelite physical cultic sacrifices, but as entities that are controlled and animated by God's sanctifying Spirit."
[95] Elliott 2000:421, "[t]he use of the term 'sacrifices' is consonant with the depiction of the believers as a 'priestly community' and spells out its proper priestly function."

Thus, the metaphor of ἱεράτευμα does not simply describe the community's status, but also its activity directed towards God.

Nowhere does Paul connect the idea of the community as a Temple with priesthood and sacrifice. Paul never uses the term ἱεράτευμα and never employs Exod 19.5-6. Indeed, Paul does not use the term πνευματικός in any of his cultic metaphors. Yet, even this portion of 1 Peter's metaphor again has a distinctly Pauline flavour. The most commonly drawn parallel, one we have already examined, is Rom 12.1:

> Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν·[96]

There are interesting verbal and conceptual parallels here. Paul conceptualizes rightly directed Christian behaviour and service as θυσία. While these sacrifices are not spiritual, they are ζῶσαν and ἁγίαν, two important concepts in the Petrine metaphor, the former denoting the vitality of the seemingly inanimate and the latter demonstrating its sanctification to God. Likewise, these sacrifices are described as "pleasing to God". The term εὐάρεστον, a close synonym of εὐπροσδέκτος, is used in a similar sacrificial metaphor in Phil 4.18, where the gift Paul has received is described as ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτήν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ. In Romans, Paul does later use εὐπροσδέκτος twice. In Rom 15.16, Paul describes his being a "minister… to the gentiles" as "the priestly service of the gospel of God" (ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ). The gentiles themselves are described as an "offering", προσφορά, which he hopes will be εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Paul pictures his ministry as priestly, his activity as a sacrifice, which he hopes is acceptable, the conditions for which are its holy and spiritual character. Paul echoes this sentiment in Rom 15.31, where he hopes, more

---

[96] See section 3.2.1.

desperately, that his ἡ διακονία… ἡ εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, likely referring to the collection and which may stand metonymically for his mission as a whole, will be pleasing (εὐπρόσδεκτος) to the saints in Jerusalem.

Returning to the last clause of Rom 12.1, Paul describes this whole metaphorical conceptualization as τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν, often translated as "your spiritual worship." Paul, however, does not use the term πνευματικός but rather λογικός. Michaels sees the Petrine πνευματικὰς θυσίας as equivalent to the Hellenistic λογική θυσία.[97] Indeed the Petrine author himself appears to use λογικός as a near synonym to πνευματικός in 1 Pet 2.2, the only other NT example of the term.

Though the metaphor of Christian service and activity as priestly may be stock language, it certainly has its closest parallels with Paul, particularly in the paranetic section of Romans 12-15, with which 1 Peter may have been familiar.[98] Paul only uses the metaphor individually of himself and while he likely viewed his own ministry as unique there is no reason to conclude from Paul's usage that the priestly metaphor would be exclusive to it. The entailments of such a metaphor, being set apart for the task for glorifying God, are certainly transferable to larger bodies of people, as is done in 1 Pet 2.5. Again, unlike the 1QS metaphor, both the Petrine and Pauline conceptualizations are unrelated to the task of atoning for the land.

4.4.2.5. Race, Nation, People

Similar to the Pauline Temple metaphors, the primary aim of the passage in which 1 Pet 2.5 is found is not the proper identification of the Temple, but rather the proper definition

[97] Michaels 1989:101.
[98] The verb συσχηματίζω in 1 Pet 1.14 has a close parallel in the very next verse, Rom. 12.2.

of the community. The domain of the Temple is mapped onto the community and functions as a conceptual tool through which the Petrine author can delineate and articulate his central point. On this, we can agree with Elliott that, "pervading and uniting this complex passage is the concept of the *election and holiness* of God's people…, which in turn links this passage to a dominant emphasis in the letter as a whole."[99] In the midst of tribulation, the community is reminded that, like Christ, they are rejected by men but chosen and precious to God. This culminates in v. 9:

> ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς·

The significance of this passage is well summarized by Horrell:

> What is immediately striking is how, compressed into just half a verse, not only are the three key terms, γένος, ἔθνος, and λαός, all used to denote the communities of Christians in Asia Minor but also these ethnic-identity terms are linked with central Jewish identifications: chosen or elect, holy, and God's own or special possession.[100]

There are two points of note. First, we observe the universalizing, anthropological intent of 1 Peter. The passage here defines not simply a community but a people, and not simply a people, but the people of God. The Temple metaphor of v.5 models the unity, holiness and election of that people as well as their function to worship God and to be his dwelling place.

1 Peter does not use only ethnic reasoning to define this people but also employs Jewish covenental categories drawn from Exod 19.5-6, Isa 43.20-21 and culminating in Hos 2.25 in v.10. While at first blush this appears to be clearly supersessionist, the lack of any discussion of the implications for Israel is striking. So Michaels: "[t]he absence in

---

[99] Elliott 2000:408.
[100] Horrell 2013:141 For a full analysis of these terms, their background and reception see Horrell 2013:133-163.

the letter of any discussion of the relationship between Christian and Jewish communities makes it impossible to determine how the author understood that relationship, whether as continuation or fulfillment or reenactment or replacement."[101] The mechanism of this relationship, which engages Paul throughout his letters but particularly in Rom 9-11 (wherein he cites Isa 28.16, 8.14 and Hos 2.25) and which the Temple metaphor of Eph 2.20-22 attempts to elucidate, appears either of no interest to the Petrine author or in his mind has been resolved. What is most notable is the lack of any explicit polemic here. So Horrell:

> Yet in another sense, 1 Peter's discursive strategy is strikingly non-oppositional. Unlike plenty of other early Christian texts…, there is no direct claim here that the Church lays claim to an identity which is at the same time denied to Israel, no assertion that Israel's covenant is now obsolete or that Christians are now able to be and to enjoy all that Israel failed to attain.[102]

The lack of polemic was first suggested at the beginning of the section. 1 Pet. 2.4 serves as a paraphrase and interpretation of Ps 117[118].22 which is later cited in v.7. When this Psalm is cited in the Gospels and Acts, the οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες who reject the stone are clearly interpreted as the Jewish authorities. In 1 Peter, the living stone who is Christ is rejected ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. "This modification shifts the focus from anti-Judean polemic in particular to a universalizing indictment of *all nonbelievers* who reject Jesus Christ."[103] It is clear that 1 Peter is not taking aim at the Jews, whatever the implications of this language may have for their status.

The Temple metaphors of 1 Cor 3.16-17 and Eph 2.20-22 address divisions, the former internal divisions within a particular community, the latter a general division

---

[101] Michaels 1989:167.
[102] Horrell 2013:162.
[103] Elliott 2000:410.

between Jews and gentiles. In each, the metaphor itself aims at delineating and conceptualizing the creation and maintenance of unity. That unity in the more universalizing Ephesians results in v.15 in ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, a new humanity. The Petrine metaphor addresses a division but not one internal to the community itself. It does not discuss σχίσματα or Jews. Rather it addresses how being members of the people of God has created a division between them and the world that has resulted in their tribulations. Snodgrass argues this demonstrates the absence of Pauline influence here:

> It is particularly embarrassing to any theory of dependence that I Peter ii.11 stresses that Christians are sojourners (πάροικοι) in this world whereas Ephesians ii.19 stresses that Christians are no longer sojourners (πάροικοι)."[104]

However, this criticism actually emphasizes the contextual differences and sense of development in which the Petrine metaphor is applied. In Ephesians the Temple metaphor explains how gentiles are no longer πάροικοι but are citizens with the saints and members of the household of God. However, as a result of that membership, in 1 Peter we see they have become πάροικοι in the world. In 1 Peter, we see the author taking the premise of the Ephesian metaphor, the creation of one new humanity, and universalizing it even further. He uses his own Temple metaphor to delineate the place of that new humanity in the world: chosen and precious to God but rejected by humanity.

4.5. Conclusion

We have observed in 1 Pet 2.4-10 a high concentration of possible Pauline parallels. These range from common scriptural citations to both verbal and conceptual constructions. It is clear that the Temple metaphor in 1 Pet 2.5 was not composed in a

---

[104] Snodgrass 1977:101.

vacuum and, therefore, no simple explanation of its composition is possible. If there is Pauline influence here, it is not all there is, as we observe clear evidence of authorial adaptation and appeals to other traditions. If this passage in 1 Peter is completely independent, it is certainly extremely conceptually proximate to Pauline traditions.

The possible Pauline parallels in 1 Pet 2.4-10 are all drawn from Romans and Ephesians. Parallels to these two texts can be found throughout 1 Peter, making them the most likely source of Pauline influence. Indeed, Romans and Ephesians in concert would provide the majority of the essential ingredients for the composition of this metaphor. So Horrell:

> Since Romans may be seen to some extent at least, as synthesizing and consolidating key aspects of Pauline teaching – and the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, for Ephesians – the influence of these two letters in particular indicates a significant connection between 1 Peter and the Pauline tradition.[105]

Thus the constitutive aspects of this metaphor are all found in Pauline texts with which 1 Peter or at least its traditions seem to have been familiar.

The other two strong candidates for a Petrine source are the Qumran sectarian writings, particularly 1QS 8, and common Christian tradition. We have observed there are parallels between 1 Pet 2.4-10 and 1QS 8, even stronger than those with Eph 2.11-22: the conceptualization of the community as a house, the explicit use of Isa 28.16, the connection a Temple metpahor with those of priesthood and sacrifice. However, like Eph 2.11-22 the parallels with Qumran are more incidental than fundamental when compared to Paul. As opposed to Qumran, 1 Peter and Paul, Eph 2.11-22 in particular, conceive of the community in terms of an edifice built upon a Christologically understood cornerstone. This edifice is under construction, its growth organic and attributable to

---

[105] Horrell 2013:19.

God. This building is spiritual and thus a Temple in that it houses and is defined by the Holy Spirit. The members of this group are understood as priestly as their duties are sanctified and their activies are sacrificial offerings of praise to God. The result of this Temple construction is not a sectarian group or atonement for Israel at large, but a new people who are unified, holy, and elected. In terms of both conceptual correpondence and entailment, the Petrine metaphorical structure closely aligns with the Pauline.

The recourse to a common Christian tradition as the source of both Paul and 1 Peter is predicated on the verbal and contextual variants in their parallels. Thus we must ask whether it is possible to explain these variants while maintaining Paul as a source of influence. We have argued, cautiously, that it is possible, even if at times Paul is seen as influencing 1 Peter indirectly through its tradition and the Petrine author is viewed as a creative adapter and combiner of traditions. Variations in the scriptural citations can be explained through the independent knowledge of scripture and the further development and combination of texts. The term οἶκος is preferred to ναός as its semantic versatility is able to support and maintain continuity with other Petrine metaphors. The dropped θεμέλιος from Isa 28.16 and Eph 2.20 allows the author to maintain the material identity between Christ and the community. The term πνευματικός, while not appearing in Paul's cultic metaphors, is a Pauline terms that denotes a Pauline concept, the indwelling Spirit. Finally, the combination of Temple metaphors with priestly and sacrificial ones can be explained through a Petrine synthesis of known Pauline metaphors.

None of these parallels definitively determine the existence of Pauline influence but they do maintain its possibility. These variants certainly indicate that the author of 1 Peter was not a Pauline scribe nor a slavish recipient of Pauline traditions. If there exists

Pauline influence in 1 Peter, it is creatively appropriated and developed. If there is not influence, we observe an author who is writing after Paul, perhaps from a city in which Paul was known, using a tradition nearly indistinguishable from Paul's, employing characteristic Pauline language and concepts all while remaining totally independent of Paul. If this is the case, 1 Pet 2.5 provides the most informative parallel to Paul's Temple metaphors as we can view a Temple metaphor constructed with the same premises and mapped onto a historically and conceptually moving target, the Christian community.

Whether or not 1 Pet 2.5 is under the influence of Paul, it remains instructive to identify what is distinctive about the Petrine Temple metaphor, at the very least as a close parallel to Paul's. Cultic metaphors can be identified in isolation in several places in 1 Peter (cf. 1.2, 19, 3.18), though Elliott is correct that οἶκος in its semantic variations rather than the cult is the root metaphor of 1 Peter. However, in 1 Pet 2.5 we observe the most comprehensive single sentence cultic metaphor in the NT. Only here are the concepts of Temple, purity, priesthood, and sacrifice, the fundamental and constitutive elements of the Jewish cultic domain, simultaneously mapped onto the community. While we do not find a thoroughgoing cultic discussion as we do in Hebrews, we do find a succinct, all-encompassing metaphorical mapping. While this metaphorical synthesis can be observed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, though with those correspondences bearing different entailments, it is found nowhere else in the NT.

Despite many contemporary scholarly reconstructions, 1 Peter's metaphor highlights that Paul makes no attempt at such a metaphorical synthesis. We see that Paul is perfectly capable of conceptualizing Christian phenomena in terms of the Temple, purity, priesthood and sacrifice but never does so in combination. Indeed, in this one

verse the Petrine author does more to systematize cultic metaphor than Paul achieves in his entire corpus. Whether or not Paul saw these metaphors in conjunction or had a systematic metaphorical conception of cultic is nowhere demonstrated, even though this is often assumed and central to many substitutionary positions on Paul's view of the cult.[106] However, 1 Peter further highlights the compatibility of various cultic metaphors by creating a synthesis of them. If 1 Peter is using Paul, he demonstrates that Paul's cultic metaphors can be combined while maintaining their fundamental correspondences and entailments. Though Paul does not construct a comprehensive or systematic cultic metaphor, he provides the linguistic and conceptual building blocks with which to do so.

In 1 Pet 2.9 covenantal terms that identify Israel as God's chosen people are applied to the community. However, the implications of this adoption of terms for historical Israel are unclear. Furthermore, there is a surprising absence of polemical language. Unlike 1QS, the Temple metaphor is actualized in a context with no hint of cultic critique or conflict. However, the shift from τὸ πνεῦμα being the subject of the verb οἰκεῖ in 1 Cor 3.16, to the prepositional phrase ἐν πνεύματι in Eph 2.22, to the adjectival πνευματικός in 1 Pet 2.5, while primarily denoting the same reality, results in a metaphor more susceptible to dualistic definitions of the Temple itself and has certainly influenced the use of the term *spiritualization*. This combined with the synthesis of cultic metaphors could suggest a more comprehensive and possibly substitutionary source domain. Similarly, while the Ephesian metaphor is utilized to demonstrate the incorporation of the gentiles into the people of God, the Petrine metaphor contributes to the appropriation, or at least an assumption, of Israel's covenantal claims. Paul's focus is

---

[106] This is particularly evident in Moule 1950 and Young 1983's reconstructions of a *spiritualized* Christian cult.

on the mechanics of the internal composition of the community, whereas for 1 Peter, the arrangement of this community is not at issue. Whether appropriation rather than incorporation reflects a different period in the definition of the people of God, or a different motivation on the part of the Petrine author, the Temple metaphor once more appears conceptually well suited to this changing landscape, but also goes beyond anything we see in Paul with regards to a implementation of the Temple metaphor in a doctrinal definition of the church.

By utilizing a similar source structure, and maintaining the central entailments of Paul's Temple metaphors – unity, sanctity, and the indwelling of the Spirit – the Petrine metaphor is able to develop its conceptual structure in order to address its particular situation. In doing so, 1 Pet 2.5 represents a possible, though not necessary nor evolutionary, trajectory for the interpretation and actualization of Paul's Temple metaphor and highlights the conceptual and hermeneutical potential of this mapping. At the same time, exposure to 1 Pet 2.5 within the analysis of Paul's Temple metaphors begins to fill in the gaps of historical distance between the modern interpreters and Paul and brings to light how this possible hermeneutical trajectory may have unconsciously shaped our interpretation of his metaphors, particularly in terms of 1 Peter's metaphorical synthesis and appropriation of Israelite covenantal claims.

CHAPTER FIVE:
EARLY EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS (2): THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

5.1. INTRODUCTION

Our second case study into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors differs from the first in a number of significant ways. Rather than examining a particular passage, we turn our attention to an entire text – the Epistle to the Hebrews. Similarly, rather than observing an instance of how Paul's metaphors have been received and actualized, we examine how the reception of Hebrews as Pauline has affected the way in which Paul's metaphors can be construed. Hebrews, itself perhaps the most historically anomalous document in the New Testament in both content and origin,[1] has been regularly cast under the shadow of Paul and has had an enormous effect on Pauline reception. From its earliest extant manuscript to its acknowledgement as Pauline in the 4th and 5 century councils, "ancient Christian readers consistently associate Hebrews with Paul or the *corpus Paulinum,* even as patristic literari recognized the problem of assigning Hebrews to Paul."[2] As the text is formally anonymous, why would interpreters of the text associate Hebrews with the apostle? How does Hebrews structure its cultic concepts, and what implications might this have for the Jewish cult itself? Finally, if Hebrews could be understood to be Pauline, what might this tell us about how Paul's cultic, and in particular, Temple metaphors, could and have been read and understood?

---

[1] For this reason Ounsworth 2012:3 states, "[p]erhaps more than any other books of the New Testament… Hebrews makes the reader aware of the historical distance between himself and the text's own time and place, that the Epistle emerges from a world of ideas and symbols far removed from our own."

[2] Eisenbaum 2005:219.

To answer these questions, first we survey the early historical association of Hebrews with the Pauline corpus. From there, we discuss some current theories, particularly those of Eisenbaum and Rothschild, regarding Hebrews' Pauline association, in which we will see how the text could be viewed as a supplement to the Pauline corpus, whether or not this was intended by the author.

Next we turn to Hebrews' discussions of how cultic categories structure the author's argument, as well as possible models for understanding their implications. We observe that Hebrews never discusses the Temple (ναός), but rather the tent (σκηνή), sacrifice (θυσία), and the high priest (ἀρχιερεύς), each of which will be examined in turn. Since there are insufficient linguistic parallels to examine particular passages of Hebrews as directly dependent on Paul, we shall compare the two cultic discourses to discern whether they conceptualize the same phenomena using the same conceptual models. Although a direct genetic link between Paul and Hebrews may not be demonstrable, we observe that Hebrews' Pauline association is a result of the fact that the Epistle's cultic discussions appeared to early interpreters as consonant with what Paul might have said regarding those subjects about which Paul said nothing. Therefore, the highly delineated cultic mechanics spelled out by Hebrews have filled in the lacunae left by Paul and in doing so have guided reconstructions and interpretations of the implications of Paul's Temple metaphors.

5.2. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Corpus

5.2.1. A Brief History of Reception of Hebrews and Paul

The standard narrative of the reception of Hebrews suggests that the text was received as Pauline first in the East in the 2nd century CE and later in the West under the influence of Augustine and Jerome in the 4th and 5th centuries, albeit with more reticence.[3] *Prima facie*, the manuscript evidence appears to support this narrative. The earliest attestation of Hebrews is the P^{46}, a collection of Pauline texts dated from the 3rd century. This collection not only contains Hebrews, including the title ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ, but also places it after Paul's epistle to the Romans.[4] The title clearly mirrors the titles of Paul's epistles, which are named for their addressees. This inclusion in P^{46}, at the very minimum, "reveals that Hebrews was considered by some to be part of the Pauline corpus."[5] However, Eisenbaum makes a subsequent observation:

> While different forms of the *corpus Paulinum* circulated, and some versions did not include Hebrews, there is no evidence that Hebrews circulated with other collections of Christian writings... Neither is there evidence that Hebrews circulated independently...[6]

While the evidence here is too thin to verify this contention, Eisenbaum may be correct that the absence of any independent manuscript attestation may be suggestive of Hebrews' earliest interpretations and even its intentions.

The Eastern P^{46} is often contrasted with "Western" Muratorian Fragment or Canon, a canonical list, usually regarded as of late second/early third century Roman provenance. This list does not include Hebrews amongst the letters of Paul (Lines 39-67)

---

[3] Attridge 1989:1-2, "Pauline authorship was not widely accepted in the West until the fifth century" Cf. Koester 2001:19-27.
[4] Koester 2001:21 suggests this placement is "perhaps because of its length and the mention of Italy in Heb 13:24."
[5] Allen 2010:46.
[6] Eisenbaum 2005:218.

and, in fact, omits it from the canon entirely.[7] Rothschild argues against both the western provenance of the Muratorian Canon and the implications of Hebrews' omission.[8] She follows A.C. Sundberg's argument for a fourth century eastern provenance and contends the omission is based on the popular correlation between the Pauline epistles and the seven churches of Revelation (Lines 46-59; cf. Jerome *Ep. Ad Paul*. 53.9).[9] Although the thesis of Sundberg Jr. has found some support, most recently in Hahneman,[10] it has far more detractors and the traditional second century dating has the lion's share of scholarly support.[11]

Rothschild concludes that "in the end Hebrews' 'rejection' by the Muratorian Fragment is an argument *ex silentio*. And, from this silence scholars should resist the temptation to construe its dismissal."[12] It is certainly the case that the absence of Hebrews from this canon list is not self-explanatory. The Muratorian Fragment does not explicitly reject Hebrews, as it does the epistles to the Alexandrians and Laodiceans. The omission of Hebrews could simply denote that it was unknown to the compilers. At the same time, this is evidence that Hebrews was not an essential or necessary part of the Pauline corpus

---

[7] It is worth noting that the Canon also omits 1 Peter, a similarly popular text, as well as 2 Peter, James, 3 John. These omissions may support the earlier dating for the Canon as this could represent an early stage of canonical development.
[8] Rothschild 2009:21-24.
[9] Cf. Sundberg 1968, 1973.
[10] Hahneman 1992, 2002.
[11] For criticism of Sundberg Jr., see Ferguson 1982 For criticism of Hahneman, see Verheyden 2003, Markschies 2007:234, 2012:64 For a summary of both positions which ultimately sides against Sundberg Jr. and Hahneman, see Schnabel 2014:239-253.
[12] Rothschild 2009:24.

in some circles and allows for the possibility of reticence regarding the Pauline character of the text in the West in the 2nd century.[13]

The earliest perceived use of Hebrews, however, comes from the West not the East. The epistle of *1 Clement,* in particular 36.1-5, is thought to echo Heb 1.1-14; 2.17; 4.14-16.[14] These parallels were observed in the early church, as Eusebius notes that *1 Clement* "gives many thoughts from the Epistle to the Hebrews and even quotes verbally when using certain passages from it" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.38). The contemporary consensus tends to agree with Eusebius.[15] However, Theissen has argued that the two texts both relied on a common source and, similarly, Lindemann states the possibility of an intermediary source for the first chapter of Hebrews. To counter, Cockerill has argued there is a distinctive combination of elements in *1 Clement* and Hebrews: "[t]he context of *1 Clem*. 36.1-6 provides no rationale for the association of Pss 2:7; 104:4; and 110:1 other than dependence on Hebrews."[16] Koester also notes that if this high priest Christology were established in an earlier tradition, the author of Hebrews would not need to argue for it so vigorously.[17] While Attridge's contention that it is "impossible to assume anything but literary dependence" may be overstating the certainty,[18] it appears

---

[13] Later compilations Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus placed Hebrews after the Pauline church letters but before the individual letters. By the sixth century, in Claromontanus, Hebrews assumes its contemporary place in the canon after the Pauline texts. Koester 2001:27, "[t]his reflects the idea that Hebrews belongs in the outer ring of the Pauline writings, and the arrangement remained dominant until Pauline authorship was challenged in the sixteenth century."
[14] Koester 2001:21.
[15] Hagner 1973:179, "Clement's acquaintance with and dependence upon the Epistle to the Hebrews is acknowledged by nearly everyone." Though Hagner himself is quite maximalist in his views on Clement's knowledge of the New Testament.
[16] Cockerill 2012:34. Cf. Cockerill 1978.
[17] Koester 2001:22.
[18] Attridge 1989:6.

more likely than not that the first extant author to demonstrate knowledge of Hebrews was *1 Clement*.

Unfortunately, however, the author of *1 Clement* gives no indication of whom he perceived he was citing when using Hebrews. From *1 Clem.* 5.5-7 we know that the author knew of Paul's life and from *1 Clem*. 47.1-4 we can see that he knew of Paul as a letter writer and of his first letter to the Corinthians.[19] Lindemann observes that here Clement believes it self-evident that he should appeal to Paul as an authority, that the Corinthians still have Paul's letter, and that the letter had made its way to Rome.[20] Unfortunately, outside of *1 Clem* 47.1-4, where parallels with 1 Corinthians and other Pauline texts do exist, the author does not specifically ascribe them to Paul.[21] Thus it is unclear in 36.1-5 whether the author believes he is citing Paul or someone else. At a minimum then, what we can observe is that someone who knew Paul and his letters also seems to have known Hebrews.[22] We can also observe that one of the earliest interpreters who used Paul did not reject Hebrews, whether or not he perceived it to be Pauline.[23]

There is also some suggestion that the author of the *Shepherd of Hermas* was aware of Hebrews. This conclusion is implied by the two documents' shared discussion of a second repentance. Heb 6.4-6, 10.26, and 12.17 state rather unequivocally that no such repentance is possible. In *Mand.* 4.3.1-7, *Hermas* states that he has heard that there

---

[19] Gregory 2007:144, "[s]uch testimony to 1 Corinthians means that this conclusion is secure, even without any significant verbatim parallels at this point"
[20] Lindemann 1979:190-191.
[21] For example *1 Clem.* 37.5-38.2//1 Cor 12.12, 14, 20-8; *1 Clem.*49.5// 1 Cor 13.4-7; *1 Clem.* 24.1//1 Cor 15.20, 23; *1 Clem.* 24.4-5// 1 Cor 15.36-7.
[22] So Gregory 2007:142-143, "[w]e do not know what opinion Clement held about its authorship… we must remain agnostic about the views of Clement of Rome."
[23] Rothschild 2009:20 states that "First Clement establishes a precedent hardly to be breached for the next thousand years." This is true if referring to the use of Hebrews, but is not certain if use here is interpreted to imply Pauline attribution.

was no second repentance. Rothschild notes that the only text before *Hermas* to suggest there is no second repentance was Hebrews.[24] Westcott in the *NTAF* also observes knowledge of Hebrews. However, more recently Verheyden finds only reference to Matthew and 1 Corinthians in *Hermas*.[25] Knowledge of Hebrews is more questionable in *Hermas* than with *1 Clement,* as there are no linguistic parallels. The author certainly does not refer to Paul or attribute the question of second repentance to him. It is important also to note that *Hermas* modifies the position of Hebrews on second repentance in *Vis* 2.2.4-5 and even further in *Sim* 9.26.5-6. So if *Hermas* did use Hebrews as a Pauline source, he felt able to modify it. Lastly, the Muratorian Fragment, which omitted Hebrews, includes *Hermas*, with a possible implication being that it agreed with *Hermas* over Hebrews. This could represent further evidence of knowledge of Hebrews in the West both without Pauline ascription and with some reserve as to its authority.

An author who took the opposite approach to the Muratorian Canon, favouring Hebrews over that "apocryphal Shepherd of adulterers", was Tertullian. However, Tertullian believed the epistle to be penned by Barnabas, the companion of Paul, rather than by Paul himself (*Pud*. 20).[26] As such it preserved apostolic teaching and was authoritative but not Pauline. In his extant works, Irenaeus never explicitly cites or refers to Hebrews. However, Eusebius claims that Irenaeus composed "a little book of various discourses in which he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews and the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, quoting certain passages from them" (*Hist. eccl.* 5.26). In the sixth century,

---

[24] Rothschild 2009:30 Similarly Koester 2001:23, "[t]his question probably reflects knowledge of Hebrews since Hebrews is apparently the only text prior to the Shepherd of Hermas that formulated the issue of second repentance in this way."
[25] Verheyden 2007.
[26] Tertullian perhaps saw more in common between the cultic positions of Hebrews and the *Epistle of Barnabas*, than between Hebrews and Paul.

Stephanus Gabarus claimed that Irenaeus denied Pauline authorship (*Phot. Cod. 232* (Migne, (PG 103.1103)). Bingham, in his study of Irenaeus and Hebrews, concurs that the bishop rejected Hebrews as Pauline but that his use of the text, "demonstrates… the presence of a text, the language and ideology of which, has seeped selectively and quietly into his polemic."[27] Bingham believes that Irenaeus's hesitancy over citation is because his arguments are tied to the apostolic tradition and, as with Tertullian engagement with Marcion, his Gnostic opponents may not have accepted Hebrews. These are perhaps instances of Hebrews being regarded as authoritative in the West, but not Pauline.

Hippolytus, according to the same testimony regarding Irenaeus, also rejected Pauline authorship. Cyprian never cites Hebrews, but contrary to it, believed that lapsed Christians should be allowed to be restored (*Ep*. 51). Most notable is an anecdote about Gaius of Rome, recorded by Eusebius. In combatting opponents of "new Scriptures", he reports that in his Dialogue, Gaius, "mentions only thirteen epistles of the holy Apostle, not numbering the Epistle to the Hebrews with the rest; seeing that even to this day among the Romans there are some who do not consider it to be the Apostle's" (*Hist*. eccl. 6.20). Rothschild believes Gaius' claim "points to its [Hebrews'] popularity and prominence in Rome" and that "this text's author in Rome gave its marginalization by Gaius potency."[28] Furthermore, she adds that Gaius' position was motivated more by anti-Montantist propaganda rather than skepticism about Hebrews' authorship. It is difficult to ascertain which were more representative of the general sentiment in Rome, Gaius' or his opponents' position on Hebrews. The tradition of non-Pauline authorship of

---

[27] Bingham 2012:72.
[28] Rothschild 2009:25.

Hebrews in Rome, whether pre-existing to or under the influence of Gaius, appears to be strong enough that it continued to persist until the time of Eusebius.

The major testimonies from the East are also provided by Eusebius. Pantaenus, teacher of Clement of Alexandria, is remembered as saying:

> Since the Lord, being the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, through modesty, since he had been sent to the Gentiles, does not inscribe himself as an apostle of the Hebrews, both to give due deference to the Lord and because he wrote to the Hebrews also out of his abundance, being a preacher and apostle of the Gentiles (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14).

His student, Clement of Alexandria, held similar views. Addressing the appearance of a different compositional style, Clement states 'indeed it is Paul's, but that it was written for Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue and that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it for the Greeks.'" Like his teacher, he believed that Paul's signature on the document would "repel" the Hebrews who were suspicious of him. Origen also observes the stylistic differences noting that Hebrews does not have "the apostle's rudeness of speech" and is "better Greek in the framing of its diction" (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25). He does acknowledge the value of the theology found therein, claiming its thoughts are "admirable and not inferior to Paul's". Thus to combine these insights, Origen constructs a theory: "the thoughts are the apostle's but that the style and composition belong to one who called to mind the apostle's teachings." He famously concludes, "[b]ut who wrote the epistle, in truth God knows." However, here Origen does not seem to be reporting a traditional theory of authorship but is stating his own (ἐγω δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος…). An account had also reached Origen that Clement or Luke had written the epistle.

While simply dividing these testimonies geographically into East and West is an oversimplification as Rothschild notes,[29] it is worth mentioning two things. If the document was initially intended for Rome as many current theories suggest, it is noteworthy that it is in Rome where we see the most reticence about its Pauline origin, both in lack of explicit attribution, disagreement regarding second repentance, and Gaius' rejection. This may suggest that the Pauline attribution arose once the document began circulating and was divorced from its original occasion. Furthermore, Koester has noted that due to Alexandrian exegetical presuppositions, it may have been easier for interpreters in the East to align Hebrews with their existing readings of Paul as they were already interpreting Paul in categories similar to those of Hebrews.[30]

In his commentary, Koester writes, "Christians probably based their understanding of authorship on inferences from Hebrews, rather than on traditions about the author's identity."[31] Origen, however, seems to support a traditional inference when he states, "[f]or not without reason have the men of old time handed it down as Paul's" (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25). Unfortunately, from these Eastern writers we do not get explicit examples of what these "reasons" might be. What we do get evidence of is an ongoing discussion about authorship, which is mostly absent in the West. For the most part, this takes the form of a defense of why Paul did not sign the letter and why the literary style seems different. We should also note that the earliest discussions we have of Pauline authorship are already defenses of that position.

---

[29] Rothschild 2009:43, "[r]eferences 'East' and 'West' are less useful categories today than in the past."
[30] Koester 2001:20.
[31] Koester 2001:21.

From this brief survey of the reception of Hebrews, we observe a number of possible positions on the relationship between Hebrews and Paul. First, by the end of the second century it is possible for Hebrews to be found in a *corpus Paulinum* (P^{46}), though it could also be left off such lists (Muratorian Fragement). The former either held, or wanted to suggest, that the text was written by Paul, the latter either rejected this or was simply unaware of Hebrews. Second, in the second century it could be cited and alluded to by authors who knew Paul (*1 Clement,* Irenaeus) but is not explicitly attributed to him. In the case of *1 Clement* and *Hermas*, the authors may have believed they were referencing Paul, though *Hermas* departs from Hebrews' position, which may suggest he did not. Irenaeus it seems believed the text authoritative and useful, but was hesitant to explicitly cite or attribute. Third, in this period the text could be attributed to other authors (Tertullian: Barnabas) or seen as a translation/draft of Pauline thoughts (Origen: Luke or Clement). Both positions retain Hebrews' proximity to Paul while accounting for its differences from the apostle's epistles. Fourth, in Gaius of Rome we see a rare explicit rejection of Hebrews as written by Paul, as well as a continuing tradition of this position.

From the positions which view some connection with Paul we may draw several conclusions. When Hebrews is attributed to Paul, the presumption is that the letter was intended for a Jewish audience, evidenced especially in both the title in P^{46} and in Clement of Alexandria's assessment. This presumption is clearly based on the Jewish content of the text, especially the detailed description of the cultic system, which would seemingly only be understandable to a Jewish audience. We also see in both Clement's and Origen's defense of Pauline authorship that it is the presentation of Hebrews, in

particular its linguistic style, which creates doubt, not its theological positions. From this perspective then, whether it is a translation or a second draft of a Pauline production, Hebrews presents what Paul would have said if he had addressed Jews directly about particularly Jewish matters, which, as we will see, largely pertain to the Jewish cult. Similarly, those who reference Hebrews without attribution to but rather in conjunction with Paul, likely viewed Hebrews' position as at least consonant with the apostle's. Though not in agreement, both of these stances on Hebrews' authorship reveal particular, albeit implicit, interpretations of Paul's view of the Jewish cultic system.

5.2.2. Recent Accounts of Hebrews and Paul

Was this 'Pauline' posture intentional on the part of the author of Hebrews? Unfortunately, over a millennium of advancements in historical methodologies and reflection have not provided further clarity on the question of Hebrews' authorship. As Rothschild writes, "the authorship of Hebrews is one of the least tractable problems of NT research."[32] While there have been changes in perspective on the author, setting, and date of the text,[33] most commentators still opt for an unknown, anonymous author.[34] Recently, new attempts to identify the author of Hebrews have arisen, many of which place it back into close proximity with Paul.

---

[32] Rothschild 2009:14.
[33] So Koester 2001:42, "Hebrews had traditionally been read as a letter that was written by Paul to Jewish Christians, who were thought to live in or near Jerusalem prior to the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. By the end of the twentieth century, however, all of this had changed, as many came to think that Hebrews might be an unknown author's homily to Christians of an indeterminate ethnic background, who may have resided in Italy rather than in Palestine."
[34] Attridge 1989:1-6, Koester 2001:42-45, Cockerill 2012:3-10.

Eisenbaum, in answer to the historical problem of why Hebrews circulated anonymously but as part of the *corpus Paulinum,* provides three possible answers: (1) the author's name was at some point removed; (2) Hebrews was designed as a speech for presentation and did not have a formal address; and (3) the author deliberately concealed their identity. The second option is more likely than the first as the manuscript tradition provides no evidence of a epistolary salutation.[35] However, the second option is problematic as its anonymity and title both do not match the standard format.[36] Thus, Eisenbaum argues that "the author or scribal editor deliberately concealed his identity as an *implicit* form of pseudonymity."[37] The author however, was motivated more by an issue than a particular occasion: "Hebrews was composed by an educated and theologically reflective person who wished to clarify and perhaps unify Christological claims."[38] These claims would thus gain greater credibility by association with Paul.

Rothschild's position has much in common with Eisebaum's. As noted, Rothschild argues against the East-West reception narrative and suggests that Hebrews was generally accepted by both from the 2nd century onwards. She then argues that Hebrews' author,

> makes an audacious claim to Pauline authorship in but not limited to the postscript and the rest of Hebrews – its elevated style, its numerous prophetic forms and its contradictory theological positions – can only be fully understood in this light.[39]

---

[35] However, Eisenbaum believes that the postscript could have been a late or later addition to the text.
[36] Eisenbaum 2005:222, "[m]oreover, titles of speeches normally refer to their subject matter, not their audience (cf. Melito's De Pascha, or Plutarch's De Superstitione)."
[37] Eisenbaum 2005:224.
[38] Eisenbaum 2005:222.
[39] Rothschild 2009:215.

As the quote suggests, the postscript plays a pivotal role in Rothschild's theory that the anonymous author was attempting to pass Hebrews off as a Pauline prison letter. She notes the density of Pauline phrases and vocabulary, which are found nowhere else in Hebrews. This combined with the reference to Timothy in 13.23 demonstrate an intentional relationship with the Pauline postscripts. She then attempts to show the connection in the intended imitation of Paul in Heb. 13.1-19, Hebrew's use of scripture, and finally throughout the whole text. Rothschild argues that the purpose of Hebrews was to fill a gap in the Pauline corpus, a speech to a Jewish audience, as found in Acts 28.23-28.

The strongest challenge to both Eisenbaum's and Rothchild's positions is the lack of any Pauline ascription by the author of Hebrews. If the author wanted their text to be associated with the *corpus Paulinum* why not sign it? Eisenbaum does not provide a direct answer to this challenge, but seems to indicate the author wanted to be accidentally associated with Paul. Rothschild appeals to Aune's theory of Christian prophecy, where many prophetic texts were attributed to an author while remaining anonymous.[40] However, if this is the case, then why include the postscript? If the pseudonymity of the text relies upon it looking like a Pauline epistle, why not have an epistolary salutation? Indeed Rothschild is correct to note the success of Hebrews if it is pseudonymous, but it seems from the previous section that all the reticence that was present in its early reception would have been resolved by the apostle's signature. While anonymous works do exist, by definition it is pseudonymous texts that tend to make a claim for apostolic authorship. Similarly, if attempting to assume the character of the apostle, why include

---

[40] Aune 1983.

2.3?[41] Furthermore, while Rothschild is correct to point out that the Hebrews' postscript appears remarkably Pauline, it is neither identical with any extant postscript nor is an attempt at Pauline pseudonymity the only explanation.

The identity of the author of Hebrews will likely never be confirmed and thus the implied author will continue to be reconstructed in a multiplicity of different ways. While it is unlikely that Hebrews was intended as implicit or intentional pseudepigraphy, the arguments of Eisenbaum and Rothschild further highlight how successful Hebrews has been as a supplement to the Pauline epistles. The content of the epistles creates just enough overlap in vocabulary, concepts, and "narrative worlds" between Paul and Hebrews[42] for early interpreters to see Hebrews as the answer to many of the questions that the apostle had left behind. While Hebrews may not be an interpretation of Paul, its reception as Pauline is itself an implicit interpretation of Paul and, in particular, his cultic language. By attributing Hebrews to Paul, the interpreter is simultaneously attributing to Paul the epistle's views on the tent, sacrifice and priesthood. Hebrews thus belongs in the reception of Paul, not necessarily because of any literary connection, but because it reveals what early interpreters of Paul believed the apostle capable of saying on cultic topics. As such, Hebrews' cultic discourse both highlights many of the subjects which Paul did not address and provides a possible interpretation of Paul by the way in which it addresses them.

---

[41] Attridge 1989:2, "[i]t is quite inconceivable that Paul, who so emphatically affirms his status as an apostle and eyewitness of the risen Christ, could have put himself in the subordinate position of a secondhand recipient of tradition as does our author at 2.3."
[42] Cf. Miller 2005.

5.3. Hebrews' Tent and Paul's Temple: A Comparison of Cultic Language

When Pauline authorship of Hebrews is doubted, nowhere in ancient or modern discussion is the stated reason for this skepticism Hebrews' distinctive treatment of the Jewish cult.[43] Since cultic concepts are so thematically and structurally central in Hebrews, it makes sense that these would be essential to any comparison with Paul. Unfortunately, the significance and implications of these images are difficult to reconstruct precisely due to the lack of concrete historical information we have regarding the date and occasion of Hebrews.[44] The meanings of the cultic models employed vary immensely depending upon whether the text is seen as pre- or post-70 CE and for a Jewish or gentile audience.[45] The aim here is not to settle these historical obscurities, but to reconstruct the meaning and implications of Hebrews' cultic language and compare it with Paul's in light of some of these obstacles. While there is little evidence for direct literary dependence and citation in particular passages, postscript aside, we shall examine Hebrew's conceptual cultic framework to see if it contradicts, contrasts, or is consonant with Paul's structuring.

5.3.1. The Tent and not the Temple

The Epistle to the Hebrews contains no Temple metaphors as we have defined them, a source domain of the Temple mapped onto a target drawn from a different domain. This

---

[43] To recall, Origen deems the thoughts of the epistle as "not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle" and states that "the thoughts are the apostle's".

[44] Aitken 2005:131, "Hebrews floats, as it were, unanchored by place and time, lending itself to readings that are less dependent upon place and time than are political and ideological approaches."

[45] Again Aitken 2005:132, "Hebrews is a highly multivalent text that contains numerous interwoven ways of constructing and defining the identiy and ethic of its audience, as is not uncommon in texts that are homiletical in character."

is due not only to the fact that Hebrews does not conceptualize target phenomena in terms of the Temple, but also because the concept of the Temple itself is conspicuously absent. The author speaks extensively of "the tent" (ἡ σκηνή) and "the sanctuary" (τὰ ἅγια) but never of the Temple (ναός, ἱερόν). This omission has implications for the setting and date of Hebrews, as well as how we interpret the text's cultic language and its implications.

The destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, the lynchpin for the dating of so many NT documents, is not mentioned or even alluded to in Hebrews. Some believe the destruction of the Temple cannot be used to date Hebrews.[46] For most of the history of reception, this was of no consequence, as Paul would have been writing pre-70 CE. However, even when Pauline authorship was in doubt, a position arose in which Hebrews must have been written before 70 CE because, as Montefiore states, "[t]he best argument for the supersession of the old covenant would have been the destruction of the Temple."[47] The arguments found in Heb 8.4 and 10.2 in particular would be fortified by the non-existence of the Temple, thus the lack of reference must mean destruction has not yet occurred. Similarly, this fits with the traditional view that the author was worried his audience would backslide into ritual Judaism, which would require a functioning sacrificial system. This pre-70 CE date is then all but confirmed by the author's use of the present tense when discussing the cultic system (7.27-28; 8.3-5; 9.7-8, 25; 10.1-3; 13.10-11).

Yet there are reasons why these arguments are not determinative for a pre-70CE date. We have observed that the use of the present tense to describe the cultic system

---

[46] So Aitken 2005, "'[t]he destruction of the Herodian temple is not an expressed element in this exposition and therefore cannot be determinative of the date of Hebrews"
[47] Montefiore 1964:3.

post-70 CE is not uncommon (cf. Jos. *C.Ap.* 277; *1 Clem.* 40; *Diogn*. 3). This language is congruent with Hebrews' description of the cultic system which is theoretical rather than historical. Eisenbaum notes that the author "gives no impression of having experiential knowledge of the Temple cult"[48] as all the information presented in the text could be derived from Exodus and Leviticus.[49] To respond to Montefiore, the best argument for the supersession of the old covenant might not be the *de facto* destruction of the Temple, for as we have seen, it was certainly not clear that it would remain destroyed, but rather that it lacked efficacy and has been replaced *de jure.* Other factors that suggest a later date are the author's second generation referenced in 2.3 and that the audience have been believers for "some time" in 5.12. The high Christology and literary affinities with the Lukan corpus, Pastorals, and 1 Peter may also point to a date in the 70's or 80's.[50]

Gelardini's interpretation of Hebrews as a synagogue homily may also suggest a post-70 CE date. She argues that Hebrews is modelled after a sermon in the Palestinian Triennial Liturgical cycle in which the *sidrah* (reading from the Torah) is Exod 31.18-32.35 and the *haphtarah* (reading from the Prophets) is Jer 31.31-34. This would place the homily in the month of Av, which contains the important fast on the ninth day (Tisha be-Av), which commemorates the sins of Israel in the desert and looks forward to the Day of Atonement. On the significance of Tisha be-Av she states:

---

[48] Eisenbaum 2005:225.
[49] Hooker 2009:209, "[h]ere, incidentally is the explanation as to why our author speaks about the 'tent' rather than the 'Temple'. It is because his concern is not with what is (or is no longer) going on in Jerusalem, but with showing that Christ's death is according to the scriptures, and with spelling out the implications of that 'fulfillment'."
[50] Cf. Attridge 1989:8, Eisenbaum 2005:229 suggests that Hebrews' use of καταπέτασμα perhaps shows some knowledge of Mk 15.38; Matt 27.51; and Lk 23.44. This position is strongly contested by Cockerill 2012:39.

> *Tisha be-Av* commemorates not only the prohibition to enter the land but also the destruction of the First *and* the Second Temple; later too, the conquering of the last stronghold of the Bar Kochba revolt, the city Bethar, and also the erection of a heathen Temple in Jerusalem by Hadrian and the renaming of the city as *Aelia Capitolina*.[51]

Thus, for Hebrews she suggests the possibility that,

> The author of Hebrews may be speaking to Jewish slaves in Rome, exiled in the aftermath of the second Jewish War; that may be why he could not promise the return to the material city of Jerusalem and was left only with the possibility of promising the heavenly one, which in Jewish conceptuality exists exactly above the terrestrial one.[52]

Similarly, Aitken reconstructs a context for Hebrews that is a response to the destruction of the Temple:

> Hebrews should be read as one response to the imperial ideology expressed in the events and monuments surrounding the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, a triumph bestowed upon them by the Roman senate for their victory in the First Jewish war and the destruction of the Jerusalem in 70 C.E.[53]

The high Christology of the text and its appeal to cultic features are an attempt to resist the ideology and triumph of Flavian propaganda.

Although Gelardini's reconstruction may be too specific calendrically, and Aitkens's parallels perhaps too convenient, they both provide a plausible context for Hebrews' argument in which the tenor of the argument is not the invalidation of the Temple cult but a consolation and compensation for its loss. As Eisenbaum suggests "the author has reached his conclusions precisely because his ruminations about these matters happen in a world that is devoid of Jewish cultic institutions."[54] Since the date of Hebrews cannot be firmly established, perhaps it is prudent to interpret the text in ways that do not require dependence. It is possible, however, that the full extent of the author's intentions and their implications could be directly related to whether or not the Temple

---

[51] Gelardini 2005:123.
[52] Gelardini 2005:123.
[53] Aitken 2005:132.
[54] Eisenbaum 2005:226.

stood at the time of composition, either as a radical critique of an existing cult or a response to its destruction. Both pre- and post-70 CE datings have a *terminus ad quem* of the date of the composition of *1 Clement*, which itself is not firm, but is likely late first early second century CE. As we will see in what follows, the character of Hebrews' criticism of cultic principles, not just performance, is so different not just from Paul but also from anything else we have observed in pre-70 CE Jewish appraisals of the cult that it would better suit a post-70 CE date.

Whether composed before or after the destruction of the Temple, it remains curious why Hebrews discusses only the tent and not contemporary or recent practice in the Temple in Jerusalem. As noted, Hebrews' depiction of the Jewish cult is almost exclusively exegetical. Eisenbaum has argued that the author of Hebrews never references Israel's life in the Promised Land nor the institutions established therein.[55] Similarly, Hays suggests that,

> Readers of the letter are not encouraged to gloat over their superiority to unfaithful Israel; rather, they are encouraged to understand themselves in a situation precisely analogous to the situation of Israel in the wilderness.[56]

Unlike what we have seen in the prophetic critique of cult or at Qumran, the author of Hebrews is not addressing current practice or malpractice, but the efficacy of the system as it is prescribed in the law, its theoretical and theological underpinnings. Thus he hermeneutically situates his readers at the cult's original institution in order to examine its initial purpose. However, the critique of cult is not so much the aim of Hebrews' argument but the consequence of structuring its Christology and eschatology along cultic

---

[55] Eisenbaum 1997:140-142; 170-175.
[56] Hays 2009:166 Hays further notes that this closely parallels the hermeneutical strategy of Paul in 1 Cor 10.1-22.

lines.[57] Thus, it is not immediately clear how this critique applies or would have applied to the Jerusalem Temple.[58] It is to this question and how Hebrews' position compares with Paul's metaphors that we now turn.

5.3.2. The Tent in Hebrews - A Sketch and a Shadow

The tent is a unifying structural concept in Hebrews since it serves as both the theatre in which many of the text's dramatic events occur and as a foil through which the author differentiates the two covenants. The author's scheme for the tent is programmatically introduced in 6.19-20:[59]

> ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The verb ἔρχεσθαι, initially denoting the theme of entering God's rest (3.11; 18, 19; 4.1-11), here introduces the prevailing theme of Hebrews' cultic discussions, entering God's presence. Although the tent itself is not mentioned here, τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος combined with the high priestly description of Christ points to Day of Atonement imagery (Lev. 16.2, 12, 15) and the conceptual design of the tent begins to

---

[57] Attridge 1989:8, "Hebrews is interested in the old cult primarily as a foundation for the Christological exposition that undergirds the paraenetic program of the text."

[58] Attridge 1989:8, "Hebrews is not explicitly interested in the Herodian Temple and contemporary high priests, but in the Torah and the cultic system of the desert tabernacle that it portrays. The cultic language, could, in some secondary fashion, allude to contemporary practice, but it need not." The question of the implications of this for the Temple will be addressed below in section 5.4.

[59] Attridge 1989:183, "[i]n the process there sounds a theme that will be of crucial significance in interpreting Christ's sacrificial death, his entry "through the veil" into the heavenly sanctuary. This allusion prepares for the renewed references to Christ's High Priesthood that will formally close the pericope."

emerge.[60] While the nature of this sanctuary is not yet clear, central to Christ's task as high priest is not only to enter the inner sanctum, but also to be a "forerunner" (πρόδρομος), providing a means of access for the believer as well.

The theme of approaching God is revisited in 7.18-20:

> ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές – οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος - ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος δι᾽ ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ. Καὶ καθ᾽ ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς.

Once more, the high priesthood of Christ brings a "better hope", not only accomplishing his own access to God, but also offering it to others. However, here it becomes clear that the former means of access, as provided by Aaronic priests and proscribed by the law, is deemed inadequate. Later in the text there is a direct correlation presented between attaining access to God and having the conscience (συνείδησις) perfected (cf. 9.9, 14). The law is considered unable to accomplish this (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος) because it is "weak and ineffectual" (ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές). Furthermore, an abrogation (ἀθέτησις) of this former measure is required to make way for newer and more effective strategies. Attridge notes that "[t]he critique is more radical than Paul's remarks in Rom 7:14, where the Law itself is seen to be spiritual."[61] This is the first suggestion that the law and cult are not merely insufficient in obtaining access but have also become a hindrance to that end.

The architecture, ornaments and activities of earthly tent receive description in chapters 8 and 9. From the outset in 8.2, this earthly structure itself is subordinated. Jesus is described as "a minister in the sanctuary (τῶν ἁγίων) and the true tent (τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς

---

[60] Koester 2001:330 notes that the term καταπέτασμα is consistenly used in the LXX of the inner veil in the tent and temple and only rarely of the outer. Cf. Cockerill 2012:291, Filtvedt 2015:147

[61] Attridge 1989:204.

ἀληθινῆς) that the Lord, and not any mortal has set up (ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος.)." The terms "true" and made "not by humans" are clearly pejorative and, at first blush, the author of Hebrews appears to be claiming that the earthly tent is false or perhaps even idolatrous. However, the contrast is between temporal and eternal, type and archetype. So Ribbens:

> The identification of the heavenly sanctuary as (true) does not mean that the earthly sanctuary was false, but it identifies the heavenly sanctuary as abiding, original, and ideal as opposed to the temporary earthly sanctuary [...][62]

This language is clarified in 8.5, where the tent pattern provided to Moses serves as a "sketch and shadow" (ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ) of the heavenly tent. Although bearing some apocalyptic and Platonic overtones, this concept is drawn primarily from Exod 25.40.[63] While it is unclear whether Exodus understood this τύπος as a heavenly tent as opposed to simply a blueprint,[64] the author of Hebrews is certainly referring to what he believes to be a metaphysical reality, an existing structure in the heavenly realm from which the earthly tent is conceptually derived. The tent constructed according to the law corresponds to and prefigures the heavenly reality, yet its inferiority to said reality is firmly established.[65]

In 9.8 the earthly tent is revealed explicitly to be not only inferior, but essentially an impediment to approaching God: τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν. The τοῦτο at

---

[62] Ribbens 2016:103. Cf. Koester 2001:376.
[63] Ribbens 2016:111-112 argues that the terms are being used to denote correspondence and a vertical relationship but are not found as technical Platonic terms.
[64] Attridge 1989:220.
[65] Koester 2001:377, "[i]n a positive sense God provided Moses with the pattern of the sanctuary so that the earthly tent was the counterpart to the heavenly one, but in a negative sense the earthly tent was transient and limited in its benefits."

the beginning of the verse refers to the continual ministry of the priests and high priest (vv.6-7). These previous verses pose the problem of access: regular priests could only visit the first tent while the high priest could once a year visit the second, but only with an offering of blood for the unintentional sins of himself and the people. There is debate whether the "first tent" is a spatial reference, similar to v.6, denoting the outer tent, or a temporal reference signifying the earthly tent. The former interpretation offers continuity with the early verse and is perhaps preferable,[66] though the issue of the outer tent could stand as a synecdoche for the problem of the earthly tent as a whole. The role of the Holy Spirit disclosing this problem, suggests that this architectural set up has a deeper meaning.[67] Indeed, in v.9 the first tent is a "symbol of the present time" (ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα). Thus the problem of the outer tent represents the soteriological plight of the lack of access to God and the futility of the former means of access. Attridge writes, "[t]he access that the high priest has to the sacred realm does not signify openness, but is only, as it were, the exception that proves the rule."[68] However, it is unclear to what extent God can be accessed in the earthly tent even by the high priest, since when Christ acts as high priest he enters "the greater and perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation)" (9.11) and "into heaven itself" (9.24).

---

[66] Attridge 1989:240.
[67] Attridge 1989:240.
[68] Attridge 1989:240.

The first tent, however, is not simply symbolic; it also functions as an obstruction, preventing access while it "has standing". The phrase ἐχούσης στάσιν, can point literally to the structure's physical existent, or to its normative function.[69] Filtvedt concludes:

> Hebrews 9:8 seems to indicate, in other words, that the existence of a valid cult conducted in the first tent precludes access to the heavenly sanctuary, and since access to the heavenly sanctuary has now been provided, it follows logically that the cult in the first tent has lost its validity."[70]

It is unclear that this statement invalidates the earthly tent in the suggestion that it was never prescribed or authorized by God. It does, however, seem to suggest that the tent was always meant to point to and be replaced by something superior and that the cult conducted within such a sanctuary is no longer required or desirable.

The themes assembled around the idea of the tent culminate in 10.19-25, the first two verses reading:

> Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

Here, with the οὖν, the argument shifts from the larger expository section of 7.1-10.18 to exhortation.[71] The passage picks the theme first presented in 6.19-20, the hope of access to God (εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων). This hope has turned in 10.19 into confidence (παρρησίαν). Jesus's forerunning has been fulfilled as access is now available. This availability is made possible not only by Jesus' prior entry but also by his blood (see 3.3). This εἴσοδος is described as a "new and living way" (ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν), the unprecedented access that is denied in 9.8. The term used for Jesus' act of providing this

---

[69] Attridge 1989:240 So Koester 2001:397: "Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary means that the first covenant and its sanctuary no longer have normative "standing" among the people of God."
[70] Filtvedt 2015.
[71] Filtvedt 2015:145.

access is ἐγκαινίζω. This can mean to "open" but also to "dedicate", and to "renew", as the term is also used of the covenant in 9.18, and is καινός cognate.[72]

The phrase that follows is more difficult to parse. Both τοῦ καταπετάσματος and τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ are governed by διά. The question is whether the διά has the same sense in both instances. If both are taken locatively, Jesus' flesh is an appositive explanation of the curtain, the thing which needs to be opened up and passed through.[73] However, if διά is taken as locative in the first case but as instrumental in the second, his flesh becomes the means by which the curtain is opened and pass through. The second option seems to have more merit, as διά… τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ in v.20 should be paralleled with ἐν τῷ αἵματι in v.19.[74] Jesus passing through the curtain into the inner sanctuary of the tent, enabling believers to do so as well, provides the fundamental structure for how Hebrews understands the work of Christ and the new covenant.

What we find in Hebrews' depiction of the tent is certainly more intricate and comprehensive than anything in Paul's Temple metaphors. We have noted that Hebrews contains no Temple metaphors, but we might also argue that it contains no tent metaphors either. While it could be argued that the author is merely metaphorically conceptualizing heaven or the means of access to heaven as a tent, his discussion of the earthly tent as a blueprint for the heavenly indicates that the author is not simply mapping a conceptual and linguistic structure onto an abstract idea but is discussing an actual metaphysical and

---

[72] Koester 2001:443 Cf. Heb 8.8, 13; 9.15 for the use of καινός with διαθήκη.
[73] Attridge 1989:285-287.
[74] Koester 2001:443-444.

apocalyptic reality.[75] For Hebrews there exists a heavenly structure, a not uncommon view in Second Temple and post 70-CE Judaism.

The concept of a heavenly tent or Temple is not found explicitly in Paul. In 2 Cor 5.1-5, Paul speaks of having an "earthly tent" (ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους) that is destroyed and of receiving from God, "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). Paul uses an eschatological scheme similar to Hebrews, but again uses it metaphorically to describe the experience of the resurrection body. In terms of Pauline eschatology, Paul does speak of "the Jerusalem above" (ἡ… ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ) in his allegory in Gal 4.21ff,[76] he can speak of "our citizenship" being in heaven (τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς) in Phil 3.20-21,[77] and that "out of Zion the Deliverer will come" (ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος) in Rom 11.26.[78] But it is never clear if the Temple plays a part in this apocalyptic scheme and these eschatological ruminations are never connected to his Temple metaphors.[79] It is possible to interpret

---

[75] So Hooker 2009:202: "[t]he language is that of apocalyptic: the heavenly realities represent the true world, which already exists, since it is eternal, even though it will remain hidden until Christ appears a second time."

[76] Cf. Dunn 1993:253, "[h]ere Paul clearly had in mind the strand of apocalyptic thought which presumed that there was a heavenly Jerusalem, that is, an ideal form of Jerusalem in the purpose of God, waiting, as it were, in heaven to be revealed at the end of time, when God's purpose would be completely fulfilled."

[77] Cf. Bockmuehl 1998:235, "[a]s elsewhere in the NT, to affirm a present stake in the Messianic kingdom does not rule out one's expectation of its future coming. The notion of the Saviour and his commonwealth coming from heaven may in this respect be comparable to the apocalyptic belief in a future descent to earth of the new Jerusalem."

[78] Cf. Jewett 2007:704, "Zion in this citation appears to be identical with the heavenly Jerusalem ('Jerusalem above' in Gal. 4.26), the place from which Christ originated and was expected to descend at the parousia."

[79] Rev. 21.22 is evidence that one can speak of a New and Heavenly Jerusalem that contains no Temple.

Paul's Temple metaphors in 1 Cor 3.16 and 2 Cor 6.14-7.1 through this apocalyptic lens, but we have seen this is problematic and by no means the necessary interpretation.[80]

There is also a marked difference in emphasis and function between Hebrews' depiction of the tent and Paul's Temple metaphors. For Paul, the domain of the Temple is mapped onto the community to conceptualize and identify the *location* of the presence of God. The Temple of God is constituted by his indwelling Holy Spirit in the midst of the community. For Hebrews, the presence of God does not ultimately lie in the earthly tent, or even on earth but in heaven. Indeed, Hebrews is largely silent on the presence and work of the Spirit.[81] The emphasis here, then, is not on the reality of the presence of God but on the mechanisms of attaining *access* to that presence which is in heaven. The closest a Pauline text comes to this within a cultic scheme is Eph. 2.14, 18, where the "dividing wall" (τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ) is destroyed and through Jesus both Jews and gentiles have "access" (προσαγωγή) to God. However, the piece of Temple architecture discussed is different (the dividing wall of the court of gentiles rather than the veil) and the aim is not primarily the means of accessing God's presence but the reconciliation of Jew and gentile in the worship of God, a subject for which the author of Hebrews shows no concern. In general terms, Hebrews' discussion of the tent is primarily soteriological while the metaphors of the Temple in Paul are ethical and communal.[82]

Hebrews and Paul use different concepts (tent and Temple) to conceptualize different ideas (heaven and community) to different ends (access to God and the presence

---

[80] Cf. in particular McKelvey 1969.
[81] Miller 2005:262.
[82] Though we have noted that in Heb 9.14 and 10.25, the aim of Christ's atoning action is to form a worshiping community that meets together, not entirely unlike Paul's argument for unity in 1 Cor 3.

of God). Furthermore, with the metaphysical mapping that the author of Hebrews has drawn, it is difficult to imagine how he could conceptualize anything, let alone a group of people, as a tent or Temple. Thus, Hebrews and Paul here appear conceptually divergent. However, Paul's silence on the heavenly Temple presents a gap which Hebrews could possibly be seen to fill. Indeed, since their discussions of tent and Temple cover such different ground conceptually, they could perhaps be seen a complementary or at least supplementary, rather than as outright contradictory.

5.3.3. Sacrifice in Hebrews - Once for All

For the author of Hebrews the death of Christ and its benefits are fundamentally understood as a sacrifice. According to 9.26b, "he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself." As with the tent, sacrifice is not merely a means of conceptualizing the death of Christ, but defines and identifies the act *in toto*.[83] The author is thus required to outline the mechanics of sacrificial efficacy in order to explicate the mechanics of Christ's death.

The primary sacrificial pattern that Hebrews employs, as noted, is drawn from the Day of Atonement. The atoning function of sacrifice is introduced in 2.17, where Jesus makes "a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of his people" (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ).[84] This model is expanded upon in the depiction of Christ as high priest. The author notes that the high priest who goes into the second tent once a year

---

[83] Finlan 2011:92 attempts to capture this when he states "[t]he approach to God is not just pictured as sacrifice; it is understood in sacrificial terms… The cultic principle governs the author's interpretation of what Christ did…"

[84] The verb ἱλάσκεσθαι appears only in Luke 18.13 in the NT, where it means, "to be merciful". Regarding its meaning here "[i]n Hebrews, Christ's sacrifice is always directed at removing sin and its effects, not at propitiating God." Attridge 1989:96 n.192. Cf. Filtvedt 2015:207.

"not without taking the blood that he offers for himself and for the sins committed unintentionally by the people" (9.7). The various effects of sacrifice are outlined in the remainder of the chapter. The blood of sacrifice sanctifies (ἁγιάζω) and results in the purification of flesh from defilement (πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα) in 9.13. The inauguration of the covenant requires the blood of sacrifice (ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται) in 9.18. Finally, the blood of sacrifice is required for the forgiveness of sins in 9.22 (χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις). These elements of animal sacrifice structure the author's understanding of the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and his blood as purifying, inaugurating, and atoning.

However, we see in 9.14 that Christ's blood is infinitely more efficacious than regular animal sacrifice (πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ…). As with the earthly tent, animal sacrifice is an inferior pattern of heavenly sacrifice: "[t]hus it was necessary for the sketches of the heavenly things (τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις) to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves need better sacrifices than these" (9.23). The elevation of the sacrifice of Christ, its metaphysical and soteriological superiority, results in the depreciation of animal sacrifice to that extent that it is ultimately revealed as ineffective. While animal sacrifice can purify defiled flesh, the gifts and sacrifices that priests bring are not able "to perfect the conscience of the worshipper" (μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα), precisely what Christ' blood effects in 9.14 (καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι) which enables us to approach God (cf. 10.22).[85]

---

[85] Filtvedt 2015:148, "[j]ust as external cleaning would have been a prerequisite for entering the Temple in Jerusalem, the author seems to argue that internal cleansing is also necessary, when approaching God in his heavenly sanctuary."

The most radical statement regarding the efficacy of animals sacrifice appears in 10.4: "it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins".[86] The author of Hebrews supports this comment with citations from Psalm 40(39).7-9, a *locus classicus* of the prophetic critique of cult. However, this statement goes well beyond those as "prophetic criticism never called for or led to the cessation of properly performed sacrifice."[87] This principle is also observable and exemplified by the required repetition of sacrifices; if sacrifice were truly effective it would not bear repeating (cf. 10.11).[88] This leads into and highlights the fundamental characteristic of Christ's sacrifice and secures the invalidity of the earthly cultic system: "[b]ut as it is, he has appeared once for all (ἅπαξ) at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9.26, cf. 10.10,12,13). The efficaciousness of Christ's sacrifice, its eternal and universal application is demonstrated by its singularity. It is worth noting that even in heavenly sacrifice, blood as an empirical substance is still required for the forgiveness along the lines of 9.22.[89]

This once for all sacrifice has two clear consequences for the author of Hebrews. First, "there is no longer any need for another sacrifice".[90] We observed in 7.18-19a that there was an "abrogation" (ἀθέτησις) of the earlier commandment, regarding priestly

---

[86] Filtvedt 2015:158, "Hebrews' most radical point is not the rejection of the sacrifice in general, but its rejection of sacrifices prescribed in the Law."
[87] Ribbens 2016:234. See also Thompson 1982:109, such a "radical rejection of an earthly cult is at a considerable distance from the prophetic critic of the cult, for there is no evidence that the prophets ever rejected the Jerusalem cultus entirely." Again Filtvedt 2015:164-165, "none of these texts make a definitive argument for the necessity of abolishing all animal sacrifices, as is done in Hebrews."
[88] Moore 2015:210 is right to note that "repetition did not alter the effect of the sacrifice. Instead, repetition draws attention to an inefficacy whose cause lies elsewhere." Repetition here then is a symptom of the inefficacy of the atoning function of sacrifice, not the cause of it.
[89] Ribbens 2016:234. It is along these lines that the author becomes contradictory according to Wedderburn 2005:401-404.
[90] Ribbens 2016:239.

descent, because the "law made nothing perfect" (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος). This is applied specifically to continual sacrifices in 10.9 where Christ "abolishes (ἀναιρεῖ) the first in order to establish the second."[91] Just as access to God was impossible while the first tent had a standing (ἐχούσης στάσιν) so Christ's sacrifice and the offerings for sin prescribed in the law, the first order (ὸ πρῶτον… στήσῃ), "mutually exclude one another."[92] Second, the sacrifice of Christ is so efficacious and singular and the author of Hebrews invective against repeating sacrifices so fierce, that for those who continue to sin "there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins" (10.26; cf. 6.4-8).[93] A second repentance is impossible within the logic of Hebrews' sacrificial scheme as it would require a second, or repeated sacrificial act.

Although Hebrews' fundamental understanding of the death of Jesus and its effects is structured according to the sacrificial model, unlike with the tent, the author is able to conceptualize other activities sacrificially:

> Through him, then, let us continually offer a sacrifice of praise (ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως) to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God (τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός) (Heb. 13.15-16).

Here, the source domain of a sacrificial offering is constructed using the terms θυσία and ἀναφέρω and mapped onto a target domain of worshipful acts of praise, here confessing his name (ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.). We have already observed how widespread this sort of metaphorical construct was within Second Temple Judaism. What

---

[91] The verb ἀναιρέω here has the sense "annul" though more forcefully means "do away with" or kill" in other NT passages (Matt. 2.16; Lk. 22.2, 23.32, 2 Thess 2.8, Acts *passim*.), cf. Attridge 1989:275 n.98.
[92] Filtvedt 2015:160.
[93] Moore 2015:211, "[t]he utter and lasting effect of the atonement excludes any possibility of repetition, for repeating Christ's work could only be detrimental."

is worth noting is that while sacrifice is the singular model within which the death of Jesus is to be understood, the model itself is metaphorically applicable to other phenomena and not exclusive to Jesus's singular act.

It is in their discussions of sacrifice that Paul and Hebrews are perhaps at their most proximate, both conceptually and verbally. Both texts understand the death of Christ in terms of sacrifice. However, the undisputed Paulines never describe Christ as a θυσία.[94] 1 Cor 5.7 pictures him as a paschal lamb ἐτύθη, whereas Hebrews exclusively uses the noun form. In a related image, both authors speak of the efficacy of Christ's blood (Rom 3.25; 5.9; Heb 9.14, et al.). This sacrificial imagery is also connected in both texts to the idea that the law is unable to fulfill its ultimate purpose (Rom 8.3; Heb 10.4; 7.19). We have seen that Paul is also capable of conceptualizing rightly oriented human behavior as a pleasing sacrifice (Phil 4.18, cf. Heb 13.15-16).

Most notably, while most early Christian texts use Passover imagery to depict the death of Christ as we observe Paul doing in 1 Cor 5.7, which makes sense calendrically, Romans 3 and Hebrews stand out for their shared employment of Day of Atonement imagery. This could further suggest a similar destination and ethnic make up of the addressees of these two texts. In Rom 3.25, God puts Christ forward as a ἱλαστήριον. Though Christ is never described as a ἱλαστήριον in Hebrews,[95] in 2.17 he makes a sacrifice of atonement, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι, and since in Hebrews Christ is both priest and victim, he is both the subject and object of that verbal action. It is likely that this shared

---

[94] The only time θυσία is used of Christ in the Pauline corpus is Eph 5.2: καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.

[95] Heb. 9.5 also uses the term ἱλαστήριον, but here it clearly refers to the Mercy Seat.

imagery and the overlaps in other sacrificial images that strongly contributed to what led interpreters to believe Paul authored Hebrews.

There are, however, also some marked differences in the discussions of sacrifice. First, for Paul the image of sacrifice is a useful but undeveloped metaphor, whereas Hebrews explicates the mechanics of sacrifice from first principles and demonstrates how these comprehensively correspond to the death of Christ.[96] For Paul, primarily writing to gentiles who may not have had an intricate understanding of the Jewish sacrificial system, these particulars would have lacked argumentative or pedagogical force. Whereas the depths of detail to which the author of Hebrews plunges regarding the sacrificial system is one of the reasons it is believed he was writing for a Jewish audience.[97] Furthermore, for Paul sacrifice is *a* way in which to understand Christ's death and its benefits, for Hebrews it is *the* way to understand these. While Hebrews is capable of employing other metaphors, the sacrificial understanding of Christ's death is so intrinsic and necessary to the argument that it could be seen as the exclusive understanding of it. Indeed for Hebrews, Christ's death is not simply understood as a sacrifice, Christ's death *is* an actual sacrifice in that an actual victim was sacrificed by an actual priest in an existing sanctuary where actual blood needed to be shed. As with the tent there is an explicit metaphysical realism here. For Paul, the cultic interpretation of Jesus' death is one among many, and it may be argued is secondary to other interpretations, such as those conceptualized by legal metaphors.

---

[96] Finlan 2011:92 states, "[t]his is most unlike Paul, who never turns a sacrifical metaphor into a point-by-point allegory."

[97] Where Paul is the most detailed in his sacrificial metaphor is Romans 3, precisely where he might be addressing a mixed congregation.

As we have noted, Paul's sacrificial metaphors are allusive but ultimately elusive, as the apostle never fully maps out the intended correspondences created by his conceptualizations. With the apparent terminological and conceptual overlap in this domain, Hebrews provides a useful appendage to this thinking. By working out the sacrificial logic of atonement and relating it to the Jewish cult, Hebrews does what Paul does not and does so in close enough conceptual proximity to it could be viewed in continuity with and as a contribution to the apostle's metaphors.

5.3.4. The Great High Priest

At the heart of the Epistle to the Hebrews lies Christology, and the defining feature of that Christology is the understanding of Christ as the high priest. This understanding is inextricably linked with the text's depiction of the tent and sacrifice. The idea is introduced in concert with the concept of atonement in 2.17, and it is his role in entering the inner sanctum and making atonement that becomes the emphasis of the latter half of the text. The main function of the high priest is outlined in 5.1: "[e]very high priest chosen from among mortals is put in charge of things pertaining to God on their behalf, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." This follows an explanation of how Jesus as high priest is able to sympathize with human weakness (4.15). However, Jesus did not take this upon himself, but was appointed by God (5.5). The evidence for this comes from Ps 2.7, initially quoted in 1.5, and Ps 100(109).4. The first text connects Christ's priesthood with his sonship,[98] the second introduces the crucial concept of a high priest "according to the order of Melchizedek" (ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ). The Melchizedek

[98] Cf. Attridge 1989:146-147.

narrative from Gen. 14 is recounted in chapter 7 of Hebrews, and demonstrates that "lack of parentage, genealogy, and temporal limits are predicated of Melchizedek to evoke the character of the true High Priest."[99] In fact, once it has been established that Christ is a priest according to the order of Melchizedek in 5.5, the term "forever" (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) is attached to his priesthood a further five times (6.20; 7.3, 17, 20, 26). This title also stands as a direct criticism of and challenge to the levitical priesthood:

> Now if perfection had been attainable through the levitical priesthood—for the people received the law under this priesthood—what further need would there have been to speak of another priest arising according to the order of Melchizedek, rather than one according to the order of Aaron? (Heb. 7.11).

Once more, the cultic system and its administrators are unable to provide "perfection" (τελείωσις) and again something external to that system is required to fulfill its function.

Christ as the high priest also plays a role in the soteriological scheme we have discussed in the previous two sections. It is in his role of high priest that Christ "passed through the heavens" (4.14), as the "forerunner on our behalf" (6.20), who entered into the "greater and perfect tent" (9.11) and is "exalted above the heavens" (7.26) and now "seated at the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heavens" (8.1). His entry into the inner sanctum of the heavenly tent is contingent on his status as high priest. Similarly, his activity within this sanctum is also reliant on his priesthood. In Hebrews' plot, however, Christ functions as high priest and victim, as sacrificer and sacrifice: "[u]nlike the other high priests, he has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself." (Heb. 7.27, cf. 9.13, 26).

---

[99] Attridge 1989:192.

While there are some parallels between Paul's Christology and Hebrews (particularly Phil 2.6-11, Col 1.15-20 and Heb 1.5-14), the high priestly Christology of Hebrews is entirely absent in Paul. Paul is able to describe his own ministry as priestly (Rom 15.16) and makes comparisons with priests (1 Cor 9.13-14) but never is that role ascribed to Jesus. In fact, the logic of Rom 3.25 seems to suggest that it is God that offered Jesus as atoning sacrifice not Jesus himself. Hooker argues that Christ as high priest and victim is "only to put into sacrificial language an idea which Paul expresses in more traditional language by speaking of Christ 'giving himself."[100] While this may be the case, Paul never explores this Christological idea metaphorically, nor does he connect it with his other cultic metaphors. As for Hebrews, "[g]iven the role Jesus' priesthood plays in the world of Hebrews, it is difficult to imagine the writer of Hebrews using a priestly metaphor to describe the ministry of anyone other than Jesus."[101]

5.4. Cultic Criticism and Supersession in Hebrews

There is much debate regarding how best to understand Hebrews' depiction of and, in particular, its critique of the Jewish cult. Large parts of this debate are centered on a response to Wedderburn's provocative 2005 article, "Sawing off the Branches: Theologizing Dangerously *Ad Hebraeos*". Wedderburn suggests, regarding Hebrews, that "the argument of the author reaches conclusions which seem to undermine the foundations on which his argument has hitherto been based."[102] This "inherently self-subverting" tendency is found in Hebrews' Platonic spatial dichotomy and its cultic

---

[100] Hooker 2009:206.
[101] Miller 2005:261.
[102] Wedderburn 2005:393.

models. On the latter, Wedderburn argues "Hebrews seems to persist resolutely with cultic terminology even after it has, to all intents and purposes, dealt the cultic way of thought a *coup de grâce*."[103] Others have observed this as well. Eberhart argues that "the total denial of the validity of the Judean sacrificial cult in Heb 10:4 is inconsistent with Hebrews' own argument in 9.13. There the effectiveness of this cult is the foundation of the metaphor of Christ's sacrifice."[104] Similarly Finlan, "Hebrews may be inverting cultic principles, but the inversion still has a cultic shape."[105] He further praises and favours Paul's "spiritualization" for not falling into this trap.

Hays attempts to counter Wedderburn by suggesting that there is a "New Covenantalism" evident in Hebrews. Hays examines Hebrews' use of scripture to argue that the text is not supersessionist in the classic sense but envisions the restoration of Israel.[106] However, this restoration stance has one exclusion:

> When the old covenant is contrasted unfavorably to the new, the specific deficiency of the old is described exclusively in terms of the ancient sacrificial cult as a means of the atonement of sins.[107]

This is of course the crux of Wedderburn's argument, and Hays responds by appealing to Stanley Fish's concept of the "Self-Consuming Artifact", a text aimed at destabilizing the readers' own interpretative categories. In this way, Hebrews intends to lead the reader beyond its own rhetoric to an encounter with the living God.[108] This seems to trivialize the metaphysical and apocalyptic realism with which Hebrews discusses cultic categories

---

[103] Wedderburn 2005:409.
[104] Eberhart 2005:60.
[105] Finlan 2011:95.
[106] Hays 2009:162.
[107] Hays 2009:165.
[108] Skarsaune 2009:182 in his response to Hays suggests that for Hebrews perhaps the cultic system is a self-consuming artifact. This comes close to the view of Justin Martyr, who saw the cult as a compromise for Israel's idolatrous tendencies.

which are also inherent to its soteriological system and reduces them to merely linguistic strategies.

Ribbens similarly attempts to mitigate the implications of Hebrews' supersessionism. He argues that Hebrews' theology is not based on a malicious reading of the LXX nor is it self-contradictory. He states, "the author's message would not have been *rhetorically* effective if the author had handled the levitical sacrifices in an incompetent or expressly malevolent manner."[109] He argues that for the author of Hebrews, animal sacrifices, while not *ipso* facto atoning, are still efficacious through the promise of God and a prophetic and anticipatory typological model. He states, "[t]he levitical sacrifices, therefore, were external rituals linked to the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, and that efficacy was proleptically applied to the levitical sacrifices."[110] This is certainly a generous reading of Hebrews and maintains the text's conceptual coherence, but it is hard in light of texts such as 10.4 to see sacrifice as ever efficacious nor is this sacramental interpretation of sacrifices explicit in the text.

Filtvedt offers six propositions regarding the implications of Hebrews' cult criticism for the Jerusalem Temple which provide a useful summary of the points relevant to this discussion.[111] First, he suggests that discussion of the earthly tent and the conclusions drawn apply to the Jerusalem Temple. Second, and similarly, the Jerusalem Temple is the best and closest analogy to these discussions. These seem sensible as the Temple in Jerusalem was intended to stand in architectural and theological continuity with the tent. Third, if the Temple stood, the author would not have endorsed

---

[109] Ribbens 2016:228.
[110] Ribbens 2016:236.
[111] Filtvedt 2015:161-163.

participation in it. This is more controversial but seems to be explicit in in 9.8 and 10.9. In these cases the author of Hebrews seems to create a casual connection between the abrogation of the former to achieve the latter. As Hooker comments, "[if] Jewish Christians assume that it is necessary to go on repeating sacrifices, what are they implying about the sacrifice of Christ?"[112] Moore argues against this, appealing to 9.13 as evidence for a continuing external purifying function of sacrifice.[113] However, 9.14 seems to suggest that the blood of Christ produces the effects of animal sacrifice superlatively, by purifying the conscience which allows for worship of the living God. The eschatological act of Christ entering the heavenly sanctuary as the high priest and sacrificing himself has rendered the earthly cult and any participation in it unnecessary but, furthermore, these events are required by and contingent upon that cult's existing inefficacy.

Filtvedt's fourth proposition is that if the Temple had fallen, this event alone would not have accounted for the author's critique. He states, "[t]his critique is not *logically dependent on, nor adequately explained by, the fall of the Temple."*[114] This is true, in that there is no way to definitively demonstrate a post-70 CE date and thus it is possible to reconstruct the argument of Hebrews in a pre-70 CE setting. As mentioned earlier, if Hebrews is pre-70 CE, its critique is all the more startling not merely theologically, in suggesting the inefficaciousness of the Temple cult, but also politically in the de-legitimization of the high priest and the Jerusalem priestly caste.

---

[112] Hooker 2009:197.
[113] Moore 2015:211, "[n]otably, Hebrews never states that Christ's death and ascension provide external purity, a different kind of effect, and it is thus not implausible to suggest that the author thought the Levitical regulations still provided these (as seems to be assumed in Heb 9.13)."
[114] Filtvedt 2015:163.

To Filtvedt's fifth point, the author's argument implicitly precludes any legitimate attempt to rebuild the Temple. While this text contains no passage such as *Barn*. 16, which directly addresses rebuilding, the explicit non-necessity of an earthly cult is so well founded that Hebrews' eschatology argues against the reestablishment of a new one.

Sixth and finally, membership in God's people has been detached from a concrete earthly cultic shrine and implicitly from a concrete earthly land. One of the few pieces of evidence for the occasion of Hebrews is 10.25, which seems to suggest that the community addressed have not been meeting together (μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν). Filtvedt argues that when communal gathering is encouraged, it is "likely that the author has particularly in mind the assembly of his addressees as a *worshiping* community." [115] He argues that 9.11-14 is the soteriological and compositional center of Hebrews. The section ends with an infinitive of purpose laying out the aim of the Christ event, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι (9.14). Similarly in 12.28, the author encourages his audience that the appropriate response upon receiving the kingdom is to give thanks and to offer worship (ἔχωμεν χάριν δι᾽ ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους·). However, this worship is focused on Christ, not a geographical location or any shrine therein.[116]

So to return to this section's heading, is the Epistle to the Hebrews cultically supersessionist? Hays argues,

> The New Covenantalism of Hebrews is certainly not supersessionist in the classic sense that it replaces one religious system with a new stable religious system that allows readers to stand in a position of secure superiority.[117]

---

[115] Filtvedt 2015:181.
[116] Filtvedt 2015:185, "[t]he conception of worship found in Hebrews is fundamentally Christ-centered."
[117] Hays 2009:172.

Hays is certainly correct that there is no triumphalist anti-Jewish polemic or *verus* Israel lines of argument in Hebrews. However, following Filtvedt's six propositions, if there is a new covenant being offered to Jews in Hebrews, it is certainly one that does not include cultic worship at a sanctuary. The aims of the cultic system have been fulfilled, their functions replaced, and future participation in that system is not only no longer required but also prohibited. We are forced to conclude that while we can agree with Hays that Judaism may not have been superseded by Christianity, the need for a material cult has certainly been replaced by Christ and the Christ-event.[118] Hebrews' demonstration of superior realities inevitably de-legitimizes and precludes central forms of material worship whether or not such forms of worship are currently available.

Does this cultic supersession make Hebrews self-contradictory? Up to chapter 9, Eberhart comments,

> It may be pointed out that throughout this argumentation, the general validity of the cult has remained unquestioned. The soteriological concept of Christ's sacrifice and the purification it effects are developed in analogy to Levitical sacrifice, which means that the latter is taken for granted so that the validity of the earlier can be derived from it.[119]

This appears to change in chapter 10, particularly 10.4, where animal sacrifice is shown to be ineffective. However, the argument of Eberhart and Wedderburn may be challenged and that of Ribbens tweaked with some terminological clarification. Hebrews seems to uphold simultaneously the *validity* of the traditional Jewish cult, in that it was prescribed

---

[118] Nanos 2009:185, "if partaking of that system is still open to them and they are being told to abandon it as bankrupt because there is now a new and better way that makes that covenantal behavior obsolete or counter-faithful, then it would seem to represent a new religious movement, or if a Judaism still, then one that denies to all other Jewish practitioners the viability of their claims, that is, it represents supersessionism and replacement theology, if not of Jews by Gentiles, then of all other Jews by Christ-believing Jews."

[119] Eberhart 2005:59.

and authorized by God, while claiming that it was not soteriologically *effective*, in that it did not provide atonement for sins. Why would God prescribe a system that was ineffective? Ribbens seems correct here when he discusses the cult as pedagogical and prophetic, in that it laid out the model and logic of effective atonement, a priest shedding blood in the presence of God, and conceptually prepared for and foreshadowed the Christ event. However, in doing this it need not be "proleptically effective" or sacramental as the author makes clear, "it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (10.4). For the argument of Hebrews to be consistent, the sacrificial cult needs only to provide a valid logic of atonement that can structure the understanding of the death of Christ; it need not effect atonement itself.

5.5. Conclusion

This chapter examined how the historical association of Paul and Hebrews affects the hermeneutical horizon from which we understand the implications of Paul's Temple metaphors. While it is difficult to demonstrate that the epistles of Paul influenced the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is clear that Hebrews has influenced the interpretation of Paul. Despite no longer being attributed to Paul, this historical connection has resulted in the epistle's particular cultic scheme serving as an interpretive tool for the construal of Paul's Temple metaphors. We observed in the early history of reception, Hebrews was viewed as a useful appendage to the epistles and thought of Paul. Hebrews historically has filled the role of a supplement to the Pauline corpus, addressing the people (Jews) and the issues (the cultic system) which Paul himself does not. As result, Hebrews' unique depiction of the tent, sacrifice, and Christ as high priest are ascribed to Paul.

Earlier we observed that Paul's cultic metaphors are multivalent and discrete. He uses multiple source domains for the same target and the same source for multiple targets. His metaphors do not appear to represent set categories or modes of understanding. So Finlan, "[t]he source domains that Paul uses have less control over his message than does the single source domain that Hebrews uses."[120] Nor are these metaphors systematically interconnected. We saw this systematizing move being made in 1 Pet 2.4-10, where the domains of Temple, sacrifice, and priesthood are combined in a single metaphorical conceptualization. This type of interconnected cultic thinking infiltrates the argument of Hebrews at every level and is intrinsic to its logic and aims. Indeed, the text's concepts of tent, priesthood, and sacrifice are conceptually dependent on one another. This is, in part, due to the difference in reference. With Paul we can speak of linguistic conceptualization and metaphor; with Hebrews we have reference to existing realities beyond the scope of the earthly realm.

Finally, while we have observed that Hebrews' cultic discussions are largely theoretical, the author does comment directly on the institution and its efficacy, which we have also seen is lacking in Paul. Hebrews' depiction of the heavenly tent, Christ's sacrifice and high priesthood create a system of contingency, where the efficacy of the new is reliant on the inefficacy of the old. Thus the earthly tent is not the "true tent" (8.2) but merely a "sketch and shadow" (8.5) of the tent "not made by hands (8.2; 9.24) which is "heaven itself" (9.24). This is not merely inferior but stands as an obstacle to proper access to God (9.8). Similarly, heavenly things require "better sacrifices" (9.23). This is because the blood of animals cannot take away sins (10.4) and thus sacrifices are

---

[120] Finlan 2011:92.

repeated. Christ takes the role of the great high priest because of deficiencies with the levitical priesthood (7.11). This results in the abolishment of the first order to establish the second (10.9). Paul, while employing cultic concepts, never provides an appraisal of the Temple or its accompanying institution, let alone such a fundamental critique of them. Nor are the consequences of Paul's cultic metaphors for the Temple made explicit. With Paul, we are left to discern and reconstruct the implications of his cultic metaphors; not so with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

What is perhaps most remarkable at this point is how different the cultic discussions in Paul and Hebrews appear. While there is some conceptual overlap, they generally discuss different cultic institutions in different ways to different ends. While we have seen that there are not the kind of linguistic parallels or references with which we can make an argument for direct or indirect literary dependence, what begins to emerge is the reason why Hebrews could be viewed as a useful addition to the Pauline corpus. Particularly on cultic issues, Hebrews is seen addressing many of the theological gaps left by the apostle. Nowhere does the apostle address the efficacy of the Jewish cult; nowhere does he discuss the mechanics of sacrifice; nowhere is Christ's agency included in a cultic scheme. Whether or not this is how Paul himself would address these topics remains unknown. However, that early in their receptions the Pauline corpus and Hebrews were believed to have been composed by the same author indicates that both early interpreters recognized these gaps in Paul and that Hebrews was seen as consonant with and thus provides an interpretation of Paul. Therefore, it was possible in the second century to believe that Paul thought that Jewish sanctuary architecture prevented access

to God, that the blood of animals could not take away sins, that Jesus was the one true high priest.

Thus, Hebrews' acceptance as Pauline has utility for our study of the effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. Whether intentionally on the part of the author or implicitly in its reception, the epistle to the Hebrew provides a useful lens that directs our eyes towards and highlights the moves that Paul does not make in his extant works but how, in the mind of some interpreters, the apostle could have made them.

CHAPTER SIX:
EARLY EFFECTIVE-HISTORY OF PAUL'S TEMPLE METAPHORS (3):
THE *EPISTLE OF BARNABAS*

6.1. INTRODUCTION

This third and final case study on the *Epistle of Barnabas* continues our exploration into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors, the ways in which these metaphors could be interpreted and applied, and how these uses have affected our understanding of them. The aim of this chapter is to determine precisely *Barnabas'* view of the Temple and to what extent this view utilizes Paul's metaphorical structures. To this end, we address some preliminary contextual issues, the authorship, provenance, and, in particular, the date of *Barnabas*, which have direct impact on the text's agenda with regard to the Temple. We then attempt to reconstruct the role the Temple plays in the occasion and argument of *Barnabas* 1-16, whether it is simply an intermittent topic or a fundamental issue. Next, we examine the relationship between Paul and *Barnabas*, in contemporary discussion and in light of specific texts. Finally, we address the three Temple metaphors in *Barnabas*, 4.11, 6.15, and 16.10, to observe what role they play in the text's overall scheme, and to what extent they have been influenced by Paul. *Barnabas* offers one of the most polemical and radical interpretations of the Temple in Jerusalem in this early period of Christian history. While his Temple metaphors may be actualizations of unintended implications of Paul's conceptualizations, we will demonstrate that they are contingent on the reality of the destruction Temple. As such, *Barnabas* can be seen as a paradigm of the *spiritualization* model, which simultaneously demonstrates the unsuitability of this model for understanding Paul's Temple metaphors.

6.2. *THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS* – CONTEXTUAL ISSUES

6.2.1. Authorship

Despite its name, the *Epistle of Barnabas* is an anonymous document as there is no self-identification or internal attribution of authorship within the text. The first ascription of this text to Barnabas is by Clement of Alexandria, c. 200 CE, who is also the first author to show knowledge of the text.[1] This attribution is also found in manuscripts G and L and was generally accepted by later authors.[2] The general consensus in modern scholarship, however, is that the author is not Barnabas the companion of Paul. The document believed to be composed somewhere between the end of the first century and 130 CE suggests a date likely after the activity and death of Barnabas. Furthermore, the Barnabas presented to us in the New Testament is a Levite (Acts 4.36) who in the Antioch incident, as reported by Paul, was "led astray" by the hypocrisy of the envoy from James and by Cephas (Gal 2.13). It seems unlikely that such a figure could believe that the ritual law was never meant to be interpreted literally (*Barn.* 9.4), or that the Jewish people never possessed covenantal status (*Barn.* 4.7-8; 14.1-4). Finally, if the well-known apostle composed this document, the lack of self-identification or an appeal to his authority is unusual.

Perhaps the more interesting question for our purposes, though equally elusive, surrounds the author's religious/ethnic background, be it Jewish or gentile. This is also not clearly indicated internally. The early reception of the text and its ascription to Barnabas assumes a Jewish background. To support this, the author's use of Rabbinical

---

[1] Cf. *Strom*. 2.6.31; 2.7.35; 2.20.116; 5.10. Clement was also the first author to ascribe Hebrews to Paul (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.2). See section 5.2.1.

[2] Tertullian *Pud.* 20 quotes the 'epistolae Barnabae' clearly with reference to Hebrews. Cf. Carleton Paget 1994:5 n.12.

exegetical techniques in chapters 7 and 8 are cited as well as his knowledge of Jewish ritual.[3] There is a shared outlook with Jewish apocalyptic, particularly seen in the anti-Roman tone of 4.3-5, as well as the conceptualization of future hopes in terms of land (*Barn.* 6.8-19) and Temple (*Barn.* 4.11; 6.15; 16.1ff).[4] Finally, the presence of the Two Ways material in chapters 17-20 aligns with material found in other Jewish texts (4Q473) and the *Didache,* which are considered to be of Jewish provenance.

Cited against *Barnabas'* Jewish background are *Barn.* 14.5 and 16.7, particularly the latter: "before we believed in God […]". These lead Hvalvik to conclude that in these verses "we no doubt hear the voice of a former gentile."[5] Added to this is *Barnabas'* disregard for the literal meaning of the law and perceived anti-Judaism, particularly in his likening of the Jewish Temple to a pagan edifice (16.2). However, we have already seen that Philo knew of Jews who also disregarded the literal meaning of ritual (*Migr.* 89-93) and Carleton Paget notes that Barnabas' use of σχεδὸν, "almost" in 16.2 shows certain reluctance about the comparison.[6] Secure conclusions are difficult to reach. If *Barnabas* did in fact have a Jewish background, it is hard to comprehend how he would understand this background in light of his own covenantal theology. Was he formerly one of those who were "misguided" (16.1), who formerly believed the covenant was theirs (4.6)? Does this explain the vehemence of his critique? He never uses the word Jews, referring only to Israel, but his use of "they" and "them" certainly indicates a group of which he no longer feels a part.

---

[3] Carleton Paget 1994:7. Hvalvik 1996:44-43 argues that his knowledge of Jewish rites is faulty which points to a gentile provenance.
[4] On the apocalyptic outlook cf. 4 Ezra 11-1; *Sib. Or*. 5.403-33, cf. Horbury 1998:332. On the future hope see Carleton Paget 1994:8, Richardson and Shukster 1983:33-37.
[5] Hvalvik 1996:44.
[6] Carleton Paget 1994.

While the author remains unknown, the ascription to Barnabas has two important implications. First, by assigning the text to Barnabas, a companion of Paul, early interpreters placed the epistle and its thought in close proximity to Paul. This has weaker implications than the ascription of Hebrews to Paul, but still places *Barnabas* in a Pauline sphere. Second, the presence of and seeming familiarity with such cultic and legal material may have led to the ascription of the document to Barnabas the Levite in the first place.[7] Thus, the attribution of this epistle to *Barnabas*, suggests an early understanding of it as text associated with Paul, engaged in cultic issues.

6.2.2. Provenance

The identification of the provenance of *Barnabas* is equally mired in uncertainty. There is no explicit indication of where the document was composed or where it was intended to be circulated. *Barnabas*' earliest attestations arise in Egypt in the works of Clement and Origen. Clement cites it as a venerated text (*Strom*. 2.20.116) and Origen assumes his Alexandrian interlocutor Celsus has knowledge of it (*Cels.* 1.63).[8] Carleton Paget further suggests that the letter's attribution to Barnabas may be the result of the apostle's association with Alexandria where the text was well known.[9] The work's earliest manuscript attestation is in Codex Sinaiticus (ℵ), also of Egyptian provenance. Internal indications of an Alexandrian provenance are found in the author's use of the allegorical exegetical method, and Barnabas' interpretative proximity to Philo of Alexandria.[10] Finally, in his discussion of the ubiquity and insignificance of circumcision, Barnabas

[7] Windisch 1920:413.
[8] Carleton Paget 1994.
[9] Carleton Paget 1994:36.
[10] Carleton Paget 1994:37.

concludes, "why, even the Egyptians practice circumcision" (9.6). Whether or not this is an editorial addition to one of his sources, the singling out of Egypt is noteworthy. The cumulative effect of this makes a strong argument for Alexandrian provenance.

Hvalvik, however, cautions against a too specific or too certain ascription of provenance. He argues that allegorical methods are themselves not localized and *Barnabas'* use of such may explain his popularity in Alexandria, rather than his origin there.[11] Hvalvik further states that *Barnabas* is often at odds with Philo when discussing a specific text and favours something more in line with rabbinic or Qumranic interpretation. Equally, there are links with some Syria-Palestinian texts such as the Gospel of Matthew and the *Didache*. The presence of *Barnabas'* eschatological tone is not typical of Alexandrian theology,[12] and the Two Ways material must also give us pause.

The discussion of *Barnabas*' provenance edges us closer to the issue of the text's integrity and the author's use of sources. Perhaps this variation signifies that *Barnabas* is a patchwork composition of sources from different locations. Without denying Barnabas' use of sources, nor his editorial or authorial voice, we can agree in general with Hvalvik that "it is fairly certain that the epistle originated in the Greek-speaking Eastern part of the Mediterranean"[13] and yet also concur with Carleton Paget that an Alexandrian provenance in particular is at the very least "probable."[14] This general placement has implications for the documents dating, and thus the occasion with relation to the Temple.

---

[11] Hvalvik 1996:36-39.
[12] Hvalvik 1996:39.
[13] Hvalvik 1996:44.
[14] Carleton Paget 1994:42.

6.2.3. Date

The most contentious contextual issue for the *Barnabas* is the question of its date, as this may directly affect the interpretation of the text's occasion and purpose. Similarly, it becomes vital for our discussion of Temple metaphor. There is agreement that 16.4a "for because they went to war, it [the Temple] was torn down by their enemies" is a reference to the Jewish war and fall of Jerusalem.[15] This sets the *terminus a quo* at 70 CE. The document's first attestation, as mentioned, is Clement's *Stromata* providing a *terminus ad quem* of c. 200 CE. A further *terminus ad quem* is suggested and generally agreed upon due to the conspicuous absence of any reference to the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132-135 CE. While this is unmistakably *argumentum ad silentio*, the idea that *Barnabas*, who gains so much rhetorical and theological traction from the Roman victory in 70 CE and the destruction of the Temple, would remain silent on the colossal failure of this second revolt, the existence of Aelia Capitolina on the Jerusalem site, and the dashing of Jewish hopes of a rebuilt Temple, is considered almost universally incomprehensible.[16]

With our window of composition somewhat confidently set between 70-132 CE, further chronological specificity relies on the interpretation of two passages: *Barn.* 4.4-6a and 16.3-4. The first of these texts is the more obscure and should be understood in

---

[15] Robinson 1976:133 observes that Barnabas 16.4 "is noteworthy as the first Christian document explicitly to mention the fall of Jerusalem in the past tense."

[16] Schwartz 1992:151, "[T]here is no hint in the Epistle to indicate it was written after the revolt." Carleton Paget 1994:9, "[T]he absence of any mention of the second Jewish revolt, particularly in a document so tainted by an anti-Jewish spirit, indicates a terminus ad quem of about 130 c.e." Hvalvik 1996:23, "[s]ince Barnabas has no hints of the outbreak of the revolt, the most probable date for its writing is 130-132 CE." Rhodes 2004:80, "[s]ince Barnabas makes no clear reference to the Bar Kochba revolt (an event whose disastrous outcome he might be expected to exploit), the epistle is usually dated prior to the war."

terms of the interpretation of the second. Therefore, we begin our examination with 16.3-4.[17]

6.2.3.1. *Barnabas* 16.3-4

The crucial text for determining the date of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and, in many ways, the text's purpose as a whole, is 16.3-4:

> πέρας γέ τοι πάλιν λέγει· Ἰδού, οἱ καθελόντες τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, αὐτοὶ αὐτὸν οἰκοδομήσουσιν. γίνεται. διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθῃρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν.

This passage is built upon an interpretation of passages conflated from Isa 40.12, 66.1, and 49.17. There are two important text critical issues in this section. The γίνεται found at the beginning of v.4 is not found in older manuscripts such as א but is retained in the Latin version (L) as "fiet". Although only attested in later manuscripts, the γίνεται is compatible with the νῦν later in the verse. Richardson and Shukster followed by Carleton Paget also argue that it is the harder reading and is more easily understood as being subsequently dropped by scribes, rather than added, because the building was no longer underway.[18] Thus the γίνεται is generally retained in critical editions and translated as "this is happening (now)". Next, in א there is a second καί following the αὐτοί in v.4. This significantly changes the meaning of the verse as the αὐτοί no longer emphasizes the οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται but refers to a separate group, "they themselves *and* the servants of their enemies". The conjunction found in our earliest manuscript א, is omitted by H,V,

---

[17] This procedure does not predispose one to a particular conclusion. It is followed by Richardson and Shukster and Hvalvik who come to different datings. Cf. Richardson and Shukster 1983:31-37, Hvalvik 1996:17-18.

[18] Richardson and Shukster 1983:35 n.10, Carleton Paget 1994.

and L. Since the time of Harnack, the second καί has been left out, as he saw it as clumsy and unnecessary modification to the Isaiah passage.[19] The word is retained by Carleton Paget who sees it as the harder reading.[20] As we will see, the retention of the καί certainly favours a particular interpretation and dating of the passage, where the Jews and the Romans are pictured as building the Temple. However, its presence or absence is not necessary to any one position.

We have already commented that the event referred to in v.4 is almost assuredly the Jewish war and destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE. The crux of the interpretation of the passage lies in identifying the αὐτόν, which, at the end of v.4, is being "rebuilt" (ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν). Does this pronoun refer to the πνευματικὸς ναός of v.11, a different temple entirely, or does it refer back to the τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον in v.3?

The view of Lightfoot, followed by Prigent and others, that *Barnabas* here is referring to a rebuilt "spiritual temple" has little support and tends to be rejected on exegetical grounds.[21] It is clear that the reference in 16.1, 4a, and 5 are physical Temples. One might expect the author to denote a clear change of reference in v.3 and 4b if that were his intention.[22] Carleton Paget notes that when Barnabas does begin to discuss the spiritual Temple he introduces it with an emphatic δέ indicating a change of subject.[23] This reading also suggests that the οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται are Christians, an unnatural and tendentious interpretation.[24] Rhodes' conclusion on this is apt:

---

[19] Harnack 1897/1958:424ff.
[20] Carleton Paget 1994:18-19.
[21] Lightfoot 1890, Prigent and Kraft 1971, Prigent 1961.
[22] Hvalvik 1996:19.
[23] Carleton Paget 1994:19.
[24] Richardson and Shukster 1983:34, Rhodes 2004:75.

> Barnabas's theological agenda ultimately aims at the spiritualization of the temple, an aim he accomplishes in 16:6-10. This does not, however, preclude the possibility that some historical circumstance has provoked him to frame his argument as a contrast not simply between physical and spiritual temples, but between the temple's *destruction* and *rebuilding.*[25]

The majority position, espoused by Hvalvik and Rhodes among others, is that the reference here is to Hadrian's construction of the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the Jerusalem site as part of his founding of the colony Aelia Capitolina.[26] This would place *Barnabas* c. 130 CE. This view favours the report of Dio Cassius over Eusebius that the construction Aelia Capitolina was the cause of the Bar Kokhba revolt not a punitive measure taken after the conclusion of the war.[27] In this view, the οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται are simply the Romans building a temple. For Hvalvik this is indeed the only historical possibility for a temple building in which the Romans were involved.[28] This also does full justice to the γίνεται as this as a project presently occurring not simply in the future. The ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν is then to be read *ironically* upon seeing the disjunction between the reference τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον and αὐτόν. Since the Jews "consecrated him in the Temple almost like the Gentiles do" (16.2), the building of a pagan sanctuary on the Jerusalem site paradoxically fulfills the Jewish hope. Not only is the Jewish Temple similar to its pagan counterparts, it is being rebuilt as one.

---

[25] Rhodes 2004:75-76.

[26] Cf. Harnack 1897/1958:410-418, Schwartz 1992:151.

[27] "At Jerusalem he founded a city in place of the one which had been razed to the ground, naming it Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of the god he raised a new temple to Jupiter. This brought on a war of no slight importance nor of brief duration […]" (Dio, *Hist.* 69.12.1). "Thus when the city came to be bereft of the nation of the Jews, and its ancient inhabitants had completely perished, it was colonized by foreigners, and the Roman city which afterwards arose changed its name, and in honour of the reigning emperor Aelius Hadrian was called Aelia." (*Hist. eccl.* 6.6)

[28] Hvalvik 1996:21, "[w]e thus have to look for a temple-building where the Romans were involved. And that leaves us with only one possibility: the building of the Jupiter-temple in Hadrian's Aelia Capitolina."

This position, often taken as standard, is not without its issues. First, it is premised on prioritizing Dio's account over Eusebius'. Hvalvik addresses this issue by appeal to Smallwood's position that "[t]he two authorities can be combined without difficulty by supposing that Dio records the inception of the plan and Eusebius its fulfillment."[29] It is however, difficult to see with historical certainty what exactly would have been initiated before the revolt. If this is referring to a planned construction, this may undercut the strength of γίνεται as referring to something occurring presently, which exposes the over-certainty which commentators possess when they refer to the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus as the only historically concrete possibility. It is also unclear why *Barnabas,* in describing Hadrian's plans, would portray this as a "rebuilding" (ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν). This ironic reading of the verb asks a lot of his potential readers who, while likely at some distance from Palestine, would not only need to know of the plans for the Jupiter temple construction but also interpret the unintuitive meaning of ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν as well as the change in referent between τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον and αὐτόν. Would not Barnabas want to make explicit this immense embarrassment and sacrilege? Indeed the brevity and sublety of the reference here more likely indicates the author's own discomfort with what is occurring. While Barnabas does seem to associate the Jerusalem Temple with pagan temples, as we have said, the σχεδόν in v.2 betrays that he is not fully comfortable with a direct identification either. Furthermore, if the reference is to a pagan temple being constructed, the presence and purpose of *Barnabas'* invective against cultic activity in chapters 2, 7, and 8 becomes harder to explain.

---

[29] Smallwood 1976:433. Cf. Hvalvik 1996:23 Others have noted the possibility that the plans preceded the revolt, cf. Grabbe 1992:569-75, Goodman 2008.

Thus, the position that *Barnabas* here is referring to the building of a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus is not historically definitive nor is it a natural reading of the text. Furthermore, this pre-revolt dating relies on the virtual consensus surrounding the *Barnabas'* silence about Bar Kokhba revolt itself, as the revolt's failure would provide a further and immediate explanation of the Jews' failed hopes. However, it is unclear why this consensus argument does not apply, *mutatis mutandis,* to an event recorded by Eusebius, which precedes the Bar Kokhba revolt by thirteen years:

> In the course of the eighteenth year of the reign of the Emperor a rebellion of the Jews broke out and destroyed a great multitude of them. For both in Alexandria and the rest of Egypt and especially in Cyrene, as though they had been seized by some terrible spirit of rebellion, they rushed into sedition against their fellow Greek citizens, and increasing the scope of the rebellion in the following year started a great war while Lupus was governor of all Egypt. In the first engagement they happened to overcome the Greeks, who fled to Alexandria and captured and killed the Jews in the city, but though thus losing the help of the townsmen, the Jews of Cyrene continued to plunder the country of Egypt and to ravage the districts in it under their leader Lucuas. The Emperor sent against them Marcius Turbo with land and sea forces including cavalry. He waged war vigorously against them in many battles for a considerable time and killed many thousands of Jews, not only those of Cyrene but also those of Egypt who rallied to Lucuas, their king. The Emperor suspected that the Jews in Mesopotamia would also attack the inhabitants and ordered Lusius Quietus to clean them out of the province. He organized a force and murdered a great multitude of the Jews there, and for this reform was appointed governor of Judaea by the Emperor. The Greek authors who chronicle the same period have related this narrative in these very words (*Hist. eccl*. 4.2).[30]

While less is known about the revolt under Trajan, this should not diminish our understanding of its magnitude or significance. This is a conflict that arose among the Jews and their neighbors, perhaps under the name of particular leaders, with archaeological records showing that pagan temples were singled out and destroyed.[31] It appears to have spread across Egyptian and Cyrene and perhaps into Cyprus,

---

[30] Smallwood 1976:393, "The only writer to give anything approaching a complete account of the Jewish rising in N Africa is Eusebius[…]" See Dio *Hist.* 18.32.1-2 and Oros. 7.12.6-7; 7.27-6 for other supplemental accounts.

[31] Goodman 1992:34-35. Applebaum 1979:269-285, Lüderitz 1983:nos. 17-25.

Mesopotamia, and Palestine to the extent that Trajan was forced to send Q. Marcus Turbo, his foremost general in Parthia, where the Emperor himself was currently campaigning, to put it down.[32] This resulted in massive losses on both sides, though particularly on the Jewish side. Appian records that Trajan "exterminated" the Jewish race in Egypt (*Bella Civilia* 2.90) and Arrian that Trajan was determined 'to destroy the nation entirely, but if not, at least to crush it and stop its presumptuous wickedness" (*Parthica*).[33]

If we do place *Barnabas* in the Roman East in 130 CE, we must surely ask why a conflict of this severity, with a conceivably religious or cultic motivation, resulting in lasting and devastating consequences for the Jews, which happened in close geographical and temporal proximity to our author's composition, makes no mark on *Barnabas'* account. The *argumentum ex silentio,* which securely places *Barnabas* before the Bar Kokhba Revolt, cannot account for its silence about the Trajanic Revolt thirteen years earlier. Thus this argument cuts both ways for the Hadrianic dating and possibly suggests for *Barnabas* a further *terminus ad quem* of 115 CE.

The Hadrianic dating, in many ways, is an argument from the impossibility of the contrary, that there is no historical candidate for this reference other than the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus. However, a third position suggests that 16.4 refers to the renewed Jewish hope in a rebuilt Jerusalem Temple during the reign of Nerva, 96-98 CE.[34] This provides the most straightforward reading, as τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον and αὐτόν retain the same referent; the Jerusalem Temple, destroyed in the war of 70 CE, is now being rebuilt. This

---

[32] Smallwood 1976:393.
[33] Stern 1980:152.
[34] Richardson and Shukster 1983:35, Carleton Paget 1994:28, Horbury 2014:303.

also allows for a plain reading of ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν, since "rebuilding" *prima facie* denotes the building-again of the same structure. The οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται would be the Romans, which creates some tension because it is unclear why they would be rebuilding a Jewish sanctuary. This may explain our second textual variant. Carleton Paget wants to retain the second καί which would suggest a joint venture between the Jews and the Romans.[35] While we may argue against Carleton Paget for its inclusion on the grounds that it is the harder reading, the presence of the second καί in א certainly points to an early understanding of this passage as referring to a rebuilt Jewish Temple. Indeed the participation of the Romans can easily be read as the imperial assent and support of a rebuilt Jewish Temple which may also be reflected in Barnabas' negative view of the Empire.

Hvalvik counters this position arguing that γίνεται and νῦν, which are authorial additions to the Isaian text, do not make sense in the context of hopes for a rebuilt Temple.[36] However, *Barnabas* is expounding and applying a two stage prophecy: first the Temple is destroyed and then it is rebuilt. The interjection of γίνεται can easily be read as the commencement of the prophecy as a whole with the completion of its first stage, destruction. The νῦν linked with the future ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν signifies the imminent initiation of the second stage, rebuilding. Read in this light, there is no tension with *Barnabas'* temporal additions, in fact they seem to support the idea of a Temple not yet built but on the verge of being constructed.[37] Indeed, in this chapter *Barnabas* denigrates

---

[35] Carleton Paget 1994:18-19.
[36] Hvalvik 1996.
[37] One might argue that the Hadrianic position argues for a similar point simply replacing the Jewish hope for a rebuilt temple with the Roman plan for one. Thus this criticize applies to both positions but seems better accounted for by the Nervan solution.

the Jews, referred to here as "wretches", who are presently misguided (πλανώμενοι) precisely for having put their hope (ἤλπισαν) in the Temple. Chapter 16 as a whole seems to be aimed at challenging the Jewish hope in the Temple. *Barnabas*, as he does throughout, is undercutting a present claim by destabilizing its historical referent.

Taken as the most serious objection to the Nerva dating is the lack of concrete evidence for a renewed hope in the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple during his reign.[38] Often discussed in this context is the Rabbinic legend of Pappus and Lulianus founding Gen. Rab. 64.10, where the Roman מלכות ordered the Temple to be rebuilt.[39] While this narrative is certainly of note, as with many Rabbinic stories, its historical veracity is difficult to corroborate. More illuminating is Goodman's thesis of the political connection between the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and the Flavian dynasty we examined in CHAPTER TWO.[40] When Vespasian was acclaimed emperor, the requirements of imperial status and propaganda required him to have a military victory over a foreign people of which to boast, with Jerusalem being the most expedient candidate. This explains the hasty and costly final assault on Jerusalem by Titus in terms of the need for a swift publicity triumph.[41] The minting of *Iudaea Capta* coins and the imposition of the *fiscus Iudaicus,* the converted temple tax which funded the rebuilding of the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome, further emphasized the connection between the conquest of Judaea

---

[38] Of course, we are equally unsure about the plan to construct Aelia Capitolina before the Bar Kokhba revolt.
[39] Richardson and Shukster 1983:47. Horbury 2014:302-303.
[40] Goodman 1989, 1992, 2004, 2008. See our discussion of Goodman's position in section 2.2.6.
[41] Goodman 2004:16, "[t]he accident occured because Titus had chosen to capture Jerusalem not by the normal means of choking off supplies and waiting for surrender but by full scale assualt on the walls. The method was highly wasteful of Roman lives but it was justifiable in the eyes of Titus and his father Vesapsian by their urgent need for a propaganda coup."

and the imperial seat. Most importantly, this also had implications for the fate of the Jerusalem Temple.

> Once the Temple in Jerusalem had burned down, the new regime had little option but to portray the deed as desirable and heroic. In principle any temple could be rebuilt, but to allow rebuilding in this case would be hopelessly counter productive for the image of the new regime, since it would imply that the dynasty had begun with the sacrilegious desecration of an ancient sanctuary, hardly a propitious omen. Instead, Titus and Vespasian claimed the destruction as the brilliant culmination of their campaign, parading the Temple utensils in Titus' triumph and putting them on permanent display in the new temple of Pax.[42]

Domitian further endorsed this dynastic justification with the erection of the Arch of Titus, the reissuing the *Iudaea Capta* coins in 85 CE fifteen years after the fall of Jerusalem, and the collection of the Jewish tax *acerbissime* (Suet. *Dom*. 12.2).[43]

With the assassination of Domitian in 96 CE the Flavian dynasty came to an end. The newly appointed emperor Nerva "had nothing to gain by hostility to the Jews",[44] as his ascent was completely independent of the Jewish war. In 96 and 97 CE, perhaps in an attempt to distance himself from the perceived tyrannical Domitian, he minted a series of *aes* coins. These depicted a palm tree, a symbol often referring to Judaea, and stated *fisci iudaici calumnia sublata*. The precise meaning of this phrase is difficult to determine, but it suggests some remission of the economic burden placed on the Jews as punishment for their war with Rome. Goodman notes that the term *sublata* rather than the more standard *remissa* or *remisso* seems to indicate a more permanent repealing.[45] Indeed, as Richardson and Shukster put it:

> During the forty-seven years between the fall of Jerusalem and the death of Trajan there is only one historical event which might signal a change in Roman policy concerning the

---

[42]Goodman 2004:17 Cf. Jos. *War* 1.123-62.
[43] Goodman 1989:40.
[44] Goodman 2004:21.
[45] Goodman 2004:20.

> Jerusalem Temple: the alteration, during Nerva's reign, of the *fiscus Iudaicus*. The tax which symbolized the Roman government's dissatisfaction with the existence of the Jewish national cult is changed in some manner beneficial to the Jews.[46]

To support this, there are no receipts for the collection of this tax dated to the rule of Nerva.[47] Goodman further argues that this optimism about the possible rebuilding of the Temple is reflected in Josephus *C.Ap.* 2.193-198, where he asserts that the essence of Jewish worship lies in the *present tense* in the sacrificial rites in Jerusalem.[48]

This all changed in 98 CE with the death of Nerva and the ascent of Trajan. Trajan's father, Ulpinus Traianus, was a general in the Jewish War under Vespasian, and his accomplishments therein were a major factor of his son's adoption by Nerva. The new emperor Trajan responded to his adoption by deifying his biological father. In 98 CE, the *fiscus Iudaicus* was resumed. It is hard not to see a connection between the dashing of these hopes and the aforementioned conflict that arose in 115 CE:

> Suggestions that the timing was connected to Trajan's Parthian campaign are plausible, but for a deeper motivation it is unnecessary to postulate any reason for the Jews' despair beyond their continued deprivation of the sanctuary where they believed their God had chosen to be worshipped.[49]

This hope lost may be a good candidate for the "terrible spirit of rebellion" with which the Jews were seized as described by Eusebius as the cause for this outbreak. While there is no text that clearly and definitively articulates the hope for a rebuilt Temple under Nerva, a reconstruction of Roman-Jewish relations before and after, as well as the

---

[46] Richardson and Shukster 1983:47.
[47] Goodman refers to the ostraca from Edfu. Cf. Goodman 2004:20
[48] Goodman 2004:21 *C.Ap.* 193, 198b.
[49] Goodman 2004:26.

positive testimony of Josephus strongly suggest a context in which *Barnabas* 16.3-4a can be read and understood.

Thus the Nervan dating provides a more straightforward reading of the text. It allows for a single referent for ναός throughout the passage, not requiring the reader to identify an ironic and subtle second referent. It explains the temporal idea of a future building happening now. Its context can be reconstructed, predating the surprisingly unmentioned Trajan Revolt and in reference to the renewed hope in a rebuilt Temple following the demise of the Flavian dynasty.

6.2.3.2. *Barnabas* 4.4-6a

The second passage is notoriously obscure and comes from the eschatologically loaded chapter 4. Following the pronouncement of the presence of "the final stumbling block", *Barnabas* quotes from prophecy:

> λέγει δὲ οὕτως καὶ ὁ προφήτης · Βασιλεῖαι δέκα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς βασιλεύσουσιν, καὶ ἐξαναστήσεται ὄπισθεν αὐτῶν μικρὸς βασιλεύς, ὃς ταπεινώσει τρεῖς ὑφ᾽ ἓν τῶν βασιλειῶν. ὁμοίως περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λέγει Δανιήλ· Καὶ εἶδον τὸ τέταρτον θηρίον πονηρὸν καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ χαλεπώτερον παρὰ πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀνέτειλεν δέκα κέρατα, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μικρὸν κέρας παραφυάδιον, καὶ ὡς ἐταπείνωσεν ὑφ᾽ ἓν τρία τῶν μεγάλων κεράτων. Συνιέναι οὖν ὀφείλετε.

There are multiple issues for interpretation here. The passage cites Daniel twice, out of order (Dan. 7.24; Dan 7.7-8), seemingly ascribing the first citation to Enoch.[50] The wording here follows no known Greek version of Daniel 7.24 or 7.7-8. Additionally, this is one of the few OT citations which *Barnabas* himself does not elucidate for his readers, simply stating in 6a "and so you should understand". This in combination with his

[50] It is possible that by ὁ προφήτης means Daniel but if so it is odd that this is made explicit in the second citation.

seeming ignorance of the source and order of the text perhaps indicates his own incomprehension of what he cites and thus his use of a prior source here.[51]

His use of a source may also explain why there is no clear referent for the "small king" (μικρὸς βασιλεύς) or "little horn" (μικρὸν κέρας). As the βασιλεῖαι are generally taken to be emperors of Rome, one would imagine identifying this emperor is as simple as counting to ten.[52] However, arithmetic complications abound. First, do we begin counting with Julius Caesar or Augustus? Second, are Galba, Otho, and Vitellius all to be included? Third, does the emergence of the small horn ἐξ αὐτῶν mean he is to be counted among the ten or subsequent to them? Fourth, we need to identify an emperor who can fittingly be described as μικρός and a παραφυάδιον. Finally, does Barnabas' addition ὑφ' ἓν mean "with one blow", "at one time", or something else? Unfortunately, there is no single emperor who fits all of these conditions and any identification will favour some of these elements above others.

The two best candidates are the emperors Vespasian and Nerva.[53] Vespasian is the tenth emperor on the list if we count from Julius Caesar and ἐξ αὐτῶν is taken to be inclusive. The three emperors defeated ὑφ' ἓν would be Galba, Otho, and Vitellius from the year of four emperors (68-69 CE). However, Vespasian did not subdue Galba or Otho and in fact, saw himself as a successor to the former.[54] Richardson and Shukster also argue that as a general, Vespasian is not well suited to the title παραφυάδιον, according

---

[51] Richardson and Shukster 1983:39, Carleton Paget 1994:11, Hvalvik 1996:26.
[52] The emperors to be considered are: 1. Julius Caesar; 2. Augustus; 3. Tiberius; 4. Gaius Caligula; 5. Claudius; 6. Nero; 7. Galba; 8. Otho; 9. Vitellius; 10. Vespasian; 11. Titus; 12. Domitian; 13. Nerva; 14. Trajan; 15. Hadrian.
[53] Richardson and Shukster 1983:40.
[54] Hvalvik 1996:30 Cf. Tacitus, *Hist*. 4.40.

to Goodman however, his "origins were strikingly obscure compared with those of the Julio-Claudians… and his power had been gained by brutal civil strife."[55]

Unsurprisingly, Richardson and Shukster favour the Nerva identification. Nerva has the advantage of better fitting the term παραφυάδιον, as the unlikely and elderly successor of Domitian, and the three emperors he would have subdued ὑφ' ἓν become the Flavian dynasty: Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. However, the arithmetic is convoluted as one would need to begin with Augustus and skip Vitellius.[56] Furthermore, the dynastic interpretation of ὑφ' ἓν seems a stretch and certainly weaker than the Vespasian interpretation.

As Rhodes states, "Vespasian is by far the most probable candidate for the little horn when chap. 4 is read on its own terms." [57] Similarly, Hvalvik, who agrees with Rhodes, argues that *Barnabas* only loosely is connecting the text to his context.[58] Interestingly, both these scholars, who see the reference here as Vespasian, date *Barnabas* to the reign of Hadrian. Indeed, it is very difficult to see Hadrian himself as the reference of the little horn or how this would apply to Hadrian's reign in any way.[59] If this is a *testimonium* drawn from an earlier source, as *Barnabas'* ignorance of its many facets seems to indicate, then it is likely that he is appropriating a text originally intended to refer to Vespasian and applying it to his own period. Our focus then should turn not to

---

[55] Goodman 2004:16.
[56] Richardson and Shukster 1983:40, "[t]he number ten is not important to Barnabas… The figure 'ten' is simply carried over from Daniel as an introduction to Barnabas' development of 'three' and 'one'. The 'one' – the offshoot – is clearly the then present emperor who humiliates the previous three."
[57] Rhodes 2004:50.
[58] Hvalvik 1996:26, "[Barnabas] is eager to show that the end is at hand, but he is not concerned about the actual point of time. If he were, he would probably offer help in the interpretation of the texts which he quotes, but he does not do so."
[59] For an attempt at this see Barnard 1958. Cf. Hvalvik 1996:26.

the passage's original referent, but to its plausible use in *Barnabas*: why *Barnabas* thought these citations were *apropos*. From this perspective, it is very difficult to see how *Barnabas* would have thought these passages applied to Hadrian, indeed those who support the Hadrianic dating have to discard this text entirely as irrelevant.[60] What does seem more plausible is that *Barnabas*, taking a source he did not fully understand that originally referred to Vespasian, attempted to map it, albeit largely unsuccessfully, onto the next most fitting candidate Nerva and for obvious reasons left the intricacies of this mapping mostly unexplained. This is certainly speculative, but can explain the presence of this passage here in a way that the Hadrian dating cannot and fits with our interpretation of chapter 16 which remains the most important piece of evidence regarding the date of *Barnabas*.

In conclusion, the position that the *Epistle of Barnabas* was written during the reign of Nerva and in light of renewed hopes in the rebuilding of the Temple makes the best sense of the two passages in question, and, as we shall see the text as a whole.

6.3. The Issue of the Temple in the *Epistle of Barnabas*

The dating of the *Barnabas* greatly affects the reconstruction of the issue of the Temple within the text as a whole. Both Hvalvik and Rhodes date the text c. 130 CE, but for entirely different reasons; the former seeing the spread of Judaism as a real threat to *Barnabas*, and the latter seeing it as a Deuteronomic interpretation on the now sealed fate of Israel. For Hvalvik, because this text is written in 130 CE the Temple is not part of that threat: "[i]n fact there is nothing to indicate that the question concerning rebuilding of the

---

[60] Hvalvik 1996:26, "[b]e that as it may, with regard to our present interest, we have in any case to conclude that 4:3-6a has no bearing on the dating of Barnabas."

Temple was a burning issue for the author of *Barnabas*."[61] The discussion of the Temple is simply an additional proof for the error of the Jews.[62] Whereas for Rhodes:

> To begin by focusing on the legitimacy of the sacrificial cult and conclude by focusing on the temple itself is reason enough to affirm that the temple question forms a prominent aspect of the author's concern, quite apart from the significance one attaches to his other possible allusions to the temple.[63]

This concern, however, is a renewed reflection of Israel's national humiliation provoked by the building of the temple to Jupiter Capitolinus which is "due to a much larger pattern of continued failure to understand God' purposes, a history of failure stretching all the way back to Sinai."[64] In light of our discussion above, however, the urgent and defensive tone in *Barnabas* emphasized by Hvalvik and the recurring presence of the issue of Temple discussion together seem to make the most sense in light of the potential of the Jerusalem Temple and cultic system returning to existence.[65] Our aim here is to demonstrate how the issue of the Temple permeates *Barnabas* and attempt to reconstruct the context and agenda within which the author's Temple metaphors are actualized.

The first suggestion of a cultic concern comes in 1.7. Following the author's stated intent in v.5 to impart "perfect knowledge" (τελείαν… τὴν γνῶσιν) and grounding this in hope, righteousness, and love (1.6), he continues "[a]nd as we see that each and everything has happened just as he indicated, we should make a more abundant and exalted offering (προσάγειν) in awe of him" (1.7). We have seen that the fulfillment of

---

[61] Hvalvik 1996:25.
[62] Hvalvik 1996:235.
[63] Rhodes 2004:81.
[64] Rhodes 2004:83.
[65] Rhodes 2004:85 argues that "Hvalvik seems to think that the importance of the temple issue stands or falls with the question of whether 16:3-4 refers to a third Jewish temple, but this does not necessarily follow." While this is true, a third Jewish temple does provide a good explanation for *Barnabas'* continued reference to cult. So Carleton Paget 1994:25"[w]hy would B. choose to inveigh against sacrifice, warning his readers at 2.9 not to err like the Jews… but to make proper offering, if the issue of the temple was not in some positive sense significant."

prophecy is a significant and reoccurring thematic proof for *Barnabas* (cf. Isa 49.17 in *Barn*. 16.3). The right response to this prophetic fulfillment is conceptualized here as προσάγειν, often a technical term for sacrifice in the LXX. It is striking that the response to the fulfilled prophecy concerning the Temple in chapter 16 is to form a "spiritual Temple" and here the response to fulfilled prophecy in general is also a cultic act. This term is preceded by two comparatives, πλουσιώτερον and ὑψηλότερον, which could simply be a rhetorical flourish, but from the outset may indicate the beginnings of *Barnabas'* polemical intent and the suggested superiority of his position.

The continuation of cultic themes in *Barnabas* 2 strengthens the cultic interpretation of προσάγειν in 1.7.[66] Following in 2.1-3 what might be seen as an introduction to chapters 2-16,[67] *Barnabas* states his thesis for the section: "[f]or through all the prophets he has shown us that he has no need of sacrifices, whole burnt offerings, or regular offerings." Here echoing the words of the prophetic critique of cult found in the Hebrew bible, *Barnabas* structures this chapter around a catalogue of these passages: Isa 1.11-13; Jer 7.22; Zech 8.17; and Ps 51.17. Of particular interest are his interpretative interjections between each citation. Commenting upon Isa 1.11-13, he states:

> ταῦτα οὖν κατήργησεν, ἵνα ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὤν, μὴ ἀνθρωποποίητον ἔχῃ τὴν προσφοράν (*Barn.* 2.6).

This verse is notable, not only because of its distinctly Pauline flavour. The ταῦτα, here presumably the cultic activities mentioned by Isaiah and perhaps listed in v.4, are "nullified" (κατήργησεν), a verb *Barnabas* uses five times in the epistle (2.6; 5.6; 9.4; 15.5; 16.2). In 5.6 and 15.5 it is applied to "death" and "the age of the lawless one", in

---

[66] Rhodes 2004:38.
[67] Kraft 1965:83.

these clearly referring to "the abrogation of something which formerly existed."[68] Its usage in 9.4 refers to circumcision which is not a matter of the flesh, a principle the Jews "violated" (παρέβησαν) under the instruction of "an evil angel". The instances of καταργέω which bookend this list of examples refer to sacrifice (2.6) and the Temple (16.4). In 16.4 there is clearly a literal sense to this cessation as the Temple has been destroyed, which may equally apply to 2.6.[69] The issue is whether *Barnabas* is calling into question the prior legitimacy of sacrifice, as he seems to concerning circumcision in 9.4. The nullification is followed by a purpose clause (ἵνα), wherein the new law of the Lord Jesus Christ provides an offering (τὴν προσφοράν). This offering is certainly seen as superior as it is without "the yoke of compulsion" and "not made by human hands", perhaps also indicating the comparative superiority of the offering mentioned in 1.7.

His meaning is fleshed out further in his interjections in vv.9-10. Interpreting Jer 7.22, *Barnabas* writes "[f]or he is speaking to us, wanting us to seek how to make an offering to him (πῶς προσάγωμεν αὐτῷ) without being deceived like them (μὴ ὁμοίως πλανωμένους ἐκείνοις)" (1.9b). Here again we have the verb προσάγειν in its technical sense and this offering is contrasted with that of those who are being deceived, i.e. the Jews. That their cultic activity is the result of deception is further emphasized in v.10, where this deception is seemingly the work of the evil one (ὁ πονηρὸς), similar to 9.4. Those who are being deceived are so in the present tense (πλανωμένους) and thus the threat of the evil one deceiving *Barnabas'* readers appears to be a present concern.

---

[68] Schwartz 1992:151.

[69] Schwartz 1992:153, "[h]ere, he could point to real historical events –axiomatically directed by divine providence – which 'abrogate' these laws and thus show them to be undesirable in the eyes of the master of history." Rhodes 2004:41, "[t]he historical sense of the verb could indicate the cessation of sacrificial rites quite independently of one's value judgments about their prior legitimacy or desirability."

From this we can draw two conclusions. First, *Barnabas* believes, regarding the actual material sacrifice, that God has nullified a practice that was inherently misinterpreted and misappropriated by the Jews. Second, *Barnabas* sees the deceptive threat of this error not simply as something theoretical but of real concern to his readers in the present. This being the first topic that *Barnabas* addresses, and the directness with which he does so, also supports this conclusion.

The Temple makes a somewhat surprising appearance in the midst of chapter 4 in the form of an explicit Temple metaphor. We have already noted the strong eschatological tone of this chapter. Harkening back to 2.1-3, *Barnabas* calls on his readers to be mindful of the present because "the final stumbling block" (τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον) is at hand (4.1-3). This is followed by discussion of kings and the little horn (4.4-6a), his radical interpretation of the Sinai incident (4.6b-8), his exhortation to his readers to flee from evil (4.9-13), and his final summation in 4.14: "when you observe that Israel was abandoned even after such signs and wonders had occurred in it, we too should pay close attention […]" Why then does *Barnabas* bring up the Temple in 4.11: "γενώμεθα πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ"? One option, according to Rhodes is "[a]t minimum, it suggests that 'the temple' is one of the author's favored metaphors for Christian believers, either individually or collectively."[70] The immediate context suggests that *Barnabas* is using this metaphor to warn against a kind of realized eschatology, their claims of being "already made upright" (ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι) and being "knowledgeable before their own eyes" (ἐνώπιον ἑαυτῶν ἐπιστήμονες; Isa 5.21). This is contrasted with being πνευματικοί, encapsulated in becoming ναὸς τέλειος. The perfect

---

[70] Rhodes 2004:44.

Temple is later defined in 16.10, as the πνευματικὸς ναός, thus making it a useful source with which to conceptualize being spiritual. Indeed, the Temple metaphors of 4.11 and 6.15 may anticipate that of 16.10. As we will see, that Temple in 16.10 is also defined in opposition to the Jerusalem Temple and the Jewish hope in it. If these metaphors are being mapped with the same set of correspondences, in the context of the final stumbling block and Israel's abandonment, to what extend are those implications present here?

In chapter 6 we have a similar incursion of the Temple metaphor, this time within *Barnabas'* discussion and reinterpretation of the Jewish notion of a promised land. The first hint that the Temple may lie in the background of his words comes in 6.2b-3 which establishes the contrast between stone and flesh. In v.2b, *Barnabas* introduces an unknown citation about God casting a precious cornerstone into Zion's foundation and, in v.3, connects it with Isa 50.8-9, "[t]he one who believe in him will live forever." This leads him to ask "is our hope then built on a stone (ἐπὶ λίθον οὖν ἡμῶν ἡ ἐλπίς)? By no means (μὴ γένοιτο)!" Here there appears to be a tacit reference to the Temple. The connection between the stone in Zion and the Temple is evident. Furthermore, as in 16.1, it is precisely the hope that is set on this structure that is being condemned. Finally, this stone is contrasted with the Lord's "flesh set up in strength" (ἐν ἰσχύϊ τέθεικεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ). It is precisely this contrast between a "heart of stone" (τὰς λιθίνας καρδίας) and a "heart of flesh" (σαρκίνας), drawn from Ezek 11.19 in v.14, that leads into *Barnabas'* explicit Temple metaphor in v.15. *Barnabas* exhorts his readers not to have hearts of stone or hope in the stone of Zion, but to have hearts of flesh and hope in the Lord revealed in flesh. This leads him to say, "For the dwelling place of our heart, my brothers, is a temple holy to the Lord". Specifically, it is the heart that is being conceptualized as a

Temple here, with explicit correspondences of holiness (ἅγιος) and a dwelling place (κατοικητήριον) being drawn.[71] It is difficult not to see the contrast implicit in this conceptualization as well. One should not have hope in the stone of Zion because it is no longer the dwelling place of God and thus not the Temple. Rather it is the heart of flesh which fulfills that role. This is a clear anticipation of the polemic of *Barnabas* 16.

The discussion of the scapegoat and red heifer in *Barnabas* 7 and 8 respectively differs in tone from chapter 2. Here, cultic acts are not shown to be nullified but rather as τύπος… τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θέμενος (7.11). This is a further argument aimed at undercutting the rite, but from a different direction. The argument is again predicated on the principle that "the good Lord has revealed everything to us in advance" (7.1) and concludes "thus the things that have happened in this way are clear (φανερά) to us, but they are obscure (σκοτεινά) to them, because they have not heard the voice of the Lord" (8.7). Rhodes notes that in these cases "their" responsibility for the death of the animal, thus typologically for the death of Jesus, is demonstrated.[72] While this is apparent, the impetus of the argument seems to point more to the Jews' misunderstanding of their own rites, that those practices were always meant to signify a deeper reality. For *Barnabas*, the Jews' misinterpretation has led to their own downfall.

The issue of the Temple can be seen to lie in the background of further passages from *Barnabas*, but comes to a head in chapter 16. We have already discussed 16.1-5 above in terms of its implications for dating. This historical reflection on the destruction

---

[71] This is followed by citations from Exod 33.3 and Ps 22.22, 25 regarding the glorification of God in the assembly perhaps elucidating a communal aspect of this metaphor.

[72] Rhodes 2004:57, "[h]ence, even if Barnabas 7-8 do not offer direct evidence of anticultic or antitemple polemic, they reveal a narrative presupposition in which Jesus' death brings woe upon Israel."

and rebuilding of the Temple is summarized at the end of v.5 "and it happened just as the Lord said." The remainder of the chapter is taken up with an excursus on whether or not a Temple of God exists, εἰ ἔστιν ναὸς θεος (16.6a). *Barnabas* begins with an unknown citation that bears similarities to 1 En 91.13 and Dan 9.24: "It will come about that when the seventh day is finished, a Temple of God will be gloriously built in the name of the Lord." V.7a confirms this Temple's existence: εὑρίσκω οὖν ὅτι ἔστιν ναός. He then moves from where to how it *will* be built (οἰκοδομηθήσεται). *Barnabas* returns to the metaphor of the heart as a dwelling place (κατοικητήριον) from 6.15. He explicitly conceptualizes the heart as a Temple, but the idea of a stone is further explicated into a set of specific correspondences: corrupt/perishable (φθαρτόν), feeble (ἀσθενές), and built by hand (οἰκοδομητὸς… διὰ χειρός). *Barnabas* here can be seen to be expanding upon his metaphor in 6.15.

The next part of v.7 is problematic if *Barnabas* is continuing to associate metaphorically the heart of stone with the Jewish Temple: "for it was full of idolatry (πλήρης μὲν εἰδωλολατρείας) and was a house of demons (οἶκος δαιμονίων), because we did everything that was opposed to God (ἐναντία τῷ θεῷ)" (16.7b). We saw in our earlier discussion *Barnabas'* reticence to fully identify the Jerusalem Temple with the temples of the gentiles, σχεδὸν… ὡς τὰ ἔθνη (16.2). And while he certainly thought the Jerusalem Temple was misguided (πλανώμενοι), he acknowledges that it was "consecrated to him [God]" (ἀφιέρωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ)." As mentioned previously, the phrase πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ is much discussed in attempting to determine *Barnabas'* ethnic origin. Whether or not this indicates that *Barnabas* himself is a gentile, the phrase does evoke and address a posture of gentile atheism towards God. Coupled with the

accusations of idolatry, housing demons, and opposing God, it appears *Barnabas* has shifted his metaphor to conceptualize the heart as a pagan sanctuary, though this could also be an implicit, associative condemnation of the Jerusalem Temple. There are analogies between the Jerusalem Temple and pagan ones in that they are temples erroneously consecrated, which allows *Barnabas* to oscillate between the metaphors.

Continuing with his citation, *Barnabas* explains how the true Temple will be gloriously built in the name of the Lord. This transformation of the dwelling place of God in v.8 is grounded in becoming a new creation, enacted by the dual action of having received the forgiveness of sins and having hoped in his name (ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα). He then attempts to explain how God dwells in our hearts. Unfortunately his litany of four attributes[73] and five activities of God [74] that follow are opaque to say the least.[75] The lack of a verb in the former list obscures what the effects of God's word, calling, wisdom, demands, and commands are. Similarly with the second list, are these modes by which God dwells or activities of God upon indwelling? The logic of the metaphor appears to be that God dwells in our hearts as a Temple. Dwelling in our hearts (αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν), He prophesies through us (αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων). This prophecy is delivered through the mouth. The mouth thus becomes the door to the Temple (ἀνοίγων ἡμῖν τὴν θύραν τοῦ ναοῦ), for in hearing the prophecy, you receive redemption (μετάνοιαν διδοὺς) and are brought into the imperishable Temple since God is now dwelling in your heart (ἡμῖν εἰσάγει εἰς τὸν ἄφθαρτον ναόν). The first list could then

---

[73] ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως; ἡ κλῆσις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας; ἡ σοφία τῶν δικαιωμάτων; αἱ ἐντολαὶ τῆς διδαχῆς.

[74] αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν προφητεύων; αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικῶν; ἀνοίγων ἡμῖν τὴν θύραν τοῦ ναοῦ; μετάνοιαν διδοὺς; ἡμῖν εἰσάγει εἰς τὸν ἄφθαρτον ναόν.

[75] Kraft 1965:132, "Pseudo-Barnabas becomes so enwrapped in the gnosis of this passage that grammatical relations are abandoned in 16:9, and 16:10 is a syntactical nightmare."

perhaps be seen alongside prophecy or as the content of the prophecy that emerges from the heart through the mouth and leads to redemption and the constituting of the Temple. *Barnabas* attempts to exemplify this, again confusingly, in v.10a:

> ὁ γὰρ ποθῶν σωθῆναι βλέπει οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντα καὶ λαλοῦντα, ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ μηδέποτε μήτε τοῦ λέγοντος τὰ ῥήματα ἀκηκοέναι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος μήτε αὐτός ποτε ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι ἀκούειν.

In this scheme, Person A does not look to Person B for salvation, but to God who dwells within and speaks through Person B. As a result, Person A is amazed at what Person B says, having never heard nor even known he desired to hear such things. This leads *Barnabas* to finally and climactically address the initial inquiry of v.6, τοῦτό ἐστιν πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ.

When we arrive at chapter 17.1, *Barnabas* declares that his intention from chapters 2-16 is now complete, "Insofar as I have been able to set forth these matters to you simply, I hope to have fulfilled my desire not to have omitted anything that pertains to salvation." *Barnabas* bookends this section of his *Epistle* with the discussion of cult: sacrifice in chapter 2 and the Temple in chapter 16. In order for his readers to "make a more abundant and exalted offering" (1.7) he begins with the secession of cult *de jure* (2.6) and concludes with its *de facto* termination (16.4). The Temple now destroyed is no longer necessary because a new Temple exists in the human heart recreated through the forgiveness of sins (16.8). Within this bracket, *Barnabas* demonstrates that cultic acts have been fundamentally misunderstood and have always pointed to Jesus and indeed foreshadowed the Jews' rejection and execution of him, their ultimate failure evidenced by the destruction of their Temple (chaps. 7-8). The seemingly impromptu Temple metaphors of 4.11 and 6.15 demonstrate how fundamental this conceptualization is for *Barnabas* as a whole and anticipate *Barnabas'* definitive position in chapter 16.

At the center of this position for *Barnabas* is the concept of hope. The noun ἐλπίς or its cognate verb ἐλπίζω appear seventeen times in *Barnabas* in illuminating places. In his list of three "firm teachings" (τρία… δὀγματα), seemingly an elucidation of the "perfect knowledge" *Barnabas* wishes to impart in 1.5, "hope, which is the beginning and end of our faith (ἐλπίς, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος πίστεως ἡμῶν)" stands at the forefront (1.6). Hope is rightly directed when set on being saved (1.3; 12.7), on the cross (11.8), and ultimately on Jesus (4.8; 6.3; 6.9; 8.5; 11.11; 16.8). When hope is misdirected it is set on the rock (6.3) and on the Temple (16.1-2). In 12.2, those who have refused hope in the type of the cross created by Moses, will be attacked forever. The phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα πολεμηθήσονται is the only use of the verb πολεμέω other than 16.4 where *Barnabas* refers to the Jewish war and the resulting destruction of the Temple (διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθῃρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν), further connecting misplaced hope and destruction.[76] Chapters 2-16 can be read as a cautionary tale for the proper orientation of hope which is typified by and culminates in the Jews' misplaced hope in the Temple. This paradigmatic instance of misplaced hope, though not found everywhere in *Barnabas,* seemingly lies in the background and structures this section. It should be said that *Barnabas'* sights are most clearly on the past hope in the Second Temple. However, the immediacy and volatility with which this polemic is expressed demonstrates that his concerns are not "wholly academic."[77] nor is it simply a reflection of past errors,[78] though the destruction

---

[76] Rhodes 2004:66.
[77] Vielhauer 1975:606, "völlig akademisch." Earlier Vielhauer 1975:605 states, "[e]s ist heute wohl allgemein anerkannt, daß es keine aktuelle Gefährdung der christlichen Gemeinde durch die Juden war; nichts im Barn weist auf politische Machenschaften der Juden oder auf jüdische oder judaistische Propaganda, also auf eine äußere oder innere Gefährdung der Gemeinde durch die Juden hin."
[78] Rhodes 2004.

of the Temple looms large in the background as an important proof of the Jews' failure. If hope in the Temple is misplaced, as evidenced by its destruction and the cessation of its cult, and there is a new Temple in the Christian heart, *a fortiori* how misplaced is hope in a Temple to be rebuilt! The trajectory of this argument concludes in a Temple metaphor in which the one in whom hope should be set, dwells in the hearts and constitutes the people, as a perfect, imperishable, holy, and spiritual Temple to God and this is in contrast to the hearts and temples of stone.

6.4. THE *EPISTLE OF BARNABAS* AND PAUL

Our task now is to inquire into whether or to what extent *Barnabas'* view of the Jewish cult and his conceptualization of the heart as a Temple was prompted by or draws upon Paul's metaphors. We begin, however, by examining signs of influence outside these metaphors. Views on whether or not the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* knew or was influenced by Paul run the gamut, from suggesting its author being a representative of Paulinism,[79] radical Paulinist,[80] a gnosticising Paulinist,[81] or a conscious opponent of Paul.[82] There are those who hold that *Barnabas* knew nothing of Paul,[83] and others who claim *Barnabas* engaged with sources influenced by Paul.[84] The *NTAF* concludes that it

---

[79] Leipoldt 1907.
[80] Meinhold 1940:257.
[81] Pfleiderer 1890:393.
[82] Wengst 1984:118 n.75, "[h]inzu kommt nun, daß die Polemik des Barnabasbriefes Aussagen betrifft, die gerade Paulus vertreten hat." Vielhauer 1975:606-607.
[83] Hvalvik 1996:34, "[t]here is no basis for interpreting the theological position of Barnabas as some sort of response to Paul – whether it is called agreement, disagreement, misunderstanding or opposition. The theological agenda of Barnabas is nowhere set by Paul." Barnett 1941:207, Kraft 1965:20.
[84] Lindemann 1979:280, "[d]er Befund läßt den Schluß zu, daß die vom Vf des Barn in seiner Schrift verarbeitete Tradition von paulinischer Überlieferung beeinflußt war." Carleton Paget

is probable that *Barnabas* knew Romans and Ephesians deeming the former a B and the latter a C.[85] We shall examine *Barnabas* in general and some passages in particular that may show signs of Pauline influence. From there we will turn our attention to an examination of the Temple metaphors themselves.

If our dating is correct, *Barnabas* was written some thirty to forty years after Paul's compositions, a plausible amount of time for Paul's epistles to have been circulated and known.[86] However, *Barnabas* in no way explicitly refers to Paul, neither to his biography nor to his writings. Those who view *Barnabas* as an opponent of Paul see *Barn.* 5.9 as a tacit and derogatory reference to the apostle:

> ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.

However, Carleton Paget has demonstrated that this is not how even its earliest interpreters read the passage.[87] Whether Paul is his enemy or ally, *Barnabas* does not invoke his name or words, so we are left to judge the more tenuous category of influence rather than direct reference or citation. Our investigation, however, is not into *Barnabas'* use of Paul but how Paul's conceptual models, words and categories may have affected *Barnabas'* own.

The seemingly Pauline character of *Barnabas* could be suggested by the text's early ascription to a close companion of Paul. Müller argues that once Clement attributed

---

2007:245, "I think there is sufficient evidence to show that he was in contact with traditions which were at least conversant with aspects of Paul's theology." Cf. Carleton Paget 1994:207-214, 1996.

[85] Bartlet 1905:3-17.

[86] A dating of c. 130 CE stretches this period of dissemination, however, it also makes Barnabas' explicit silence on Paul all the more curious.

[87] Carleton Paget 1996:376, cf. Origen *Cels.* 1.63.

Hebrews to Paul, another letter had to be attributed to Barnabas.[88] There is clearly a "convergence between the concerns" of Paul and Barnabas,[89] particularly in the attention paid to the issue of covenantal continuity, albeit with the two authors coming up with distinctly different solutions. They have other subject matter in common as well: the law, eschatological ages, circumcision, food laws, and baptism. This subject sharing will inevitably result in some verbal correspondence which does not necessarily denote a connection, so we must proceed cautiously. We shall examine three passages starting with the strongest candidate for Pauline influence, using a similar procedure to our analyses of Ephesians and 1 Peter, observing: i) the form of the parallel; ii) the existence of other possible parallels; iii) whether the divergences in the parallel can be explained; and iv) whether this parallel appears particularly out of place.

We begin with an examination of *Barn*. 13.7. In *Barnabas'* discussion of circumcision he states:

> Εἰ οὖν ἔτι καὶ διὰ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐμνήσθη, ἀπέχομεν τὸ τέλειον τῆς γνώσεως ἡμῶν. τί οὖν λέγει τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτε μόνος πιστεύσας ἐτέθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Ἰδού, τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραάμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας τῷ θεῷ.

Barnabas here draws on the story of Abraham and in particular Gen. 15.6 and 17.4-5, the latter of which in the LXX reads:

> Καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ ἔσῃ πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν. καὶ οὐ κληθήσεται ἔτι τὸ ὄνομά σου Αβραμ, ἀλλ᾽ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου Αβρααμ, ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε.[90]

Several things are curious about *Barnabas'* usage here. Mostly notably is the addition of τῶν πιστευόντων δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας τῷ θεῷ to ἐθνῶν. This addition is certainly not an

---

[88] Müller 1869:16 Cf. Carleton Paget 1994:5 notes this is incorrect as it assumes that Clement was the first to attribute Hebrews to Paul. While he was the first author to do so, the implicit ascription of Hebrews to Paul in P46 predates Clement.

[89] Carleton Paget 2007:239.

[90] καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (Gen. 15.6, LXX)

obvious nor a natural expansion on the text and its presence requires explanation. A strikingly close parallel is found in Rom 4.11: πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας. Notable divergences here are *Barnabas'* retention of the term ἐθνῶν from Gen. 17.5 and Paul's retention of ἐλογίσθη earlier in 4.9, whereas *Barnabas* has ἐτέθη. These differences are easily explainable in light of *Barnabas'* program. The retention of the ἐθνῶν emphasizes that faithful gentiles are not just included in the covenant but are the true heirs, which is further supported by his omission of anything from Rom 4.12. The omission of ἐλογίσθη is not just an alteration to Paul, but to the LXX as we have it. While λογίζομαι is an important aspect of Paul's argument in Romans 4, *Barnbas* is less concerned with the mechanisms of the conferred righteousness. Additionally, *Barnabas'* use of δικαιοσύνη seems to be understood here in the Pauline sense of right standing as opposed to moral-uprightness elsewhere in *Barnabas*.[91]

Most agree that it is nearly impossible to explain this passage independently of Paul. The use of this verse, plus the distinct wording of the additions to it combined with the particular use of δικαιοσύνη demonstrate that Pauline influence has made its way to Barnabas. The *NTAF* concludes that "the O.T. passages have become conflated with the comments in Rom. 4" as the presence of this phrase "can hardly be explained otherwise."[92] Similarly Carleton Paget states, "[w]hat must be true is that at the very least knowledge of a tradition influenced by Paul is evidenced at this point."[93] Even Hvalvik admits, "Barnabas quotes Gen 17:5 in a form which is undoubtedly influenced by Rom.

---

[91] Carleton Paget 1996:374 Cf. *Barn.* 1.4, 6; 3.4; 5.4.
[92] Bartlet 1905:3-4.
[93] Carleton Paget 2007:241 Cf. Carleton Paget 1996:374.

4:11."[94] As the last two quotes indicate, this does not mean that *Barnabas* is consciously using Paul, but certainly shows he was in contact with something Pauline.[95] We observe here *Barnabas* discussing circumcision and evoking the words and categories of Paul, whether unknowingly or indirectly through his source, to conceptualize and construct his argument. Interestingly, these are being used for what we would consider distinctly un-Pauline ends, an argument against the covenantal status of Israel.

The second text *Barn.* 9.6 is less distinct though still notable and also concerns circumcision:

> Ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖς· Καὶ μὴν περιτέτμηται ὁ λαὸς εἰς σφραγίδα. ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶς Σύρος καὶ Ἄραψ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν εἰδώλων· ἆρα οὖν κἀκεῖνοι ἐκ τῆς διαθήκης αὐτῶν εἰσίν; ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐν περιτομῇ εἰσίν.

In his reference to a litany of OT texts, *Barnabas* here is arguing against the implementation of a physical circumcision.[96] Circumcision is to be of the hearing (9.3) and the heart (9.5), a law the Jews violated upon the instruction of an evil angel (9.4). In v.6 he argues that physical circumcision cannot be a "seal" of the covenant for it is not limited to the Jews. The term he uses for seal σφραγίς is also found in Romans 4.11: καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγῖδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως[…]. This description of circumcision as a seal is not found elsewhere in the Bible,[97] and while it does appear in some Rabbinic literature, this is of a later date.[98] This is a favoured verse for those arguing for *Barnabas'* antagonism towards Paul, as he seems to be in opposition to a

---

[94] However, Hvalvik 1996:34, "the Pauline flavour is hardly the result of his own emendation."
[95] Lindemann 1979:279, "[d]er Verfasser des Barn. hat das Abraham-Beispiel also offensichtlich einer christlichen Tradition entnommen, die zumindest von Paulus beeinflußt war." Cf. the admission in Pfleiderer 1890:401-402, that "[w]ohl finden sich so ziemlich noch alle paulinischen Stichworte, aber sie sind zu Formeln geworden."
[96] Ps. 18.44; Isa 33.13; Jer 4.4; 7.2-3; Ps 34.12-13; Isa 50.10; Exod. 15.26; Isa 1.2, 10; 28.14; 40.3; Deut 10.16; Jer 9.26.
[97] The term σφραγίς is found further within the Pauline corpus in 1 Cor 9.12 and 2 Tim. 2.19.
[98] See *Ber* 9.3, *Exod. R.* 19; Tg. *Cant*. 3.8**.**

particular Pauline interpretation of circumcision and the quotation format seemingly indicates he has an interlocutor in mind. This along with 4.6, "and do not become like some people piling up your sins saying that the covenant is both theirs and ours (testamentum illorum et nostrum est)" are seen as parodies of the Pauline position.[99] From v.4 it is clear that *Barnabas* is opposed to physical circumcision ever being implemented which would put him at odds with Paul. The evidence, however, is too sparse to conclude that he has the actual letter to the Romans or the apostle in mind. The presence σφραγίς is most easily explained in terms of Pauline influence, and thus Rom 4.11 may have been familiar to *Barnabas* in some form.

The final verse we shall examine here has been touched on briefly earlier. During his discussion of sacrifice, *Barnabas* states:

> ταῦτα οὖν κατήργησεν, ἵνα ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὤν, μὴ ἀνθρωποποίητον ἔχῃ τὴν προσφοράν. (*Barn.* 2.6)

Here we find *Barnabas'* first use of the verb καταργέω, a term well known from the Pauline corpus.[100] We discussed how this annulment is likely linked with the destruction of the Temple (16.16) and connected with the deception of the evil one (2.9-10). However, this text is unique in *Barnabas*, as the purpose clause appears to go against the grain of his one covenant theology and suggest a new dispensation, ὁ καινὸς νόμος. That this "new law" is τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ further calls to mind the ἔννομος Χριστοῦ of 1 Cor 9.21 and τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ of Gal 6.2. Finally, the ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης ὤν has parallels with ζυγῷ δουλείας from which Christ has freed us in Gal. 5.1. Carleton Paget is correct that the strength of this correspondence "lies in the cumulative

---

[99] Carleton Paget 1996:371.
[100] Cf. Rom 3.3, 32; 4.14; 6.6; 7.2, 6; 1 Cor 1.28; 2.6; 6.13; 13.8; 13.10; 15.24, 26; 2 Cor 3.7; 3.11, 13; Gal 3.17; 5.4, 11; Eph 2.15; 2 Thess 2.8; 2 Tim 1.10.

character of the parallels" and that its weakness is that there is no passage in Paul that contains all theses elements. Thus the passage could have its source in a Jewish-Christian anti-cult tradition.[101] It is certainly noteworthy that Paul does not use this language when discussing cultic topics. The fact that the structure of this verse only superficially supports *Barnabas* but actually undercuts his salvation-historical scheme, combined with the fact that it does not mirror any one verse in Paul does suggest that *Barnabas* is incorporating a source. The high concentration of particularly Pauline terms and concepts here gives the impression that this source is some sort of epitome of Pauline thought or, at the very least, its terms were dictated by the apostle. As such, its implementation by *Barnabas* here indicates the influence of Paul, though perhaps a mediated one.

This investigation thus far has been aimed at assessing the possibility of a footprint of Paul evident in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. Having examined these three verses, we can see there are language and ideas found in this document that are difficult to explain without any connection to Paul, however mediated. This is to say that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that it is possible that the terms of certain discussions in which *Barnabas* participates have to an extent been set or influenced, whether indirectly or unconsciously, by the writings of Paul.

6.5. Paul's Temple Metaphor and the *Epistle of Barnabas*

Having examined the issue of the Temple in *Barnabas* and the presence of possible Pauline influence, we now turn to *Barnabas'* Temple metaphors themselves. Here we explore whether Paul's Temple metaphors influenced *Barnabas'* agenda and what the

---

[101] Carleton Paget 2007:241. Cf. Carleton Paget 1996:370.

implications of this might be for our understanding of both *Barnabas* and Paul. We have seen that there are three Temple metaphors in the *Epistle of Barnabas* that occupy a central position in the argument of chapters 2-16. We shall examine each of these to see how they might relate to the Pauline formulations and what correspondences and entailments are being fixed and drawn from them.

6.5.1. Barnabas 4.11

The Temple structure is first mentioned in *Barn.* 2.5 in a citation from Isa 1.11-13: πατεῖν μου τὴν αὐλὴν οὐ προσθήσεσθε. *Barnabas* himself first refers to the Temple structure in 4:11: γενώμεθα πνευματικοί, γενώμεθα ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ. Here there is a clear metaphor. The addressees and *Barnabas* are conceptualized as a Temple. The community, found in the first person plural form of the verb γενώμεθα, is the target domain which is understood in terms of the source domain, ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ. The basic metaphorical structure could be formulated WE ARE THE TEMPLE, with PERFECT and TO GOD being modifiers of the source. The source domain is understood in apposition to the predicate of the preceding clause, πνευματικοί.[102] For *Barnabas* being spiritual is equated with being the Temple to God, since the Temple to God itself is spiritual.

From the outset, this passage does not have much in common with the Temple metaphors of 1 Cor 3.16-17, 1 Cor 6.19-20, and 2 Cor 6.16. True, the overall structure is similar to 1 Cor 3.16, as the collective is conceived of as a Temple. However, in all three cases this equation is constructed with the verb εἰμί in the indicative and not γίνομαι in the subjunctive. Indeed, Paul's metaphors are indicative, statements of fact regarding the

[102] This further is supported by the direct application of the adjective πνευματικός to the noun ναός in 16.10.

status of the community, whereas *Barnabas* here has a normative sense, the community *should become* the Temple of God. The conceptualization is an aspiration, not clearly a realization. The Temple in Paul is not "to God" (τῷ θεῷ) but "of God", "of the holy spirit", or "of the living God" (θεοῦ, τοῦ… ἁγίου πνεύματός, θεοῦ… ζῶντος). This may reflect that the metaphor here in *Barnabas* is not constructed around the indwelling of God, but rather the imperative to concern oneself with the "reverential awe of God" (τὸν φόβον τοῦ θεοῦ).

Paul never describes the Temple as τέλειος, though he certainly upholds its value (1 Cor. 3.17). *Barnabas* employs this adjective six times. The first we have already seen in 1.5, where he writes so that his readers "may have perfect knowledge" (τελείαν ἔχητε τὴν γνῶσιν). This is similar to his use of τέλειος in 13.7, where his interpretation of Abraham results in "perfection of our knowledge" (τὸ τέλειον τῆς γνώσεως ἡμῶν). The term is also used in the negative in conjunction with ἁμαρτία, denoting the completeness of sin (*Barn*. 5.11; 8.1). The adjective's other appearance, most interestingly, precedes the Temple metaphor in 4.3, where *Barnabas* states "the final stumbling block is at hand" (τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἤγγικεν). It appears no accident that τέλειος qualifies both these nouns and suggests that they are not unconnected. In light of the presence of the τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον, *Barnabas'* readers should become ναὸς τέλειος τῷ θεῷ, indicating a direct contrast between the two. The contrast may imply that the final stumbling block could also be a Temple, perhaps the Jewish Temple rebuilt, against which the "perfect/final Temple" is established in opposition and as its true fulfillment. If this were the case, it would serve as a precursor to the polemical and eschatological aspects of this

metaphor in chapter 16, where the community as a Temple is the final Temple over and against the rebuilt Jewish Temple.[103]

Thus far, there appears to be little overlap between *Barn.* 4.11 and Paul's Temple metaphors. However, Carleton Paget offers an instructive comment. He notes that in this section of chapter 4, Barnabas is addressing overenthusiastic Christians who are living as if "already righteous" (ὡς ἤδη δεδικαιωμένοι) and demands they become spiritual and the Temple of God. Carleton Paget notes:

> Such an argument appears similar to one adopted by Paul in 1 Cor. 3 and 4, where in an admittedly different context and in different language, Paul states that Christians are temples dedicated to God, and goes on in 4:8 to rebuke those who deem themselves already satisfied (ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι), and believe they have already become rich (ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε). Indeed, could it be the case that *Barnabas,* far from opposing a Pauline position in this instance, is in fact, either directly or indirectly, drawing from a Pauline source which itself rebuked those who *distorted* Pauline theology for their enthusiastic purposes? This remains nothing more than a suggestion.[104]

We may note further that in chapters 1-4, Paul is addressing the Corinthians overconfident claims of spiritual status (1 Cor 2.10-3.1) and wisdom (1 Cor 1.18-29; 4.10). *Barnabas* addresses similar concerns in his citation from Isa 5.21 and following, which directly precedes the metaphor: οὐαὶ οἱ συνετοὶ ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐνώπιον ἑαυτῶν ἐπιστήμονες. γενώμεθα πνευματικοί. Finally, Paul uses the metaphor of the Temple to argue against σχίσματα within the community (cf. 1 Cor. 1.10). *Barnabas* employs his metaphor similarly against those who "sink in" to themselves and "live alone", μὴ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε, and implores his readers to gather together and seek out the common good, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι συνζητεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος (*Barn.* 4.10) which mirror Paul's constant appeal to do what "builds up" (οἰκοδομεῖν).

---

[103] Rhodes 2004:50 sees this a possibility alongside it referring to the Hadrian Temple, though it is difficult to see why a temple to Jupiter would be a σκάνδαλον to Barnabas' readers.
[104] Carleton Paget 1996:375.

Therefore, we may be able to suggest the possibility that *Barnabas'* metaphorical conceptualization in 4.11 is not wholly independent of Paul. The ways in which the Temple metaphor is used and the context to which it is applied, both of which are uniquely Pauline, are replicated here. The community is conceptualized as a Temple in order to snuff out division and to caution against overconfidence in one's knowledge and moral uprightness. We may also note here that the metaphor is construed primarily for moral purposes, which aligns it with 1 Cor 3 but distinguishes it from the later instances in *Barn.* 6.15 and 16.10.[105] This distinction in use and context could point to different strands of Pauline influence. The normative and futurizing sense of the conceptualization also differs from Paul's as does the addition of τέλειος, which suggests an eschatological and polemical aspect to this mapping. *Barn.* 4.11 then can be considered a possible use of Paul's Temple metaphor in 1 Cor 3.16.

6.5.2. Barnabas 6.15

The second Temple metaphor emerges in 6.15 in another seemingly non-cultic context: ναὸς γὰρ ἅγιος, ἀδελφοί μου, τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆς καρδίας. Here the source domain of ναός is mapped onto the target domain τὸ κατοικητήριον καρδίας. It is the heart in its activity as a dwelling place that qualifies it as the Temple, thus THE DWELLING PLACE OF THE HEART IS A TEMPLE. The source is qualified by the adjective ἅγιος, both found in and central to Paul's metaphor in 1 Cor 3.16, but not in *Barn*. 4.11. Also present is τὸ κατοικητήριον, an οἰκ- compound, which further calls to mind how

[105] Finally, though perhaps merely incidentally, the metaphor in *Barn*. 4.11 is conceived within the imperative to flee from wrongdoing (φύγωμεν ἀπὸ πάσης ματαιότητος) similar to 1 Cor 6.18 (φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν).

Paul structures his metaphor, moving from οἰκοδομή to ναός in which God dwells (οἰκεῖ). The correspondence between the temple and its target domain is the concept of dwelling, which is fundamental to all three Pauline metaphors.

A closer parallel to *Barn*. 6.15, however, is found in Eph 2, where the community is built together into a "dwelling place of God" (εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ). Aside from sharing the same term for dwelling place, the Temple in both Ephesians and *Barnabas* is also uniquely connected to the Lord. In Eph 2.22 it is a Temple ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ and in *Barn.* 6.15 it is a temple ἅγιος… τῷ κυρίῳ whereas in 1 Cor 3.16 it is clearly the Temple τοῦ θεοῦ. In the metaphors of 1 Corinthians, it is the Spirit who dwells in the community (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός) whereas in *Barn.* 6.14-15 it is the Lord, referring to Christ, who dwells in the heart (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἔμελλεν φανεροῦσθαι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖν). While the Ephesian metaphor shares 1 Corinthians' concept of the indwelling God, later in the epistle the author states: κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν (Eph 3.17). The use of the κατοικ-verbal cognate in conjunction with καρδία denoting the indwelling of Christ in the heart is clearly proximate to *Barnabas'* construction. Ephesians does not connect this idea with the Temple *per se*, the differences between *Barnabas* and Ephesians here can be explained in terms of a conceptual synthesis or amalgamation of *Barnabas'* source.

Finally, we noted the moral imperative function of the metaphor in *Barn*. 4.11 which is similar to 1 Cor 3.16-17. In *Barn.* 6.15, the Temple metaphor is clearly predicated on and aims to signify an idea of new creation brought about by the forgiveness of sins. This begins in 6.11:

> Since, then, he renewed (ἀνακαινίσας) us through the forgiveness of our sins (ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), he made us into a different type of person, that we might have the soul of children, as if he were indeed forming us all over again (ἀναπλάσσοντος).

Barnabas continues in 6.13 where God "made yet a second human form" (δευτέραν πλάσιν ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων ἐποίησεν) and in 6.14 "we have been formed anew" (ἡμεῖς ἀναπεπλάσμεθα) which culminates in being given "hearts of flesh" which are the Temple to the Lord. In Ephesians, this progression is mirrored, though not precisely reflected. Eph 2.4 states "even when we were dead through our trespasses, [God] made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved". Similarly in 2.15a, "He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances (καταργήσας), that he might create in himself one new humanity (εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον) in place of the two[…]" While Ephesians clearly has a more corporate conception of new creation resulting in the erection of the Temple, the proximity of the creation of "new humanity" and "Temple" strengthens the conceptual connection between these passages.

These parallels are deemed by the *NTAF* a **c,** and central to their characterizing *Barnabas'* knowledge of Ephesians a C.[106] The close verbal and conceptual similarities between Ephesians and *Barnabas*, mirrored nowhere else in the texts we possess, is certainly striking. Again, this does not necessarily signify that *Barnabas* possessed and consciously used Ephesians, though the presence of various Ephesian tropes here may strengthen that position. The metaphor in *Barnabas* is certainly more individualistic and polemical. In the Ephesian metaphor, it is in the flesh of Christ (ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ) that these people are united, whereas in *Barnabas*, the Lord revealed in the flesh (ἐν σαρκὶ ἔμελλεν φανεροῦσθαι) dwells in the hearts of flesh (σαρκίνας) in opposition to the hearts of stone (λιθίνας). Both metaphors describe the superiority of the new people to the old, but Ephesians does this through unification, *Barnabas* through opposition. Lastly, that

---

[106] Bartlet 1905:4-5.

the metaphor in *Barn.* 4.11 differs greatly from 6.15, and bears little resemblance to the Ephesian construction may indicate that *Barnabas* knew this metaphor in many forms and functions. Interestingly, both uses appear linked to Pauline Temple metaphors.

6.5.3. Barnabas 16.10

Finally, we return to chapter 16, this time with an eye to potential Pauline influence and its implications. The Temple metaphor is only explicitly stated in the final verse of the chapter, τοῦτό ἐστιν πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ, with the τοῦτό signifying the conceptual structuring that had been laid out in vv.6-10a. This structure is very similar to 6.15 but is expanded and it becomes clear that the earlier metaphor previewed this one.

While the direct predicative metaphorical statement comes at the end of the passage, the source and target domains emerge early on. The source domain is the Temple, ναός, here conceptualized in terms of the citation as "gloriously built in the name of the Lord" (οἰκοδομηθήσεται ναὸς θεοῦ ἐνδόξως ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου). The target domain is again the heart (καρδία), which is understood as a κατοικητήριον, and we can again structure this metaphor THE DWELLING PLACE OF THE HEART IS A TEMPLE. This once more calls to mind Eph 2.22. However, in this formulation the heart has always been a κατοικητήριον, indeed always a ναός, just one wrongly directed towards idolatry. Again paralleling *Barn.* 6.15 and Eph 2, this Temple status is also precipitated by new creation and the forgiveness of sins:

> λαβόντες τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐγενόμεθα καινοί, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι· διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν (*Barn.* 16.8).

As with 6.15, this is a Temple to the Lord. Here it is explicitly God who dwells in the Temple (ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ), more in line with 1 Corinthians and Ephesians. This conceptual interchangeability suggests either metaphorical contradiction or high Christology. If *Barnabas* had access to the formulations of 1 Cor 3.16 and Eph 2.21-22, perhaps he is here slipping back into his source's formulation, as he does not view the distinction as important.

Tension within the structure of *Barnabas'* metaphor does appear in v.9. Barnabas attempts to extend his metaphor conceptualizing THE MOUTH IS THE DOOR OF THE TEMPLE, which leads people into the Temple. He is clearly trying to describe the importance of prophecy, God speaking through people, while maintaining his metaphorical structure. However the orientational metaphor of being brought into the Temple seems to contrast with the ontological metaphor of being the Temple. It would be more metaphorically consistent if it were God who was brought into the Temple through the mouth, thus transforming the heart from a temple of idols into a Temple of God. This orientation could have a connection with the architectural metaphor, in Eph 2.22 they are "built together into the temple of God" (συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ), whereas here the implication might be that they are brought into being, or having a corporate identity as a Temple. There is a stronger corporate emphasis here than in 6.15. The target here is "the dwelling place of *our* (ἡμῶν) hearts" (6.7) and God resides in "*our* place of dwelling" (ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν) and "within *us*" (ἐν ἡμῖν). While the unity of the community is not the function of this metaphor, this collective aspect brings it closer to the tenors of 1 Cor 3 and Eph 2.

The presence of architectural language also resembles the Pauline metaphors. Once more οικ- cognates feature heavily, particularly τὸ κατοικητήριον which again is the fundamental correspondence drawn from the mapping. The Temple is also "built in the name of the Lord" (οἰκοδομηθήσεται ναὸς θεοῦ ἐνδόξως ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου) and "built for the Lord" (οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ). However, this language is evoked less to picture a structure built of component parts, but rather to contrast it with a structure built διὰ χειρός and is thus φθαρτὸν and ἀσθενές. Here, more explicitly than in 4.11 or 6.15, this Temple is set up in opposition to the physical structure in Jerusalem. This is clearly polemical, as in 16.2, those who hope in such a building hope "in vain" (ματαία). It may also show signs of being dualistic, as it is the physicality of the Jewish Temple that is being denigrated. Furthermore, when *Barnabas* explicitly states his metaphor, the source domain is a *πνευματικὸς* ναός. In 1 Cor 3.16 and 6.19 it is the indwelling Spirit that constitutes the Temple. In Eph. 2.22, the Temple is built together ἐν πνεύματι, which we observed some commentators read as synonymous with πνευματικός, and could be the source of πνευματικός. We observed in 1 Peter the use of πνευματικός. Here we argued the meaning was more in line with ἐν πνεύματι, but that it opened the door for more dualistic interpretations. The association between πνευματικός and ναός in *Barnabas* was anticipated in 4.11 where the call to be spiritual was matched with the call to be the Temple. Certainly, *Barnabas* sees the πνευματικός in terms of being ἅγιος (6.15) and morally upright (4.11). From here and 6.15 it is also clearly seen in terms of indwelling. However, since this *spiritual* Temple is so explicitly contrasted with the *physical* temple, the implication appears to be the dualistic superiority of a non-physical Temple. The Christian community and the heart are conceptualized not merely as a

Temple, but as the explicit replacement and ultimate end of the physical Temple in Jerusalem.

The Temple metaphor of *Barn*. 16.10 is constructed similarly to the metaphor 6.15 and both are in close verbal and conceptual proximity to Eph 2.21-22. Temple status is enacted through the forgiveness of sins (*Barn*. 6.11; 16.8//Eph. 2.5), new creation (*Barn*. 6.11,14; 16.8//Eph. 2.15), and becoming the dwelling place of God (*Barn.* 6.15; 16.8//Eph. 2.22). This Temple is holy (*Barn.* 6.15//Eph. 2.21) and spiritual (*Barn.* 16.10//Eph. 2.22). The metaphors in *Barn.* 6.15 and 16.10 differ structurally and somewhat functionally from *Barn.* 4.11, with the absence of any Ephesian elements in the latter perhaps suggesting a different source in 1 Corinthians 3. The case for Pauline influence through Ephesians for *Barn*. 6.15 and 16.10 is stronger and is probable, while the influence of 1 Cor. 3.16-17 on *Barn.* 4.11 remains possible.

Differences aside, the function of these metaphors comes to fruition in chapter 16. This function, despite our conclusion above, is at variance from 1 Cor 3 or Eph 2, where the holiness of unity is paramount. *Barnabas'* aim with regard to his metaphors can be categorized in three ways. First, for *Barnabas* the metaphor of the Temple is explicitly *eschatological*. The source of the Temple is not merely used to conceptualize the eschatological people of God, but the people of God are in fact the eschatological Temple. This is first suggested in 4.11 where the people are to become ναὸς τέλειος, the final or perfect Temple in contrast to the final stumbling block, τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον. This is further alluded to in 6.15, where Temple status is predicated on the reception of "hearts of flesh" which is a fulfillment of Ezek 11.19. Finally, this is unambiguously presented to us in chapter 16, where the destruction of the Temple is a fulfillment of Isa

49.17 and the Temple of the Christian heart and community is the Temple of the seventh day, gloriously built in the name of the Lord (cf. Dan 9.24; 1 En 91.13). This then is the fulfillment of hopes for the Temple, not a rebuilt structure in Jerusalem, but God dwelling in the human heart.

Second, *Barnabas'* Temple metaphor is explicitly *ontological*. *Barnabas* criticizes the former Temple and predicates his concept of the true Temple in terms of what it means *to be* the Temple of God, "let us inquire if a Temple of God still exists" (ζητήσωμεν δὲ εἰ *ἔστιν* ναὸς θεοῦ). The Jews were misguided in believing a building was the house of God (ὡς *ὄντα* οἶκον θεοῦ) and, in his inquiry, *Barnabas* concludes that a Temple does indeed exist (εὑρίσκω οὖν ὅτι *ἔστιν* ναός) and that "this is the spiritual Temple" (τοῦτό *ἐστιν* πνευματικὸς ναὸς). Here the conceptual mapping has become symmetrical; to say THE HEART IS THE TEMPLE and the TEMPLE IS THE HEART is to say the same thing.[107] This is conceptual and substantive identity, not simply conceptual delineation. *Barnabas* is concretizing the metaphorical implications of this conceptualization by fixing an ontological identity between the people and the heart as a Temple and the Temple as the people and their hearts.

Finally, *Barnabas'* Temple metaphor is explicitly *polemical*. This logically follows from our point above. The Temple metaphors of 1 Cor 3.16-17 and Eph 2.21-22 aim at unity and inclusivity, be that within the community itself or between two peoples. *Barnabas'* metaphor is exclusive. It aims to define what the Temple is over against the Jews who hope in a rebuilt Temple. Hope in the Temple in Jerusalem brought war and destruction and so the city, the Temple, and the people of Israel were handed over (*Barn.*

---

[107] On the asymmetry of metaphors, see section 1.3.2.2.

16.5). This metaphor construed in the context of Jewish hopes for a rebuilt Temple aims to state what the Temple *is not* as much as it is to state what the Temple *is*. While this implication remains a possible entailment of any Temple metaphor, it is in *Barnabas* that it is stated explicitly and indisputably. The Temple in Jerusalem was not and will never be the Temple of God.

Therefore, *Barn*. 16.10 as the cumulative statement of *Barnabas'* position on the Temple can be justly be categorized as and, indeed, serves as a paradigm of *spiritualization*. To remind us of Gärtner's definition:

> The word is used to indicate the transference of the concrete entity, the temple building, to a more 'spiritual' realm in the living community, and of the sacrifices to deeds in the life lived according to the Law.[108]

The Temple metaphor is expressed as the culmination of an evolutionary process whereby the significance of a physical reality is displaced by a deeper, superior spiritual reality. This results in a dualistic critique of the material cult. Unlike Hebrews, in which material realities are depicted simply as inferior, *Barnabas* casts doubt on the validitiy of the historical instution. Thus we observe how a conceptual model, likely derived from Paul, when actualized after the destruction of the Temple and into the polemical context of renewed hopes for a rebuilding of the Temple, can serve a program of the *spiritualization* of the Temple.

---

[108] Gärtner 1965:19. The term *spiritualization* is also used to describe Barnabas' metaphor by Rhodes 2004:75-76.

6.6. Conclusion

In this final case study we have seen that the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, identified early on as Barnabas the companion of Paul, wrote this text in the Roman East, likely around Alexandria, during the reign of Nerva, between 96-98 CE. He is thus writing within the context of renewed hopes of a Temple being rebuilt in Jerusalem following the fall of the Flavian dynasty. As a result, the issue of the Temple lies in the background of much of *Barnabas* 2-16, beginning with his critique of cult in chapter 2 and concluding with replacement of the Temple in chapter 16. Within this framework, *Barnabas* conceptualizes the Christian community and the Christian heart in terms of the Temple.

Our task here was to ask if and to what extent *Barnabas'* metaphorical conceptualization of the Temple was influenced by Paul. We noted some clear signs of Pauline influence in general, though it is unclear whether this constituted conscious use. In terms of the Temple metaphors, we observe that *Barn.* 4.11 is proximate to 1 Cor 3.16 in its function and the context which it addresses, but less so in its form. Both *Barn.* 6.15 and 16.10 come closest to Eph 2.21-22 both verbally and conceptually. Here the correspondences are much stronger than in 4.11 and the evidence of Pauline influence is probable.

Therefore, the conceptual and linguistic frameworks of *Barnabas'* Temple metaphors appear to be provided by Paul: the community is built together, indwelt, holy, and spiritual. However, we can observe Paul's Temple metaphor being construed and actualized by *Barnabas* in a significantly different context. Since Paul was addressing gentiles outside of Palestine, the Temple was not at issue for him and thus the certain entailments of his Temple metaphors for the Jerusalem Temple remain tacit. *Barnabas*,

however, construes and applies this metaphor to a situation in which the Temple was an issue, in that it may be rebuilt. In conceptualizing THE COMMUNITY/HEART IS A TEMPLE in this context *Barnabas* construes and explicitly states the entailments of eschatological fulfillment, ontological replacement, and polemic. While these entailments are not explicit in the Pauline construal of this metaphor, and are perhaps even unintended, the conceptual constituents of this position are provided by the apostle himself. Thus by viewing *Barnabas* within the *effective-history* of Paul's Temple metaphors we expose ourselves to the hermeneutical possibilites of these metaphors. Paul's Temple metaphors, when construed and actualized within the context of a Temple polemic, can produce an interpretation that *spiritualizes* and definitively replaces the Temple in Jerusalem.

Second, the aim of an effective-historical approach is to consciously bring out the temporal distance between the text and us and by doing so become aware of the prejudices that might be unconsciously informing our interpretations. We have observed that the correspondences and entailments which *Barnabas* has highlighted and made explicit by construing the Temple metaphor within his polemical context are precisely those that inform the categories we find applied to the study of Paul. In studies of Paul's cultic language, he is viewed as inaugurating the eschatological Temple, declaring a new Temple, and replacing the Temple in Jerusalem. There appears a clear connection between a post-70 CE application of Paul's conceptualization and academic attempts to reconstruct Paul's original meaning. However, from this investigation it has become clear that *Barnabas'* understanding and application of the Temple metaphor are inherently contingent on the reality of the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and the hopes of its rebuilding. At the very least, we observe the lengths to which *Barnabas* must go to state

that the Temple is obsolete, even decades after its destruction. To this end, *Barnabas* also highlights those moves we do not see Paul making: the critique of sacrifice in both theory and practice, the systematic reinterpretation of cultic acts, the use of καταργεῖν with cultic activity and the Temple. If Barnabas must do all this to replace the Temple while it no longer stands, how much more would Paul need to do while it still did.

As interpreters of Paul's Temple metaphors, we always already possess a hermeneutical horizon that has been affected by the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and the subsequent Christian re-interpretation of it. In *Barnabas*, we observe the interpretive possibility and utility of Paul's Temple metaphors in a world without a Temple. However, we also see that the categories that lead us to a supersessionist interpretation of Paul himself may in fact be given to us by such post-70 CE construals of these metaphors. Thus by viewing the *Epistle of Barnabas* in the effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors we see that questions of eschatology, ontology, polemic, and indeed replacement and supersession, questions contigent on historical realities which only occurred following his death, may in fact not be *the right questions to ask* of Paul's Temple metaphors.

CHAPTER SEVEN:
CONCLUSION

This study set out to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors. This inquiry required us to seek out the question to which these metaphors present an answer. The most commonly pursued answer, when assessing these texts, is to the question of Paul's view of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem. Do Paul's Temple metaphors indicate that the Jerusalem Temple had been rendered unnecessary and replaced by the formation of the Christian community? Thus our analysis had a dual purpose: to observe whether Paul's metaphors provide an answer to this question and, subsequently, to assess whether this is indeed the right question to ask.

We have determined that the question of the validity of the Jerusalem Temple is not the question these texts seek to answer. Rather, these Temple metaphors demonstrate how Paul can draw upon a highly delineated and well-known domain and use it to provide a conceptual structure to his discussion of the community and the body as indwelt, unified and holy. However, this conceptual structure provides no constraints and allows for the possibility of extensions and applications that could address different issues. Therefore, Paul, while not addressing the question of the status of the Temple himself, provides the conceptual and linguistic tools for those in different historical circumstances and those addressing different questions to construct an answer.

We sought to demonstrate this position through an application of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and an awareness of the hermeneutical principle of effective-history. In CHAPTER ONE we observed that many of the attempts to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors rely on the identification and reconstruction of the

essential background for these texts. However, the multiplicity of backgrounds suggested and the variety of interpretations that result, many of which are supersessionist, demonstrate the potency of Paul's metaphors, but also call for a better understanding of how metaphorical meaning is created. We outlined the fundamental principles of CMT, with a focus on the description of a metaphor's conceptual structure and hermeneutical implications. Metaphor was defined as a cross-domain mapping, from a source domain to a target domain. This mapping is partial, in that it highlights and hides aspects of the target domain, and is asymmetrical, in that mappings are formed only from source to target. Mapping fixes a set of correspondences between the source and target domains and allows for reasoning about the target with the conceptual structure provided by the source.

Verbal metaphors are only linguistic realizations of conceptual models and thus do not contain meaning, but rather elicit a construal enacted by the interpreter. This construal is a hermeneutical act and therefore takes place within an interpreter's hermeneutical horizon and seeks the answer to a particular question. In order to find the right questions to ask, we must obtain the right horizon of inquiry. To do so, we must become aware of a metaphor's history-of-effects, or effective-history, and expose ourselves to possible construals which may unconsciously inform our own horizons. Therefore, in order to understand the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors, not only must we locate them within their historical setting, but also we must understand how the conceptual structures of these metaphors generate meaning, and how the meanings that have been generated may influence the questions we bring to bear on them.

In CHAPTER TWO, we began our analysis with a historical inquiry into the setting of Paul's Temple metaphors. The aim here was not to establish a background or parallels for these texts, but to characterize a general posture of Jews towards the Temple in the Second Temple period through an assessment of their public behaviour. In examining Jewish pilgrimage, Temple tax, and reactions to the Gaius incident and the destruction of the Temple, we concluded that the overwhelming majority of Jews in this period exhibited support for and adherence to the Jerusalem Temple. By taking this general adherence as a baseline, we observed that cultic criticisms and conceptualizations *ipso facto* do not raise questions regarding the validity of the Jerusalem Temple, but often demonstrate the indispensability of the institution. Although we saw potential exceptions to this in Acts 7 and *Sib. Or.* 4, these should not lead us to presuppose or anticipate supersessionist meanings or implications when we encounter this language in Jewish texts of this period.

In CHAPTER THREE we assessed Paul's Temple metaphors to observe whether their meaning and implications deviate from this standard adherence. We prefaced this discussion with an analysis of the direct statements Paul makes regarding the Temple cult (Rom 9.4, 1 Cor 9.13, 10.21) to see if they provided any hermeneutical guidance in the assessment of Paul's metaphorical meaning. These texts betray a general respect for the Temple institution as a gift from God to the Jewish people. Furthermore, we were able to observe how Paul could derive principles from the cultic practices and use them to structure his discussions of other issues (Rom 12.1, 15.16).

We then turned to the Temple metaphors themselves (1 Cor 3.16-17, 6.19-20; 2 Cor 6.14-7.1). In examining both their possible backgrounds and conceptual structures

we observed how these metaphors generate meaning. In 1 Cor 3.16-17, Paul develops a conceptual structure with which to address the issue of divisions in Corinth. This Temple structure is combined with others (agricultural and architectural) and allows for reasoning about the status of the Corinthian community using the conceptual tools drawn from the domain of the Temple. Thus the Corinthians can understand themselves as indwelt, unified, and holy. In 1 Cor 6.19, Paul maps the source domain of the Temple onto a different target domain, the body. Here Paul uses the same conceptual structure to provide inference patterns for a different issue, sexual immorality. The dual targets for the Temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians suggest that Paul is not fixing an ontological identity between the Temple and the community/body, but rather that the Temple is a powerful conceptual tool with which to discuss issues of holiness with reference to the presence of the Spirit.

The third metaphor, 1 Cor 6.14-7.1, is complicated by issues of authenticity and integrity. However, the Temple here also serves to demonstrate that the community is indwelt and set apart, this time from unbelievers. The basis for this indwelling is found in a number of scriptural citations, which may suggest a sense of eschatological fulfillment in the conceptualization. However, parallels with other Jewish texts may temper this conclusion. In sum, we observed that Paul's Temple metaphors are never combined with criticisms of cultic practice or principles; they are asymmetrical in that they seek to conceptualize the community/body not to define the Temple, and they are aimed at providing a structure with which the Corinthians can understand their status as holy in light of the indwelling of the Spirit. The explanatory power of these metaphors

conceptually depends upon the reality of the Temple functioning as the dwelling place of the Spirit.

CHAPTER THREE ended with a prelude to our three case studies into the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors. Here we began to observe how subsequent utilizations of Paul's conceptualizations may draw out the implications of Paul's metaphors, extend them in new directions, and influence our interpretation of them. Eph 2.11-22, as a text both within the Pauline tradition and representing the first instantiation of such a utilization, served as a model for this procedure. We demonstrated how Eph 2.11-22 draws upon the conceptual structure of 1 Cor 3.16-17, but extends and adapts it to address the question of Jew/gentile relations within the church. While this highlights a central entailment of Paul's own Temple metaphor, that the gentiles now form the Temple of God, it also moves towards a more universal definition of the community as the Temple.

CHAPTER FOUR examined 1 Pet 2.4-10 in relation to Paul's Temple metaphors and served as our first of three case studies in their effective-history. We argued that the οἶκος πνευματικός in 1 Pet 2.5 evokes a Temple source domain and demonstrated how this metaphor draws upon the conceptual and linguistic structures provided by Paul's cultic metaphors. The Petrine metaphor not only serves to provide consolation for the community and define them as holy over against the world, but also synthesizes a number of Paul's discrete metaphorical statements into a single structure. While this highlights the compatibility of Paul's cultic metaphors and may reveal an underlying conceptual structure in the apostle's thought, it is also a move Paul himself does not make, but one commonly found in accounts of Paul's cultic metaphors.

Our second case study on the Epistle to the Hebrews differed from those previous. Rather than observing a subsequent actualization of Paul's Temple metaphors, in CHAPTER FIVE we saw how Hebrews' literary association with the Pauline tradition affected how Paul's metaphors could be construed. By charting this association in ancient and modern studies, we concluded Hebrews was seen as a supplement to the Pauline corpus in that it filled a lacuna left by the apostle: a text addressed to Jews, discussing Jewish matters, the cult. However, Hebrews does not discuss the Temple *per se*, but rather the tent, sacrifice, and the high priest. In the author's presentation of these subjects, he explicates the logic of the relationship between the new Christian realities and the Jewish cultic institutions on which they are modeled. In Hebrews, the reality and necessity of the heavenly tent, the once for all sacrifice of Christ, and the high priesthood of Christ are contingent on the inferiority and inefficacy of the old system which has been replaced. While the date of Hebrews is difficult to determine, this position suggests a post 70 CE context, not as an example of triumphant supersessionism, but as a consolation for the loss of the cultic system. Through its association with Paul, Hebrews has influenced the entailments of Paul's conceptual structure by importing a logic of contingency to how they are to be construed.

Our final case study in CHAPTER SIX was on the *Epistle of Barnabas*. We argued that *Barnabas* was written c. 98 CE during a renewal of Jewish hopes in the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple. *Barnabas*' discussion of the Temple and his Temple metaphors (*Barn.* 4.11, 6.15, 16.10) bear conceptual relationship to Paul's metaphorical structures but are utilized for a very different end. *Barnabas* combines these metaphors with a thorough critique of the Temple and sacrifice and utilizes the metaphors' conceptual

structures in order to suggest an eschatological fulfillment, fix an ontological identity, and create a polemic with the Jerusalem Temple. However, we observed that both the critique of cult and the metaphorical actualizations were contingent on the reality of the destruction of the Temple. Although often deemed "radical", it is *Barnabas* that actually fits the *spiritualization* model that is so often applied to Paul.

By examining Paul's Temple metaphors in their setting, using the tools provided by CMT, and with an awareness of their effective-history we can see how Paul's texts do not seek to answer questions regarding the validity of the Jerusalem Temple, but can provide the conceptual resources to do so when such questions are posed. This sampling of the early effective-history of Paul's Temple metaphors brings before our eyes the various ways in which these metaphors can be adapted and employed in different situations. However, these adaptations also reflect some of the tendencies found in our own assessments of Paul's language: the application of the metaphor to Jew/gentile relations, the synthesis of cultic metaphors, the logic of contingency, and *spiritualization*. Thus we observe that Paul's Temple metaphors generate interpretations which, through their extension and application to different questions by subsequent authors, have in turn influenced the interpretation of the Paul's metaphors themselves.

What is offered in this study is a methodologically consistent and hermeneutically self-aware approach to understanding the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors. Our conclusions, however, do not suggest a necessary trajectory from Paul's Temple metaphors to *Barnabas*, or from *Barnabas* to the modern *spiritualization* or supersessionist models. Indeed, this study makes no attempt to present a comprehensive survey of *the* effects or even *the* early effects of these metaphors. Although such an

exhaustive survey is likely not possible, further texts from the selected period could be examined, and the scope of future projects could be expanded to include the voices and questions of other texts, from the early church to the present day.[1] Similarly, we do well to heed the advice of Rowland that "[t]he task of *Wirkungsgeschichte* at the present juncture requires… that we refuse to move too quickly to hermeneutical models or theological syntheses." [2] No inquiry into a text's effective-history should be reductionistic. Thus, we do not claim to have uncovered the hermeneutical key for determining the meaning of Paul's Temple metaphors. What was offered here is an attempt to "provoke" or "put at risk" some of the historical questions and assumptions we bring to bear on how these metaphors can be understood. Studies such as this do not arrive finally or conclusively at the correct approach, but contribute to the continuous pursuit of understanding a text's meaning through reflecting upon how our hermeneutical horizons are formed and from where our interpretive questions have emerged.

Rowland further cites the aim of effective-historical inquiries: "[w]e are interested in seeing, through history, how the Bible has and does come alive."[3] Ultimately, this is what we hope to have achieved here. Rather than viewing Paul's Temple metaphors as "dead" metaphors, whose meaning is consigned to and contained by their initial historical articulation, by viewing how these metaphors' conceptual structure can generate meaning and elicit construals, we can begin to view how these texts have had life and can continue to have life through a growing awareness of their textual afterlives.

---

[1] For example, the Temple metaphors found in Ignatius *Eph.* 9.1, 15.3 and *Phld.* 7.2, which appear to draw upon Paul were considered for this study. Limits in scope and space however, forced us to focus upon effects we deemed to be more hermeneutically stimulating.
[2] Rowland 2004:4.
[3] Rowland 2004:5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, Paul J. 1996. *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.

Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw. 2005. "Portraying the Temple in Stone and Text: The Arch of Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 131-148. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Allen, David Lewis. 2010. *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews*. NAC Studies in Bible & Theology. Nashville, Tenn.: B&H Academic.

Applebaum, Shim'on. 1979. *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*. Leiden: Brill.

Attridge, Harold W. 1989. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Aune, David Edward. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Barnard, Leslie. 1958. "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas - A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 44:101-107.

Barnett, A.E. 1941. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Barrett, C. K. 1991. "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, edited by William Horbury, 345-367. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Barth, Markus. 2008. *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation and Commentary on Chapters 1-3*. The Anchor Bible. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Bartlet, J.V. 1905. "Barnabas." In *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1977. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: Brill.

Beardsley, Monroe C. 1962. "The Metaphorical Twist." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* XXII (8):293-307.

———. 1978. "Metaphorical Senses." *Nous* 12 (1):3-16.

Beare, Francis Wright. 1970. *The First Epistle of Peter*. 3d ed. Oxford Eng.: B. Blackwell.

Beker, Johan Christiaan. 1996. *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Best, Ernest. 1969. "I Peter II 4-10 - A Reconsideration." *Novum Testamentum* 11 (4):270-293.

———. 1998. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Betz, H.B. 1973. "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92:88-108.

Bingham, Jeffrey D. 2012. "Irenaeus and Hebrews." In *Christology, Hermeneutics, and Hebrews: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*, edited by Jon Laansma and Daniel J. Treier, 48-73. London: T & T Clark.

Bird, Michael F., and Joseph R. Dodson, eds. 2011. *Paul and the Second Century*. Library of New Testament studies. London ; New York: T & T Clark.

Black, Max. 1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, N.Y.,: Cornell University Press.

———. 1979a. "How Metaphors Work: A Reply to Donald Davidson." In *On Metaphor*, edited by Sheldon Sacks, 181-192. Chicago: University of Chicago.

———. 1979b. "More about Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 19-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bockmuehl, Markus. 1994. "A Commentator's Approach to the 'Effective History' of Philippians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 60:57-88.

———. 1998. *The Epistle to the Philippians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers.

———. 2006. *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study*. Studies in Theological Interpretation. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

———. 2007. "New Testament Wirkungsgeschichte and the Early Christian Appeal to Living Memory." In *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: the Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium*, edited by Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Benjamin G. Wold, 341-368. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Borgen, Peder. 1984. "Philo of Alexandria." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 233-282. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Böttrich, Christfried. 1999. "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes'. Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus." In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Kathrin Ehlers and Peter Pilhofer, 285-301. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1994. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Contraversions. Berkeley; London: University of California Press.

Brooke, George. 1999. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Kathrin Ehlers and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2005. "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Temple and Worhsip in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 417-434. London: T&T Clark.

———. 2013. "2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 Again: A Change in Perspective." In *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature (1)*, 1-16. Leiden: Brill.

Carleton Paget, James. 1994. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe,. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

———. 1996. "Paul and the Epistle of Barnabas." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (4):359-381.

———. 2007. "The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writing that Later Formed the New Testament." In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostlic Father*, edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 229-249. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chester, Andrew. 1991. "The Sibyl and the Temple." In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, edited by William Horbury, 37-69. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Childs, Brevard S. 2008. *The Church's Guide for Reading Paul: The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. 2010. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Nottingham, England: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.; Apollos.

Clements, Ruth A. 2012. "Epilogue: 70 CE After 135 CE - The Making of a Watershed?" In *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*, edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss, 517-536. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Clooney, Francis X. 1985. "Sacrifice and Its Spiritualization in Christian and Hindu Traditions: A Study in Comparative Theology [Jaimin, Ramanuja, Srivaisnava]." *Harvard Theological Review* 78:361-80.

Cockerill, Gareth Lee. 1978. "Heb 1:1, *1 Clem*. 36:1-6 and the High Priest." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97:437-40.

———. 2012. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan ; Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Collange, J.-F. 1972. *Énigmes de la Deuxième Épître de Paul aux Corinthiens*. Vol. 18. Cambridge: SNTS Monograph Series.

Collins, J.J. 1983. "Sibylline Oracles." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 317-472. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

———. 1998. *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Jerusalem: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1975. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Letich. Edited by George W. MacRae. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

———. 1987. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Corsani, B. 2000. *La seconda lettera ai Corinzi: Guida alla lettura*. Piccola collana moderna, Serie biblica Turin: Claudiana.

Cranfield, C. E. B. 1985. *Romans. A Shorter Commentary*. American ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Croft, William, and D.A. Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambeidge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalferth, I.U. 1991. "Christ Died for Us: Reflections on the Sacrificial Language of Salvation." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, edited by S.W. Sykes, 299-325. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daly, Robert J. 1978. *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

———. 1997. "Is Chrisitainity Sacrificial or Antisacrificial?" *Religion* 27:231-43.

Davidson, Donald. 1979. "What Metaphors Mean." In *On Metaphor*, edited by Sheldon Sacks, 29-46. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Davies, Philip R. 1983. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield, England: JSOP Press, Dept. of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield.

Davies, W. D. 1994. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. The Biblical Seminar. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

De Lacey, D. R. 1991. "οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of Metaphor in St. Paul." In *Templum Amicitiae*, edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Deissmann, Adolf. 1910. *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman world*. Translated by Lionel Richard Mortimer Strachan. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Derrida, Jacques. 1974. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." *New Literary History* 6 (1, On Metaphor):5-74.

Dodd, C.H. 1952. *According to the Scripture*. London: Nisbet.

Downs, David J. 2008. *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. 1991. *Being-In-The-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dunn, James D. G. 1991. *Romans 9-16*. Milton Keynes: Word UK Ltd.

———. 1993. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

———. 1996. *The Acts of the Apostles*. 1st U.S. ed. Narrative Commentaries. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International.

———. 2006. *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed. London; Philadelphia: SCM Press; Trinity Press International.

Eberhart, Chrisitian A. 2005. "Characteristics of Sacrificial Metaphors in Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 37-64. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Eco, Umberto. 1983. "The Scandal of Metaphor: Metaphorology and Semiotics." *Poetics Today* 4 (2, Metaphor):217-257.

Ego, Beate, Armin Lange, Kathrin Ehlers, and Peter Pilhofer, eds. 1999. *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community without Temple: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Eisenbaum, Pamela M. 1997. *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*. Dissertation Series/ Society of Biblical Literature. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

———. 2005. "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 213-238. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Elliott, John Hall. 1966. *The Elect and the Holy*. Leiden,: E. J. Brill.

———. 1976. "The Rehabilitation of an Exegetical Step-Child: 1 Peter in Recent Research." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (2):243-254.

———. 1990a. *A Home for the Homeless: A Social-Scientific Criticism of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. 1st pbk. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
———. 2000. *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.
Elliott, Neil 1990b. *Rhetoric of Romans. Argumentative Constrait and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. Vol. 45. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Evans, Roberts. 2014. *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss in Current Practice*. London: T&T Clark.
Evans, Vyvyan, Benjamin K. Bergen, and Jörg Zinken. 2006. *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader*. London: Equinox.
Faust, Eberhard. 1993. *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris: religionsgeschichtliche, traditionsgeschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief*. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus. Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen: Universitätsverlag; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Fee, Gordon D. 1977. "II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and Food Offerred to Idols." *New Testament Studies* 23:140-161.
———. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
Feldman, Louis H. 1993. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Feldmeier, Reinhard. 2008. *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.
Ferguson, Everett. 1982. "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance." *Studia Patristica* 17:677-683.
Filtvedt, Ole Jakob. 2015. *The Identity of God's People and the Paradox of Hebrews*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Finlan, Stephen. 2004. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. Academia Biblica. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
———. 2011. "Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews." In *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*, edited by Chrisitian A. Eberhart, 83-98. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1961. "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragrah in 2 Cor. 6,14-7,1." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*:271-280.
———. 1993. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.
———. 2008. *First Corinthians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 32. The Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven and London: Yale University.
Foster, Ora D. 1913. "The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter" with their Bearing on Date and Place of Authorship." *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 17:363-538.
Frazer, James George. 1922. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. Abridged ed. London: Macmillan.

Frey, Jörg. 1999. "Temple and Rival Temple - The Case of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis." In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Kathrin Ehlers and Peter Pilhofer, 171-204. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2012. "Temple and Identity in Early Christianity and in the Johannine Community: Reflections on the 'Parting of the Ways'." In *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*, edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss, 447-507. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Furnish, Victor Paul. 1984. *II Corinthians*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. 2nd rev. ed. Continuum Impacts. London: Continuum.

Garland, David E. 2003. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

Gärtner, Bertil E. 1965. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Monograph Series / Society for New Testament Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geeraerts, Dirk, and H. Cuyckens. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gelardini, Gabriella. 2005. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation." In *Hebrews: Contempoary Methods - New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 107-127. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Gese, Michael. 1997. *Das Vermächtnis des Apostels: Die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie im Epheserbrief*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Girard, René. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Translated by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gnilka, J. 1963. "2 Kor. 6,14-7,1 im Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente." In *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift J. Schmid*, edited by J. Blinzer, 86-99. Regensburg: F. Pustet.

Goodenough, Erwin Ramsdell. 1935. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press; H. Milford, Oxford University Press.

Goodman, Martin. 1989. "Nerva, The Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 79:40-44.

———. 1992. "Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple." In *Jews and Christians*, edited by James D. G. Dunn, 27-38. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.

———. 1999. "The Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period." In *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Lee I. Levine, 69-76. New York: Continuum.

———. 2004. "Trajan and the Origins of Roman Hostility to the Jews." *Past & Present* 182:3-29.

———. 2005. "The Temple in First Century CE Judaism." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark.

———. 2008. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. 1st Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books.

———. 2010. "The Qumran Sectarians and the Temple in Jerusalem." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, edited by Charlotte Hempel, 263-274. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

———. 2012. "Religious Reactions to 70: The Limitations of the Evidence." In *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*, edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss, 509-516. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Goppelt, Leonhard. 1993. *A Commentary on I Peter*. Translated by John E. Alsup. Edited by Ferdinand Hahn. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Grabbe, L.L. 1992. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian, vol. 2, The Roman Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Gregory, Andrew. 2007. "1 Clement and the Writings that later formed the New Testament." In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostlic Fathers*, edited by C. M. Tuckett and Andrew Gregory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gregory, Andrew F., and C. M. Tuckett. 2007a. *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Second Edition ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007b. *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Second ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Gupta, Nijay K. 2010. *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hagner, Donald A. 1973. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2007. "Paul as Jewish Believer - According to His Letter." In *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, 96-120. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark. 1992. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

———. 2002. "The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the NT Canon." In *The Canon Debate*, edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, 405-415. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Harnack, Adolf von. 1897/1958. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Euseius. Teil II: Die Chronologie.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag.

Hays, Richard B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

———. 1997. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press.

———. 2009. ""Here We Have no Lasting City": New Covenantalism in Hebrews." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald, 151-173. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Hayward, Robert. 1996. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Translated by Edward Robinson John Macquarrie. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Heil, Christoph. 1996. "Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6.17." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*, edited by R. Bieringer, 717-729. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Hempel, Charlotte. 1998. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

———. 2010. "The Context of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, edited by Charlotte Hempel, 275-292. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Herzer, Jens. 1998. *Petrus oder Paulus?: Studien über das Verhältnis des Ersten Petrusbriefes zur paulinischen Tradition*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Hoehner, Harold W. 2002. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. 2006. *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Biblical Tools and Studies. Leuven: Peeters.

Hooker, Morna D. 2009. "Christ, the "End" of Cult." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald, 189-212. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Horbury, William. 1998. "Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr." In *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd.

———. 2014. *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Horrell, David G. 2013. *Becoming Christian: Essays on 1 Peter and the Making of Christian Identity*. Early Christianity in Context. London; New York: Bloomsbury. still image.

Howe, Bonnie. 2008. *Because You Bear this Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*. Biblical interpretation series. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Hultgren, Stephen. 2003. "2 Cor 6.14-7.1 and Rev 21.3-8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 49:39-56.

Hurd, John C. 1983. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. New ed. Macon: Mercer University Press.

Hvalvik, Reidar. 1996. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Jeremias, Joachim. 1925. "Der Eckstein." *Angelos* 1:65-70.

———. 1930. "κεφαλὴ γνωίας - ἀκρογνωνιαῖος." *ZNW* 29:264-80.

———. 1937. "Eckstein - Schlusstein." *ZNW* 36:154-157.

———. 1969. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Jewett, Robert. 2007. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.

Jobes, Karen H. 2006. "The Septuagint Textual Tradition in 1 Peter." In *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, 311-333. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

Johnson, Mark. 1981. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kampen, J. 1996. "4QMMT and New Testament Studies." In *Reading MMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, edited by J. Kampen and M Bernstein, 129-144. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kapfer, Hilary Evans. 2007. "The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes toward the Temple as a Test Case." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2):152-177.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1969. "Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament." In *New Testament Questions of Today*, edited by Ernst Käsemann, 66- 81. London: SCM.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1980. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Keener, Craig S. 2012. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Kirby, John T. 1997. "Aristotle on Metaphor." *The American Journal of Philology* 118 (4):517-554.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Klinzing, Georg. 1971. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen,: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Koester, Craig R. 2001. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Kovacs, Judith L. 2005. *1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators*. The Church's Bible. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Kraft, Robert A. 1965. *The Apostolic Fathers. A New Translation and Comentary. Barnabas and the Didache*. 6 vols. Vol. 3. New York Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Kratz, Reinhard. 2007. "'The Place Which He Has Chosen': The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT." In *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimat*, edited by M. Bar-Asher and E. Tov, 57-80. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute/Haifa University Press.

Kuhn, H.-W. 1992. "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, 327-339. Leiden: Brill.

Lakoff, George. 1993. "Comtemporary Theory of Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 204-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2003. "How the Body Shapes Thought: Thinking with an All-Too-Human Brain." In *The Nature and Limits of Human Understanding*, edited by Anthony Sanford, 49-74. London: T&T Clark.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Updated ed. Chicago, Ill.; London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. 1989. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

Lambrecht, J. 1994. "The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14-7,1: A Plea for Its Authenticty." In *Studies on 2 Corinthians*, edited by R. Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht, 531-549. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Lanci, John R. 1997. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaelogical Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. Studies in Biblical Literature. New York: Peter Lang.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Laporte, Jean. 1989. "Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria." *Studia Philonica Annual* 1:34-42.

———. 1991. "The High Priest in Philo of Alexandria." *Studia Philonica Annual* 3:71-82.

Leipoldt, J. 1907. *Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Erster Teil.* Leipzig: J. Hinrichs.

Leonhardt, Jutta. 2001. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Levenson, Jon D. 1995. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity*. New ed. New Haven ; London: Yale University Press.

Liddell, Henry , Robert Scott, and Henry Jones, eds. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lightfoot, John. 1890. *The Apostolic Fathers. Part I: S. Clement of Rome, Vol. 2.* London: Macmillian and Co.

Lincoln, Andrew T. 1990. *Ephesians*. Word biblical commentary. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Lindemann, Andreas. 1979. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr.

———. 1999. *Paulus, Apostel und Lehrer der Kirche: Studien zu Paulus und zum frühen Paulusverständnis*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Liu, Yulin. 2013. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Longenecker, Richard N. 2016. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Lüderitz, G. 1983. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika*. Tübingen.

Luz, Ulrich. 2007. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Rev. ed. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Markschies, Christoph. 2007. *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2012. "Haupteinleitung." In *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung, vol 1: Evangelien und Verwandtes: Teilband 1*, edited by C. Markschies and J. Schröter, 118-120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Martin, Dale B. 1995. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

Martin, Ralph P. 1986. *2 Corinthians*. Word Biblical themes. Dallas: Word Pub.

Martin, Troy W. 1992. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. Dissertation Series/ Society of Biblical Literature. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

Mbuvi, Andrew M. 2007. *Temple, Exile, and Identity in 1 Peter*. Library of New Testament studies. London: T & T Clark.

McKelvey, R. J. 1962. "Christ the Cornerstone." *New Testament Studies* 8:352-359.

———. 1969. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. London: Oxford University Press.

Meinhold, P. 1940. "Geschichte und Exegese im Barnabasbrief." *ZKG* 59:255-303.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. 1989. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Themes. Dallas: Word Pub.

Miller, James C. 2005. "Paul and Hebrews: A Comparison of Narrative Worlds." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods - New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 245-264. Ledien; Boston: Brill.

Mitchell, Margaret Mary. 2000. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Mitton, C. Leslie. 1950. "The Relationship between 1 Peter and Ephesians." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1:67-73.

———. 1951. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Montefiore, Hugh. 1964. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. 1st ed. Harper's New Testament commentaries. New York: Harper & Row.

Moo, Douglas J. 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Moore, Nicholas J. 2015. *Repetition in Hebrews: Plurality and Singularity in the Letter to the Hebrews, Tts Ancient Context, and the Early Church*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

Moule, C.F.D. 1950. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* I:29-41.

Moyise, Steve. 2005. "Isaiah in 1 Peter." In *Isaiah in the New Testament*, edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken, 175-188. London ; New York: T&T Clark.

Muddiman, John. 2001. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Continuum.

Müller, J.G. 1869. *Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Munck, Johannes. 1977. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Paperback ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. 1987. "Relating 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1 to its Context." *New Testament Studies* 33:272-275.

Nanos, Mark D. 2009. "*New* or *Re*newed Covenantalism? A Response to Richard Hays." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald, 183-188. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Neusner, Jacob. 1962. *A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, ca. 1-80 C.E*. Studia post-Biblica,. Leiden,: E.J. Brill.

———. 1970. *Development of a Legend: Studies on the Traditions concerning Yoḥanan ben Zakkai*. Studia post-Biblica,. Leiden,: Brill.

Newton, Michael. 2005. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nicholls, Rachel. 2008. *Walking on the Water: Reading Mt. 14:22-33 in the light of its Wirkungsgeschichte*. Biblical Interpretation Series,. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Olford, David Lindsay. 1985. "Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans: An Exegetical Study of Major Texts in Romans Which Employ Cultic Language in a Non-Literal Way." Ph.D., Sheffield.

Ounsworth, Richard Joseph. 2012. *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Parris, David P. 2009. *Reception Theory and Biblical Hermeneutics*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.

Pervo, Richard I. 2009. *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Petropoulou, M. Z. 2008. *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Greek Religion, Judaism, and Christianity, 100 BC-AD 200*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Pfleiderer, O. 1890. *Paulinismus: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der urchristlichen Theologie*. 2nd ed. ed. Leipzig: J. Hinrichs.

Porter, S.E. 1997. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Prigent, P. 1961. *Les testimonia dan le christianisme primitif: l'épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources*. Paris: Gabalda.

Prigent, P, and Robert A. Kraft. 1971. *Épître de Barnabé. SC 172*. Paris Les Éditions du Cerf.

Qimron, E., and J. Strugnell. 1984. "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran." In *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*, 400-407. Jerusalem: IES.

———. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'aséh ha-Torah*. Vol. 10. DJD. Oxford: Clarendon.

Räisänen, Heikki. 1986. *The Torah and Christ: Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity*. Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran julkaisuja. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society.

———. 1992. "'The Effective "History" of the Bible: A Challenge to Biblical Scholarship " *SJT* 45:303-324.

Reddy, Michael J. 1993. "The Conduit Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 164-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rhodes, James N. 2004. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe,. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Ribbens, Benjamin J. 2016. *Levitical Sacrifice and Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

Richards, I. A. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Mary Flexner Lectures. New York; London: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, Peter, and Martin B. Shukster. 1983. "Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis." *Journal of Theological Studies* 34:31-55.

Ricœur, Paul. 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

———. 1977. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1978. "The Metaphorical Process of Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling." *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1):143-159.

———. 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*. Translated by John B. Thompson. Cambridge; New York; Paris: Cambridge University Press, Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Robinson, J.A.T. 1976. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM.

Roetzel, Calvin J. 1999. *Paul: The Man and the Myth*. Studies on personalities of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Rothschild, Clare K. 2009. *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

Rowland, Christopher. 2004. "A Pragmatic Approach to *Wirkungsgeschichte*: Reflections on the Blackwell Bible Commentary Series and on the Writing of Its Commentary on the Apocalypse." *(*http://bbibcomm.net/files/rowland2004.pdf*, 10.11.2010), .*

———. 2005. "The Temple in the New Testament." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 469-483. London: T&T Clark.

Safrai, Shmuel. 1998. "Jerusalem and the Temple in the Tannaitic Literature of the First Generation after the Destruction of the Temple." In *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity*, edited by A. Houtman, M.J.H.M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz, 135-152. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill.

Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: S.C.M.

———. 1990. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London; Philadelphia: SCM Press; Trinity Press International.

———. 1992. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE*. London and Philadelphia: SCM; Trinity Press International.

Sargent, Benjamin. 2015. *Written to Serve: The Use of Scripture in 1 Peter*. Library of New Testament studies. London; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Schiffman, Lawerence H. 1999. "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." In *Gemeinde ohne*

Tempel, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Kathrin Ehlers and Peter Pilhofer, 267-284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2000. Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah. In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Lawerence H. Schiffman and J.C. Vanderkam. New York: OUP.

Schlier, Heinrich. 1930. *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Schmeller, T. 2006. "Der ursprüngliche Kontext von 2 Kor 6.14-7.1. Zur Frage der Einheitlichkeit des 2. Korintherbriefs." *NTS* 52:219-238.

Schmidt, Francis. 2001. *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism*. Translated by John E. Crowley. Biblical seminar. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2014. "The Muratorian Fragment: The State of Research." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57/2:231-264.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 1991. *Ephesians: A Commentary*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Schreiner, Thomas R. 1998. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books.

Schürer, Emil, Géza Vermès, Fergus Millar, and M. Black. 2014a. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. 3 vols. Vol. 3. Edinburgh: Clark.

———. 2014b. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. 3 vols. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: Clark.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. 1976. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38:159-177.

Schwartz, Daniel R. 1979. "Three Temples of 4QFlorlegium " *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1):83-91.

———. 1992. "On Barnabas and Bar Kokhba." In *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Schwartz, Daniel R., and Zeev Weiss. 2012. *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*. Ancient Judaism and early Christianity. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. 1946. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. London,: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

———. 1948. "The Problem of the Authorship of I Peter." *Expository Times* 59:256-58.

Seufert, W. 1874. "Das Abhängigkeitverhältniss des I. Petrusbriefs vom Römerbrief." *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 17:360-388.

———. 1881. "Das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss des ersten Petrusbriefs und Epheserbriefs." *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 24:178-197, 332-380.

Shanor, Jay. 1988. "Paul as Master Builder. Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 34:461-471.

Shimada, Kazuhito. 1991. "Is I Peter Dependent on Ephesians? A Critique of C.L. Mitton." *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 17:77-106.

———. 1993. "Is I Peter Dependent on Romans?" *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 19:87-137.

Simms, Karl. 2003. *Paul Ricoeur*. Routledge Critical Thinkers. London and New York: Routledge

Skarsaune, Oskar. 2009. "Does the Letter to the Hebrews Articulate a Supersessionist Theology? A Response to Richard Hays." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald, 174-182. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Smallwood, E. Mary. 1976. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Studies in Judaism in late antiquity. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, D.C. 1989. "Cultic Language in Ephesians 2.19-22. A Test Case." *Restoration Quarterly* 31:201-217.

Smith, W. Robertson. 1907. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First series, The Fundamental Institutions*. New ed. Burnett Lectures. London: A.&C. Black.

Snodgrass, Klyne R. 1977. "I Peter II. 1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities." *New Testament Studies* 24:97-106.

Soskice, Janet Martin. 1985. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Stern, Menahem. 1974. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Vol. 1. Fontes ad res Judaicas spectantes. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

———, ed. 1980. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism vol. 2*. Jeruslaem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Still, Todd D., and David E. Wilhite, eds. 2013. *Tertullian and Paul*. Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

———, eds. 2016. *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*. Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Stiver, Dan R. 1996. *The Philosophy of Religious Language: Sign, Symbol, and Story*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.

Strack, Wolfram. 1994. *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus*. Bonner biblische Beiträge (Bodenheim am Rhein, Germany). Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum.

Strawbridge, Jennifer R. 2015. *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*. Studies of the Bible and Its Reception,. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

Sundberg, Albert C. 1968. "Towards a Revised History of the NT Canon." In *Studia Evangelica 4: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on NT Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965, Part 1*, edited by F.L. Cross, 452-461. Berlin: Akademie.

———. 1973. "Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List." *Harvard Theological Review* 66:1-41.

Taylor, Joan E. 2012. *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. First edition ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press,.

Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New international Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans

Thompson, James. 1982. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Thrall, M.E. 1978. "The Problem of 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 in Some Recent Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 24:132-148.

———. 1994. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Tuval, Michael. 2012. "Doing without the Temple: Paradigms in Judaic Literature of the Diaspora." In *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History?: On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple*, edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Zeev Weiss, 181-239. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Tylor, Edward B. 1871. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom*. 2 vols. London: J. Murray.

Vahrenhorst, Martin. 2008. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

van den Hoek, Annewies. 1996. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *Vigiliae christianae* 50 (3):223-243.

Van Kooten, Geurt H. 2003. *Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School: Colossians and Ephesians in the Context of Graeco-Roman Cosmology, with a New Synopsis of the Greek texts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Verheyden, Joseph. 2003. "The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute." In *The Biblical Canons*, edited by J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge, 487-556. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

———. 2007. "The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament." In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Father*, edited by Andrew Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, 293-330. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vermès, Géza. 2004. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. Penguin classics. London: Penguin Books.

Vermès, Géza, and Martin Goodman. 1989. *The Essenes: According to the Classical Sources*. Oxford Centre Textbooks. Sheffield: Published on behalf of the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies by JSOT Press.

Vielhauer, P. 1975. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*. Berlin: de Gruyer.

Walker, W.O. 2001. *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*. Vol. 213. JSNTSsup. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

———. 2002. "2 Cor 6.14-7.1 and the Chiastic Structure of 6.11-13; 7.2-3." *New Testament Studies* 48:142-144.

Wardle, Timothy. 2010. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe,. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wedderburn, A.J.M. 2005. "Sawing off the Branches: Theologizing Dangerously *Ad Hebraeos*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 56:393-414.

Wehr, Lothar. 1996. *Petrus und Paulus, Kontrahenten und Partner: Die beiden Apostel im Spiegel des Neuen Testaments, der apostolischen Väter und früher Zeugnisse ihrer Verehrung*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Münster: Aschendorff.

Weiss, Johannes. 1910. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Neudruck der völlig neubearbeiteten Aufl. 1910. ed. In Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Weiß, K. 1954. "Paulus - Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (70):355-364.

Weissenberg, Hanne von. 2009. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

———. 2010. "The Centrality of the Temple in 4QMMT." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, edited by Charlotte Hempel, 293-305. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Wengst, K. 1984. *Schriften des Urchristentums: Didache, Barnabasbrief, zweiter Klemensbrief, Schriften an Diognet*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Wenschkewitz, Hans. 1932. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. [Aggelos] Archiv für Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde. Beihefte,. Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer.

Westerholm, Stephen. 2004. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Wilk, Florian, and J. Ross Wagner, eds. 2010. *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9-11*. Wissenscafliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Windisch, Hans. 1920. *Die apostolischen Väter III: Der Barnabasbrief*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Wise, Michael Owen. 1991. "'4QFlorilegium' and the Temple of Ada." *RevQ* 15 (1/2 (57/58)):103-132.

Wise, Michael Owen, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. 2005. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. 1948. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Yadin, Yigael. 1959. "A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii (4QFlorilegium)." *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (2):95-98.

Young, Frances M. 1983. *Sacrifice and the Death of Christ*. London: SCM.