

Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History

EYAL REGEV

*Department of Land of Israel and Archaeology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat
Gan 52900 Israel
email: regeve1@mail.biu.ac.il*

This article demonstrates that according to the Acts of the Apostles, the major charges brought against Peter, Stephen, and Paul—as well as, in later Christian texts, against James—are violations of the Temple’s sacredness, both by means of statements about and actions within it. On the narrative level, in their portrayal of the conflicts and trials of these early Christian leaders, the ancient Christian sources argued that because the early Christian community in Jerusalem sought to partake in the Temple worship in its own way, Jesus’ followers were falsely accused of violating the Temple’s sacredness. On the historical level, it may be concluded that these events were authentic, and that they were affected by two factors: (a) The assumption, on the part of the Jewish community, that Jesus represented an anti-Temple stance. This assumption was based on Jesus’ ‘cleansing’ action at the Temple, and the saying attributed to him regarding the destruction of the Temple and the erection of a new one ‘not made with [human] hands’. As such, Jesus’ followers were viewed as posing a threat to the Temple as well. (b) The meticulous approach to Temple rituals held by the Sadducean high priests in charge of the prosecutions. According to their approach, any deviance from the proscribed procedure desecrated the sacrificial cult and was to be avoided at any cost.

Keywords: Luke–Acts, Temple, the Jerusalem church, Sadducees, Jewish-Christianity

According to the book of Acts, to be a Christian leader in Jerusalem in the years 30–62 CE was a dangerous, and potentially life-threatening, experience. Following Jesus’ crucifixion, the early Christian leaders in Jerusalem were also brought to trial before the Temple’s high priests: Peter and the apostles were flogged, Paul was charged, and Stephen was executed. Josephus (*Ant.* 20.200) adds that James was stoned, a scene that is dramatized in later Christian sources. Different explanations have been offered for the persecution of these Christian leaders.¹

1 B. Reicke, ‘Judaean-Christianity and Jewish Establishment, A.D. 33–66’, *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (ed. E. Bammel and C. F. D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1984) 148–9,

In the present article, I will explore the charges directed against Peter, Stephen, Paul, and James by the high priests. Specifically, I will show that all these accusations and trials described in the book of Acts as well as in the later traditions pertaining to James's execution are related to the Temple. My analysis will be carried out on two different levels: narrative and historical. I will endeavor to interpret what messages were conveyed in these narratives, as well as discuss certain relevant aspects of Luke's treatment of the Temple and of the priesthood. I will similarly attempt to interpret the meanings inscribed in the later Christian traditions on James's execution.

Based on these findings, I will attempt to evaluate the historical plausibility of the Temple incidents in Acts and the traditions about James. Consequently, I will suggest that these Temple-related conflicts were shaped by two, interrelated factors: first, the conviction of Jewish leaders that Jesus posed a threat to the Temple, and second, the extreme sensitivity of the Sadducean high priests—who led the prosecution of the Christian leaders—to any possible violation of the cultic order. This latter factor, I will show, may well have led them to regard the early Christian activities in the Temple as sacrilegious threats. Finally, I will conclude with general, tentative considerations concerning the attitude of the early Christian community in Jerusalem towards the Temple.

1. Temple-Related Conflicts and Prosecutions in Acts

a. *Peter and the Apostles*

In Acts 4 and 5, Peter and other apostles are arrested and brought before the Sanhedrin (τὸ συνέδριον, a judicial committee headed by a high priest or king; the NRSV translates it as a 'council'). According to Acts 4.1–3, 'While Peter and John were speaking to the people, the priests, the captain (στρατηγός) of

concluded that they were charged with religious heresy, especially preaching 'the gospel of resurrection'. G. Baumbach, 'The Sadducees in Josephus', *Josephus, the Bible and History* (ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Leiden: Brill, 1989) 185, pointed to law and eschatology. According to P. Gaechter, 'The Hatred of the House of Annas', *Theological Studies* 8 (1947) 3–34, the high priests regarded the messianism of Jesus and the Church as a threat to their social position. A. J. Hultgren, 'Paul's Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale, and Nature', *JBL* 95 (1976) 97–111, pointed to the belief in Jesus as the reason for these other persecutions. On the possibility that Peter and the apostles were regarded as beguilers, see J. Schwartz, 'Ben Stada and Peter in Lydda', *JSJ* 21 (1990) 1–18. Finally, E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985) 281–6 argues for the shortcomings of previous suggestions and concludes that the persecutions were 'sporadic'. He suggests that they were related to the law and the Temple, even while he recognizes that this is an incomplete explanation.

the Temple,² and the Sadducees came to them, much annoyed because they were teaching the people and proclaiming that in Jesus there is the resurrection of the dead; so they arrested them and put them in custody'. At the judicial hearings, the high priests Annas, Caiaphas, and John, as well as other members of the high priestly families, were present (Acts 4.7). To be sure, the charges were not baseless: Acts 3 describes how Peter and John went up to the Temple for the afternoon prayer, and Peter, 'in the name of Jesus', healed a crippled beggar near the Temple's 'beautiful gate'. When the news of his action spread, a crowd gathered around Peter and John in 'Solomon's Portico' at the Temple Mount, where Peter delivered a speech about the failure to believe in Jesus. As a result, the Sanhedrin decided to warn the apostles 'not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus' (4.18).

A similar story is recounted in Acts 5.12–42, although the consequences of Peter's actions are quite different.³ Here, the apostles continue to heal, preach, and gather in Solomon's Portico (5.12); in response, 'the high priest and all who were with him (that is, the sect of the Sadducees), being filled with jealousy, arrested the apostles and put them in the public prison' (5.17). The apostles then fled and 'entered the Temple at daybreak and went on with their teaching' (5.21). The high priest, the captain of the Temple, and the other chief priests brought them back before the Sanhedrin, where Peter defended himself through a speech on the salvation of Israel through Jesus. As a result, the apostles were flogged and ordered to halt their teaching in the name of Jesus—although, Luke makes clear, they continued preaching at the Temple regardless (5.21–42).

In both descriptions, the high priest and the Temple officers arrested and charged both Peter and the other apostles with healing and preaching in the name of Jesus. Previous scholars have suggested that the reason for these arrests was the apostles' belief in resurrection or black magic, as well as the spreading of apocalyptic expectations.⁴ Yet instances of healing and preaching appear elsewhere in Acts (chs. 2, 8–10), and in all those cases, the high priests take no judicial measures against them. What, then, accounts for this difference in response?

2 In all the cases discussed herein, 'Temple' is a translation of ἱερόν. Cases in which 'Temple' refers to ναός (the actual building of the Temple, or the shrine) will be specifically noted. All translations follow the NRSV, unless noted otherwise.

3 Most scholars do not adopt the view that one of the incidents is a duplication. See E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 254–6. In terms of literary artistry and theological purpose, the second builds upon the first, in which the charge is the violation of the Sanhedrin's interdiction and the result a beating. See S. Cunningham, *'Through Many Tribulations': The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 142; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997) 192–4 and references.

4 Haenchen, *Acts*, 220–3 surveyed the relevant scholarship but left the question unresolved. H. K. Bond, *Caiaphas: Friend of Rome and Judge of Jesus?* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004) 76–7 suggested the possibility of apocalypticism.

If we examine Luke's narratives of the instances in question, we see that *he connected the arrests to the Temple*. His frequent mention of the Temple in relation to these episodes suggests that he associated the prosecution of the apostles with the *location* of their activity—namely, the Temple Mount. In other words, Luke makes the implicit claim that the high priests were concerned not merely by the apostles' teachings about Jesus and by their demonstrations of the power of healing through the use of Jesus' name; rather, the priests were concerned because these teachings and demonstrations were carried out in the Temple, and were regarded as a public desecration of the holy place. This claim is supported by the direct involvement of the high priest (who was in charge of the Temple cult), in the legal measures taken against the apostles, and by the presence of the captain of the Temple at the trials.⁵ In this vein, it is interesting to note that when Agrippa I executed James, son of Zebedee and persecuted Peter (Acts 12.1–5), he was not concerned with such cultic or religious issues.⁶

b. Stephen

Stephen, a Hellenistic Jew who lived in Jerusalem, was brought before the Sanhedrin. There, false witnesses declared, 'This man never stops saying things against *this holy place* (namely, the Temple) and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy *this place* and will change the customs that Moses handed on to us' (Acts 6.8–14). The high priest asked Stephen if this was true, and Stephen replied in the form of a long speech (Acts 7.2–53) containing biblical teachings and a mention of the tabernacle. Citing Isa 66.1–2, he went on to claim that 'the Most High does not dwell in houses made by human hands' (Acts 7.48)—an assertion that many commentators have regarded as proof of an anti-Temple stance⁷—and condemned those who rejected and killed Jesus. The course of his trial was altered radically, however, when he declared at his speech's conclusion, 'I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God' (7.51). The people regarded this statement as blasphemous; they rushed Stephen, drove him out of town, and stoned him to death in a kind of public lynching (7.57–58).⁸

5 On the question of the identity of the *στρατηγός*, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV* (AB 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 1375. On his functions, see D. Tropper, 'The Internal Administration of the Second Temple at Jerusalem' (Ph.D. diss., Yeshiva University, 1970).

6 D. R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1990) 119–24, suggested that Agrippa aimed to avoid political disturbances.

7 E.g., W. Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951) 31–6; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961) 165.

8 Several scholars have maintained that the entire episode is a mixture of two sources, one containing accusations of the Hellenistic Jews and the lynch, and the other containing the trial before the Sanhedrin. See S. Dockx, 'Date de la morte d'Étienne le Protomartyr', *Biblica* 55 (1974) 65–73; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 18C; New York: Doubleday, 1998)

Significantly, however, although Stephen was killed on account of blasphemy, the *original* charge leveled against him was that he had declared that Jesus would destroy the Temple and change the Law. The first part of this accusation echoes the one attributed to Jesus by the false witnesses in Mark 14.58: 'I will destroy this Temple (τὸν ναόν) that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands'. Indeed, Stephen's own statement about God not dwelling in a house made by human hands may likewise reflect an anti-Temple stance. Nevertheless, Luke made it clear that Stephen had not said what the witnesses argued he had. And in fact, if read literally, Stephen's words regarding God's dwelling do not necessarily imply the rejection of the Temple cult in Jerusalem, since they are derived from prophetic teachings whose purpose is the criticism of a belief in a limited abode for the Divine Presence.⁹ In any event, it is clear that the alleged rejection of the Temple—and certainly the claim of its imminent destruction, based upon Jesus' prophecy—plays a crucial role in Luke's presentation of Stephen's arrest and trial.

c. *Paul*

When Paul returned to Jerusalem, he was suspected by other Jewish-Christians of warning Jews not to obey the Torah. The elders associated with James insisted that Paul would disprove this accusation, and demonstrate that he 'observes and guards the law', specifically through his sponsorship of the sacrifices (i.e. Nazirite vows) of fellow Christians. Paul purified himself along with the Nazirites and entered the Temple, thus 'making public the completion of the days of purification when the sacrifice would be made' (Acts 21.18–26).

Yet as Paul entered the Temple, he was seized by Jews from Asia who declared, 'This is the man who is teaching everyone everywhere against our people, our law, and *this place*; more than that, *he has actually brought Greeks into the Temple and has defiled this holy place*'. Luke here adds an explanatory comment meant to undermine the Asian Jews' accusation: 'For they had previously seen Trophimus the Ephesian with him in the city, and they supposed that Paul had brought him into the Temple' (21.27–29). Nonetheless, Paul was dragged out of

365, 390–1. Fitzmyer claimed that the speech originated in an Antiochian source with Luke's own additions. For the background of Stephen's alleged sayings and speech, see M. Hengel, 'Between Jesus and Paul. The "Hellenists", the "Seven" and Stephen (Acts 6.1–15; 7.54–8.3)', *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* (London: Fortress, 1983) 18–26.

9 D. D. Sylva, 'The Meaning and Function of Acts 7.46–50', *JBL* 106 (1987) 261–75; J. J. Kilgallen, 'The Function of Stephen's Speech', *Biblica* 70 (1989) 177–81; C. C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 67–81. Hill also reviewed the anti-Temple interpretations. See also E. Larson, 'Temple Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflections on Acts 6–7', *NTS* 39 (1993) 379–95.

the Temple and would surely have been killed but for the Roman troops stationed nearby; hearing the commotion, they interfered and arrested Paul instead (21.30–36). It is possible that the crowd was fulfilling the legal practice, acknowledged by the Romans, according to which a gentile (ἄλλογενής) who enters the Temple's courts is to be executed immediately, even without benefit of a trial.¹⁰ Yet in this case, we must remember, it was a *Jew* who was accused of responsibility for such a sacrilegious act.

Subsequently, there ensued long and winding legal procedures under the leadership of the high priest Ananias son of Nedebaus, as well as the Roman procurators Felix and Festus and King Agrippa II. The Jewish crowd, led by the high priest and the Sanhedrin, demanded the enforcement of the death penalty, but the Romans were not convinced of any actual guilt. Therefore, since Paul was a Roman citizen, he was taken into Roman custody until his appeal to Nero.¹¹

At first glance, the Temple accusation against Paul may seem like a mere excuse to punish him for his teachings against the Torah. (Note, however, that Paul visited Jerusalem in Acts 15 *without* encountering any such enmity.) Yet Luke mentions the violation of the Temple's sacredness time and again, both in his descriptions of the charges brought against Paul as well as in Paul's own speeches. Indeed, after Paul was transferred to Caesarea, a delegation headed by the high priest Ananias approached Felix, accusing Paul of trying 'to profane the Temple' (24.7). Paul replied that he 'went up to worship in Jerusalem', but was not—in what would seem to be a clear reference to the acts of Peter and the apostles—'disputing with anyone in the Temple or stirring up a crowd either in the synagogues or throughout the city' (24.11–12). Or, as he stated to Festus in response to the subsequent accusations against him, 'I have in no way committed an offence against the law of the Jews, or against the Temple, or against the emperor' (25.8).

In Paul's speeches, Luke portrays Paul as devoted to the Temple cult. For example, according to Luke, Paul points out that after being called by Jesus, he prayed in the Temple (Acts 22.17). Moreover, Paul stressed that he came to Jerusalem 'to bring alms to my nation and to offer sacrifices; while I was doing this, they found me in the Temple, completing the rite of purification, without any crowd or disturbance' (24.17–18). It seems likely that Luke was here attempting to convince the reader that the Temple charge was false—an implicit acknowledgment that the Temple was a focal point in the conflict between Paul and the Jerusalem Jews.¹²

10 See P. Segal, 'The Penalty of the Warning Inscription from the Temple of Jerusalem', *IEJ* 39 (1989) 79–84 with bibliography.

11 Acts 21.37–26.32; B. Rapske, *The Book of Acts in its First-Century Setting*. Vol. 3, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody* (Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

12 Admittedly, due to his own theological interests, Luke also presents Jesus' resurrection as a major cause of the conflict between Paul and his opponents in his speeches.

d. *Between Narrative and History*

From the above survey of the measures taken against the early Christian leaders emerges a certain theme: Peter and the apostles as well as Paul were all arrested and put on trial on account of their having allegedly committed forbidden actions in the Temple; so, too, was Stephen prosecuted following his supposed statement about Jesus' destruction of the Temple. The question arises, however, whether we can trust Luke's presentation of these events.

Naturally, the answer depends on one's position with regard to the historical credibility of Acts. Those who consider Luke a reliable historian¹³ and his sources authentic¹⁴ would likely answer in the affirmative. They may find support for their position in Luke's precise geographical knowledge of the Temple: his references to 'Solomon's Portico', for example, and to 'the Beautiful Gate', as well as his familiarity with the sacrificial rites and security arrangements practiced therein.¹⁵ Recently, Dunn defended the historical value of Acts, pointing to Luke's attempt at faithful transmission of traditions following Hellenistic historical conventions (Luke 1.1–4); his use of what appear to be firsthand sources (such as the 'we passages'); the commensurability with Paul's letters; and Luke's historical accuracy with regard to various small details of Roman Judaea or Greco-Roman politics and culture.¹⁶ Others, however, may remain more skeptical, since Luke was after all a theologian, and thus naturally shaped his narrative to convey a certain theological message. This message, critics argue, may have affected the historical accuracy of his narrative.¹⁷ One is therefore left to wonder whether to regard Luke's competence as a historian as an indication of his reliability, or of his rhetorical skill.

13 H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (repr. London: SPCK, 1958) esp. 299–300; M. Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). Cf. G. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 16–19, 345–6, 349, 374, 386–9.

14 See G. Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987) 60, 85, 92–3, 234–6, 239, 245–6, 249–51, regarding the first arrest of Peter, and the instances in which Stephen and Paul were involved. Bond, *Caiaphas*, 74–7 noted Luke's shaping of the narrative in Acts 4–5, but nevertheless regarded the persecutions as historical, although she did downplay the role of the high priests.

15 M. Hengel, 'Luke the Historian and the Geography of Palestine in the Acts of the Apostles', *Between Jesus and Paul*, 102–6; J. J. Schwartz, 'Temple and Temple Mount in the Book of Acts: Early Christian Activity, Topography, and Halakhah', *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. J. Pastor and M. Mor; Jerusalem: Yad Yizhak Ben-Zvi, 2005) 279–95.

16 J. D. G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*. Vol. 2, *Beginning from Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009) 73–81 and bibliography.

17 See already M. Dibelius, 'The First Christian Historian', *The Book of Acts: Form, Style and Theology* (repr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004) 14–26. Cf. M. Palmer Bonz, *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2000). For Acts' tendentious history, see Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, 82–7, 160–4. See more below.

Yet while the historical credibility of Acts may be called into question, there is no doubt that Luke employed narrative history in an effort to convey certain theological messages. I will therefore turn now to an analysis of those messages implied in the Temple conflicts involving Peter, Stephen, and Paul, which may add to our understanding of Luke's general attitude toward Judaism. Later on, I will build on the results of this literary investigation in an effort to unravel the question of these events' historical reliability.

2. *Luke, the Priests, and the Temple: The Message of the Temple Conflicts in Acts*

In evaluating Luke's intentions, we must engage in a broader analysis of his attitude toward the Temple, the priests, and the high priests as expressed in both his gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles.¹⁸ Undoubtedly, the Temple is the focal Jewish institution for Luke: It both opens and ends his gospel. Luke locates Jesus' nativity and the beginning of the apostles' ministry there (Luke 24.52–53), and describes it as the scene of the apostles' activity as well. In his gospel, moreover, he stresses the priestly descent of the parents of John the Baptist, as well as the commitment of Jesus' parents to the Temple,¹⁹ while Acts 6.7 maintains that many priests accepted the Christian faith. The ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus are acknowledged in the Temple, disclosing the divine residence there (Luke 1.8–23; 2.24–38); indeed, Jesus refers to the Temple as 'my Father's house'.²⁰ Finally, in both Luke and Acts, Jesus and the apostles visit the Temple frequently and pray there.²¹ Many scholars have therefore concluded that in Luke–Acts, the Temple is the center of God's worship, prayer, and sacrifice.²²

18 The conventional view of Acts as being the continuation of Luke's gospel in terms of theology and message has recently been refined by M. C. Parsons and R. I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), who highlighted the differences between the two. Drawing on the third gospel to interpret the attitude towards the Temple expressed in Acts therefore requires an awareness of possible points of difference.

19 Luke 1.5–24, 36; 2.22–43. Luke 17.14 acknowledges the priestly authority, adding another passage in which Jesus cures lepers.

20 Luke 2.49; D. D. Sylva, 'The Cryptic Clause *en tois tou patros mou dei einai me* in Luke 2.49b', *ZAW* 78 (1987) 132–40.

21 Luke 19.47; 21.37–38; 24.53; Acts 2.46; 5.42; 21.23–26. The parable about the Pharisee and the tax collector (Luke 18.9–14) occurs when both figures are praying in the Temple.

22 M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980); J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke–Acts* (Macon: Mercer, 1988); F. D. Wienert, 'Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying about Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13.34–35)', *CBQ* 44.1 (1982) 68–76; D. D. Sylva, 'The Temple Curtain and Jesus' Death in the Gospel of Luke', *JBL* 105 (1986) 239–50; R. L. Brawley, *Luke–Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987) 107–32; E. P. Sanders, 'Jerusalem and its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice', *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Continuum,

Other scholars, however, have observed that Luke is somewhat wary—if not outright critical—of the Temple. Some claim that the Temple lost its credibility throughout the gospel, and that, for Luke in particular, the Temple had already fulfilled its purpose *before* Jesus' death.²³ Others maintain that for Luke, the Temple's role was superseded by that of the household as the actual sphere of God's redemption, and that throughout Luke-Acts, the Temple is eventually unmasked as a locus of political power the essence of which is opposed to God's people.²⁴

Ostensibly, the Temple conflicts described in Acts would seem to reinforce those interpretations of an implied criticism of the Temple. After all, according to Acts, while the Temple was undoubtedly a holy place, its establishment—namely, the high priests and their associates—stands in opposition to the belief in Jesus and the mission of the apostles. Hence, the Temple is designated a negative arena of condemnation and rejection.²⁵

In order to test these views, we must first examine several cases in which Luke had the opportunity to condemn the Temple and rebuke its high priests, but nonetheless declined to do so. For instance, in his rewriting of Mark's version of the trial of Jesus, Luke omitted the charge that Jesus had threatened to demolish the Temple and rebuild another one ('not made with hands'),²⁶ as well as the crowd's mocking of Jesus on the cross: 'Aha! You who would destroy

1999) 100-102; F. J. Matera, 'The Death of Jesus according to Luke: A Question of Sources', *CBQ* 47 (1985) 474-5, 485. According to P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987) 131-63, Luke's position is somewhat ambivalent due to Stephen's speech and the fact that the Temple was off-limits for the non-Jews in his community.

23 N. H. Taylor, 'Luke-Acts and the Temple', *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BHThL 142; Leuven: University of Leuven and Peeters, 1999) 709-21. Conzelmann, *Theology of Luke*, 147, 164-5, acknowledged the centrality of the Temple in Luke-Acts, but in considering Stephen's trial, concludes that it has been profaned 'since Jesus' occupation of the Temple'. J. B. Green, 'The Demise of the Temple as "Cultural Center" in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23.44-49)', *RB* 101.4 (1994) 495-515, argued for the neutralization of the power of the Temple to regulate socio-religious boundaries of purity and holiness, but also acknowledged Luke's positive approach to it.

24 J. H. Elliott, 'Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions', *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Neyrey; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991) 211-40.

25 Elliott, 'Temple versus Household', 223-4. The Temple conflicts outlined above may also be judged in light of the overall theme of persecution so central to Luke-Acts, a narrative device that serves the author's theological message of divine providence and triumph. See Cunningham, 'Through Many Tribulations': *The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*, who also regards these Temple-related persecutions in Acts as shaped by and viewed as a continuation of the persecution of Jesus.

26 Luke 22.66-71; Mark 14.57-59. See also Matt 26.60-61; John 2.19-21.

the Temple and build it in three days; save yourself and come down from the cross!’²⁷ Even the account of the ‘cleansing’ of the Temple is abbreviated dramatically, absent the descriptions of the financial transactions taking place there.²⁸ In sum, Luke purposely eliminated the primary attestations for Jesus’ challenging of the Temple and its leaders.²⁹

In addition, Acts 23.2–5 recalls a direct conflict between Paul and the high priest during the hearing before the Sanhedrin. Ananias the high priest ordered that Paul be struck on his mouth. Initially, Paul retorted hotly; once he was informed that the person he had condemned was in fact the high priest, however, he responded with words of respect: ‘For it is written, “You shall not speak evil of a leader of your people”’ (Exod 22.47).³⁰

Furthermore, Luke highlights the role of the Temple officers and the captain in the arrests and trials of Jesus, Peter, and the apostles,³¹ and the high priests’ part in the arrests and trials of Jesus, Peter, Stephen, and Paul.³² Significantly, however, he never accuses them either specifically or directly of unrighteousness, nor does he condemn them for hating the Christian leaders.³³ The accusations of rejecting Christ and persecuting his followers are instead directed at the Jerusalemites and *their* leaders.³⁴ It is therefore safe to conclude that Luke did not wish to condemn

27 Luke 23.26–43; Mark 15.29–30. Cf. Matt 27.40.

28 Luke 19.45–46 omitted from the Markan source (11.15–16; cf. Matt 21.12–13) Jesus’ driving out of the buyers, the overturning of the tables of the money-changers, and his opposition to carrying anything through the Temple. He also balanced the act by noting Jesus’ daily teachings in the Temple.

29 In so doing, Luke refrained from creating another ‘narrative chain’ or ‘redundant theme’ in which the Temple conflicts in Acts either continue or mirror those of Jesus in a manner that unifies his two volumes. For the occurrences of these narrative means, see D. Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the ‘Acts of the Apostles’* (SNTSMS 121; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002) 52–3, 55–6.

30 On the question of whether this scene could be historical in origin, and a rejection of the possibility that the passage merely expresses irony, see C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994/1998) 2.1058–62.

31 Luke 22.4, 52 (plural); Acts 4.1; 5.24, 26 (singular).

32 Luke 22.4, 52 (plural); Acts 4.1; 5.24, 26 (singular). See also Acts 4.6; 5.17, 24; 9.12; 19.14; 23.2, 14; 24.1. Luke also emphasizes the chief priests’ plot against Jesus in Luke 19.47 (relating it to Jesus’ teaching in the Temple); 20.19; 24.20. Cf. Luke 23.4, 10, 13. R. J. Cassidy, ‘Luke’s Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus’ Death’, *Political Issues in Luke-Acts* (ed. R. J. Cassidy and P. J. Scharper; Maryknoll, NY; Orbis, 1983) 146–67, concludes that the high priests prosecuted Jesus because they felt threatened by him. Given Luke’s positive view of the ordinary priests (see above) Luke appears to distinguish them from the high priests.

33 Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations*, concludes that although the Temple plays a role in the rejection of Christ by the Jewish leadership, Luke does not attempt to link the rejection of Christianity with the Temple.

34 J. A. Weatherly, *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994). For instance, in Acts 3.17 and 13.27 all the Jewish leaders are blamed in

the leaders of the Temple or the high priests, despite their role in the persecution of Jesus, Peter and the apostles, Stephen, and Paul. On the contrary, he confirms the credibility of the Temple in the eyes of the Christians.

Significantly, towards the end of Acts, Luke contextualizes those of Paul's speeches in which he repeatedly declares his devotion to the sacrificial cult.³⁵ In so doing, he stresses that the Christians' commitment to the Temple remains undiminished, despite the tribulations they suffered at the hands of the high priests following their visits to the Temple.³⁶

Luke expresses admiration for the Temple, in keeping with his generally positive stance towards the Law.³⁷ This position also accords with the view of several scholars that Jewish antagonism is met, in Luke-Acts, with conciliation, and an attempt to present Christianity as an integral part or continuation of Judaism.³⁸ For despite their desire to take part in Temple worship and preserve Jewish cultic heritage, the Christians, Luke seems to be arguing, were nonetheless maltreated, and on account of baseless suspicions. In other words, in arguing that the Temple episodes in fact demonstrate that Christianity is *not* a dissident Jewish faction, Luke may in truth have been furthering his own, apologetic purposes.

*The overall message to be gleaned from the Temple conflicts in Acts is therefore one of the unjustified refusal of the Temple authorities to recognize Christians as fellow Jews, as representatives of a legitimate Jewish 'way'.*³⁹ Much like the

Jesus' death. In the mockery scene, Luke 23.35 altered ἄρχιερεῖς (Mark 15.31//Matt 27.41) to ἄρχοντες. The high priests are also omitted in Luke 18.3, altering Mark 10.33-33//Matt 20.17-18. Luke 19.47 includes the high priests in the plot to kill Jesus, but broadens the circle of responsibility in comparison to Mark 11.18.

35 Acts 22.17; 24.17-18; 25.8, discussed above.

36 One of the major themes of Paul's speeches is that the Christians have not rebelled against the Temple's dictates. See M. Dibelius, 'Paul in the Book of Acts', *The Book of Acts*, 93. Indeed, Luke's detailed presentation of Paul's imprisonment attempts to show that the Jewish charges against the Christians are baseless. See R. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982) 77-8.

37 J. Jervell, 'The Law in Luke-Acts', *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1972, repr. 2002) 133-52; W. Loader, *Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997) 273-389; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 110-31.

38 For Luke's positive attitude towards Judaism (that is, his insistence that Christianity is a development within Judaism), see Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*; Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*; D. L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980). In fact, there are also indications of a certain rejection of Judaism in Acts, namely, the view that Christianity has superseded Judaism. See Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 129-54; J. B. Tyson, *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1999).

39 'The Way' (ὁ ὁδός) is the positive Christian self-designation in Acts 18.25-26; 22.4; 24.14. Opponents used the negative designation ἄρεσις (Acts 24.5, 14; 28.22).

banishment of the Jewish-Christians from the synagogue,⁴⁰ then, the *non-Christian Jews were portrayed as the ones to blame for the conflict between Judaism and Christianity*.

a. *The Historical Implications of Luke's Message*

Luke's positive attitude toward the Temple and the priesthood, as well as his message that the early Christians leaders were falsely accused of both acts and words against the Temple, shed a new light on the question of whether these Temple conflicts actually happened. Namely, they lend credence to their historical legitimacy: It is unlikely, after all, that Luke would have conjured episodes with such clear anti-Temple overtones if they were contrary to his own purposes. It is also unreasonable to argue that Luke would have introduced the Jewish (or high-priestly) conception of the early Christians as enemies of the Temple—a conception to which Luke was wholeheartedly opposed—if it was not based in historical fact. We may thus conclude that his presentation of these events is *biased*, but not fictitious.

Indeed, it is inconceivable that Luke would have been able to describe preaching in the Temple, the prophesying of its destruction, and the entering of a gentile into it—all very different kinds of violations of the Temple cult—without some familiarity with historical fact. Moreover, several scholars have argued that Acts is in truth based on earlier sources (literary and oral), which would explain Luke's ability to construct a detailed narrative with the proper historical setting (Roman rule, Jewish religious practices, etc.).⁴¹ As we shall see below, later Christian traditions about James's martyrdom also describe conflicts in or about the Temple.

3. James' Execution and the Temple: Narrative and History

According to Josephus, in 62 CE the Sadduceen high priest Ananus son of Ananus 'convened a Sanhedrin of judges and brought before them a man named James, the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ, and certain others. He accused them of having acted illegally (*παράνομησάντων*) and delivered them up to be stoned'.⁴² And with this pithy description, Josephus leaves the question

40 Luke 6.22; Acts 9.20–25; 13.50; 19.9; John 9.22; 12.42; 16.2. The closing of the Temple's doors after Paul was dragged away by the mob (Acts 21.30) may also be read in similar fashion.

41 See, in addition to the studies cited in nn. 13–15 above, J. Dupont, *The Sources of Acts: The Present Position* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd; New York: Herder & Herder, 1964).

42 *Ant.* 20.200. Translation follows L. H. Feldman in the LCL edition, with the significant amendments following J. S. McLaren, 'Ananus, James, and the Earliest Christianity: Josephus's Account of the Death of James', *JTS* 52 (2001) 6, 16: 'Sanhedrin of judges' and 'for having acted illegally' (Feldman translated the latter as 'for having transgressed the law'). For the historical

of *why* James was prosecuted—and ultimately executed—open to intense scholarly debate.

Certain scholars have concluded that James was executed because he was the leader of a messianic/apocalyptic movement that was regarded as politically dangerous, perhaps even revolutionary.⁴³ The fact that he was convicted of an illegal act has led other scholars to infer that he did not observe Jewish law strictly enough.⁴⁴ Finally, a number of scholars have deduced from Josephus that James was executed not because of his Christian beliefs or his possible status within the nascent Christian community, but rather due to more prosaic political reasons: James's political alliance with Ananus's opponents (either rival high priests⁴⁵ or common priests who were exploited by the high priesthood).⁴⁶ This alliance may have been the result of James's criticism of the priestly aristocracy, or his support for the poor and the needy;⁴⁷ it may also have simply been due to a personal rivalry between himself and Ananus.⁴⁸

All of these explanations for James's execution are problematic for several reasons. First, James could hardly be regarded as lax with regard to the law, since he is described as strict in his observance of purity restrictions in Gal 2.11–14 (see also Acts 21.24). Second, if the mission to the Gentiles or Jews was the reason for the charge against him, the high priests would have acted much earlier than 62 CE, probably closer to the Apostolic Council in 49 CE. Third, deducing James's role in the political scene based on Josephus's account of tension

credibility of the passage, despite its reference to 'Jesus who was called the Christ', see J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1991) 1.56–59.

43 M. Hengel, 'Jakobus der Herrenbruder—der erste Papst?', *Paulus und Jakobus: Kleine Schriften III* (WUNT 141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 552–3; W. Pratscher, *Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und die Jakobustradition* (FRLANT 139; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) 257–9; R. P. Martin, *James* (WBC 48; Waco, TX: Word, 1988) lxiv–xlv.

44 Reicke, 'Judaean-Christianity and Jewish Establishment', 152. P.-A. Bernheim, *James, the Brother of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1997) 257, and Martin, *James*, lxiii, suggested that James was held responsible for Paul's and others' disassociation with the law, but also mentioned the successful Christian mission as a possible motive.

45 McLaren, 'Ananus', 17–19, 25.

46 S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967) 117–26, 168–9, 189 argued that the ordinary priests were closely linked to the zealots, who opposed Ananus and the high priests. J. Painter, *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) 140–1 inferred that James opposed the exploitation of the poorer priests (cf. *Ant.* 20.205–207), bearing in mind that the Jerusalem Church was designated as 'the poor' (Gal 2.10), and that some priests had joined it. Cf. also Bernheim, *James*, 257.

47 Martin, *James*, lxv–lxvii, pointed to the role of priests among the early Christians in Jerusalem and the socio-economic defense of the poor and needy set out in the epistle of James.

48 G. Lüdemann, *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 62; McLaren, 'Ananus', 18.

between high and common priests, or between aristocrats and zealots, is highly hypothetical: We have no information whatsoever about James's relations with any of these parties. That there were some priests among the Christians (Acts 6.7), and that the Christians in Jerusalem associated themselves with the poor, is not sufficient grounds for arguing that the high priests were determined to rid themselves of James. After all, there were many other poor people and anti-aristocrats in Judaeon society at the time.

Furthermore, Ananus's convening of a Sanhedrin of judges and the execution of a death sentence were extremely exceptional steps. Indeed, Josephus does not mention any other high priest who had done so. True, both Herodian rulers and Roman governors executed opponents, but these were all revolutionary Jews, charged with sedition. Never in the years preceding the Great Revolt, when political or personal conflicts turned violent, did the high priests carry out trials and executions. Thus, the present incident can hardly be regarded as 'an excellent example of the machinations among Jews seeking public prominence'.⁴⁹ James's alleged offence must therefore have been graver than the ones mentioned above. Josephus thus leads us to a dead-end regarding the actual charge against James, apart from the sole hint provided by the penalty of stoning.

It is significant, then, that the above-mentioned studies, in attempting to determine the offense for which James was executed, focus solely on Josephus's account, ignoring four later Christian sources that are regarded (quite rightly) as legendary.⁵⁰ These sources, as we will see, are critical for understanding the event in question, and even more so for how this event was understood by later Christians. With this in mind, I will now turn to an examination of these texts on two, overlapping levels: the narrative construction provided by their authors, and their possible reflection of historical reality. I will focus both on the geographical setting of the conflict between James and his opponents in the Temple and on his execution by means of stoning or having been thrown down from a great height.

The initial, and probably earliest, source that depicts James's conflict with his fellow Jews and subsequent martyrdom is that of Hegesippus, cited by Eusebius's *Hist. eccl.* 2.23.5–18. Hegesippus portrays James as a Nazirite ascetic, and explains that 'he alone was allowed to enter into the Sanctuary (τὸ ἄγιον)...and he used to enter alone into the Temple (εἰς τὸν ναόν) and be kneeling and praying for forgiveness for the people' (6). The scribes and Pharisees asked James to persuade the crowds not to believe in Jesus as a messiah, and 'to stand at the battlement

49 McLaren, 'Ananus', 23. McLaren (pp. 17–18) states that 'Josephus indicates that a variety of means were used by those vying for prominence to assert their influence. Included in this list are kidnapping, robbery, bribery, physical assault and murder' (referring to *Ant.* 20.180–181, 205–207, 208–210, 214). But murder of Jews by Jews is not mentioned here; rather, it is only the execution of rebels by the Romans.

50 Painter, *Just James*, 141; Bernheim, *James*, 255.

of the Temple' (πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ [11]) so that everyone would be able to hear him. Yet, when they asked him, 'What is the gate of Jesus?' James replied that the Son of Man in heaven would come on clouds. They then, according to Hegesippus, threw James down and stoned him, 'since the fall had not killed him' (16). When, this, too, proved ineffective, a certain laundryman finally beat James on the head with a club (17). He was then buried 'on a spot by the Temple (ἐπὶ τῷ τόπῳ παρὰ τῷ ναῶ), and his gravestone still remains there' (18).⁵¹

A somewhat similar story was presented in the second century CE in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* 1.66–70. There, James ascends to the Temple with his congregation (including Gamliel), where he encounters a large crowd led by the high priest Caiaphas. He enters into a discussion with Caiaphas on the belief in Christ and various scriptural matters (1.66), a discussion that ends in bloodshed as a massacre of the Christians in the Temple ensues. The person who ordered the massacre, so it is written, entered the Temple near the altar and used an altar brand (1.70.1, 6); James was then thrown from the top of the stairs, although it is not stated that he was put to death (1.70.8).⁵²

A third, and even more obscure description is introduced in the *Second Apocalypse of James* from Nag Hammadi. There James announces, 'Behold, I gave you your house, which you say that God has made. Did he who dwells in it promise to give you an inheritance through it? This (house) I shall doom to destruction and derision of those who are in ignorance'. Consequently, the priests said, 'Come, let us stone the Just One'. They 'found him standing beside the columns of the Temple beside the mighty corner stone'.⁵³ And they decided to throw him down from the height, and they cast him down... They seized him and [struck] him as they dragged him upon the ground. They stretched him out and placed a stone on his abdomen. They all placed their feet on him, saying "You have erred!" Again, they raised him up, since he was alive... After having covered him up to his abdomen, they stoned him in this manner'.⁵⁴

51 Translations from Eusebius follow K. Lake in the LCL edition. For dating Hegesippus to the middle of the second century, see Painter, *Just James*, 119–20. For the πτερύγιον (pinnacle) of the Temple and its significance in early Christian memory, see Y. Z. Eliav, 'The Tomb of James, Brother of Jesus, as *Locus Memoriae*', *HTR* 97 (2004) 33–59.

52 F. S. Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source, Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* 1.27–71 (Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 1995) 101–7.

53 The mighty corner stone is identified 'in the end of the entrance of the Temple', in *Test. Sol.* 22.7–8.

54 The *Second Apocalypse of James*, Nag Hammadi Coptic Gnostic Library, Codex V 60, 14–62, in C. W. Hedrick and D. M. Parrott, 'The Second Apocalypse of James (V, 4)', *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (ed. J. M. Robinson; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 275.

Finally, Eusebius quotes Clement of Alexandria as saying that ‘James the Just... was thrown down from the pinnacle of the Temple (τοῦ πετρυγίου βληθείς) and beaten to death with a fuller’s club’.⁵⁵

Hegesippus, the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*, Clement of Alexandria, and the *Second Apocalypse of James* feature both similarities and differences. For starters, they are all based, directly or indirectly, on an early second-century CE source, or at the very least on a common ancient tradition containing remnants of a Jewish one.⁵⁶ The result, as we shall see below, is that all four narratives include two basic common features: the preaching in/about the Temple and the stoning of James.

On the literary level, all these sources place the conflict between James and his opponents (be it the high priest, the priests, the scribes and Pharisees, or simply the crowd) in the Temple. James committed several forbidden acts there: Hegesippus argued that James entered into the ναός when praying for the forgiveness of the people, thus implying that he acted as a priest—which would have been a grave transgression against the Temple cult.⁵⁷ The *Second Apocalypse of James* specifically mentions that James preached that the Temple is ‘doomed to destruction and derision’ while standing within it; and finally, in both Hegesippus and *Recognitions*, it is written that James preached about the belief in Christ in the Temple. No doubt, Hegesippus and *Recognitions* call to mind the preaching of Peter and the apostles in the Temple that led to their arrest and flogging in Acts 4–5. All three sources agree, then, that the very presence of James in the Temple, along with his actions therein, are the keys to understanding the zealous measures taken against him.

The Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*, Hegesippus, and the *Second Apocalypse of James* portray the Temple as the locus of the conflict between Jews and Christians, which in turn elevates it to a symbol of the rejection of Christ.⁵⁸ However, on the basic narrative level, it is important to note that all these

55 Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.5, referring to Clement of Alexandria, Hypotyposes, 7th book, and repeated in *ibid.* 2.23.3.

56 Lüdemann, *Opposition to Paul*, 169–77; Painter, *Just James*, 116–32, 141, 156–8, 175–7, 179–81, 189; R. Bauckham, ‘For What Offence Was James Put to Death?’ *James the Just and Christian Origins* (ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199–232; M. Myllykoski, ‘James the Just in History and Tradition: Perspectives on Past and Present Scholarship (Part II)’, *Currents in Biblical Research* 6.1 (2007) 70–83.

57 Epiphanius *Pan.* 29.4.2–3 even stated that James was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies once a year (like the high priest on the Day of Atonement). Surprisingly, however, Hegesippus does *not* present this detail as the reason for his execution.

58 The author of *Recognitions*, who stressed the authority of James (1.43.2; 44.1) held a bold anti-Temple stance, arguing for the cessation of the sacrificial cult (1.39) and claiming that the tearing of the Temple veil was a sign of the coming destruction (1.54.1). He also situated James’s teaching in the Temple in spite of the fact that the high priests and the lay priests had often beaten the Christians for teaching or learning about Jesus (1.55.1–2).

sources assume interest on the part of James in attending the Temple Mount. Hegesippus even describes him as acting like a (high) priest. These sources thus imply an attraction on the part of James and his followers to the Temple, either as a place of worship or as a venue for preaching, as attested to by Acts. Only the *Second Apocalypse of James* describes an explicit anti-Temple stance by recounting James's prophecy of its destruction as God's punishment of the Jews for their 'ignorance' (of Christ).

On the historical level, only a few scholars consider Hegesippus, and to a certain extent the *Second Apocalypse of James*, as possible keys to understanding the offense for which James was executed by Ananus.⁵⁹ According to Bauckham, since James was executed by stoning, he must have been charged either with blasphemy or with leading the people to apostasy. He suggests that the charge against James was based on his Christological interpretation of 'the gate of God' as 'the gate of Jesus', and James's preaching that Jesus is the gate of the eschatological Temple through which the righteous enter the presence of God.⁶⁰ Evans, by contrast, *did* associate James's execution directly with the Temple, although his aim was purely exegetical, and did not attempt to draw actual historical conclusions from this fact.⁶¹

In any event, it should be noted that Hegesippus, Clement, *Recognitions*, and even the *Second Apocalypse of James* detail James's activities and interest in the Temple even though these authors no longer cherished the Jewish cultic system. It is therefore likely that their descriptions are based on an older tradition, rather than simply invented.

One aspect of the narrative that may attest to a certain historical value in these later traditions is the *means* of James's execution. In the *Second Apocalypse of James* the priests wanted literally to stone James, but threw him down from the height of the Temple instead, and then 'placed a stone on his abdomen'. So, too, in Hegesippus and Clement James is thrown from the Temple, and in

Nonetheless, he also had an interest in priestly matters, purity, anointing oil, etc. (1.46–48; 1.51.1).

59 Eisler argued that James served as the high priest of the zealots, and his bold, discourteous entrance into the Holy of Holies led to his execution at the hands of Ananus. This idiosyncrastic interpretation is based on the most unusual detail (and hence, probably the most legendary one) described in Hegesippus. On Eisler and his recent followers, cf. Myllykoski, 'James the Just', 67–8.

60 Bauckham, 'For What Offence', also suggests that placing James's martyrdom in the Temple is derived from the Temple imagery attributed to James ('rampart of the people', 'the gate of Jesus'). This proposal grants, to my mind, too much credibility to the exact words of James.

61 C. A. Evans, 'Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple', *James the Just and Christian Origins*, 233–49. Evans (p. 249) concluded that Jesus and James might very well have advanced the same, somewhat critical, agenda against the Temple establishment.

Recognitions he is thrown from the top of the stairs. According to Hegesippus, afterwards he was also stoned. This type of punishment probably represents the early rabbinic version of the biblical stoning penalty: According to *m. Sanh.* 6.4, someone condemned to be stoned must be pushed down from a place that is twice the height of a man. If that does not kill him, a witness must drop a large stone on his chest (as mentioned in the *Second Apocalypse of James*), and if *that* does not kill him, he must be literally stoned to death (as in Hegesippus). Thus, all four sources describe the stoning of James, which is already mentioned by Josephus! We may conclude, then, that they do provide at least a glimmer of historical truth, albeit with changes and adjustments that reflect later rabbinic law.⁶²

Significantly, however, all four sources place the stoning or throwing down in the Temple, which would seem historically impossible. Clearly, then, their purpose is to relate as directly as possible the cause of James's execution to his involvement in the Temple, although this information is conveyed by fictitious narratives. Yet both the setting of the execution and the transgressions attributed to James discussed above hint that the *real* reason for the stoning was in truth an illegal act on James's part that had something to do with the Temple. I therefore suggest that the later authors transformed an original conflict *related to* the Temple into a dramatic and legendary confrontation *inside* the Temple.

Indeed, the very manner in which James was put to death is connected to transgressions against the Temple: The final beating with a club described in both Hegesippus and Clement, as well as the use of an altar brand wielded by a priest described in *Recognitions*, is reminiscent of the ancient Jewish penalty for Temple transgressions. According to *m. Sanh.* 9.6, a priest who served in a state of impurity was executed by fellow priests outside the Temple 'by splitting his brain open with clubs'. Furthermore, in the early, non-rabbinic penal code, trespassing the Temple's sacred domains (ascribed to James by Hegesippus) required the death penalty, which was probably practiced by stoning (perhaps even without a trial).⁶³

It is possible to conclude, then, that three of these texts attest to different sorts of offences carried out either against the Temple or within it; moreover, all four of them recall sanctions taken against transgressions of the Temple's sacredness.

62 Cf. Bauckham, 'For What Offence?', 203-4; Myllykoski 'James', 78-9; I. Gruenwald, 'Halakhic Material in Codex Gnosticus V, 4: The Second Apocalypse of James?', *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988) 279-94.

63 For the execution of 'any outsider (*zar*) who comes near' (Num 1.51; 3.10, 38; 18.7; cf. Num 4.20), see Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 307; Temple Scroll 35.1-8; 4QD^a 6ii 9-10. The early rabbis, however, left such transgressions up to divine punishment (*karet*), and shied away from human intervention. See *m. Ker.* 1.1; *t. Sanh.* 14.16 (ed. Zuckerman, 437); A. Shemesh, 'The Dispute Between the Pharisees and the Sadducees on the Death Penalty', *Tarbiz* 70 (2000) 17-34 (Hebrew).

This common theme may point to an earlier Jewish-Christian tradition that connected James's execution to the Temple, one that, I believe, has historical roots. I find it reasonable to assume that James preached the Christian doctrine *in the Temple*—much like Peter and the apostles—and perhaps said something that was interpreted as a declaration *against* the Temple (as Bauckham maintains) in a manner reminiscent of his more famous brother.

4. Temple Sensitivities: The Historical Background of the High-Priestly Prosecutions

Much like the high-priestly prosecutions of Peter, Stephen, and Paul in Acts, the traditions on James's execution regard the Temple as the locus and substance of the early Christians' conflict with Jewish leaders. Clearly, this motif is crucial to understanding the early Jerusalem Church: Scenes of Christian interest and activity in the Temple, as well as sanctions against and trials of Christians carried out by the Jews (in particular the high priests), run across too many different texts and events to be regarded as merely a literary device. It must have contained some truth.

Turning to the historical aspects of these narratives, I will now examine two issues that may have affected the harsh reactions of the Jews to the acts of the early Christian leaders in the Temple: one, the accusations that Jesus threatened the Temple; and two, the Sadducees' extreme sensitivity to any violation of the Temple's sacredness.

a. *Jesus' Anti-Temple Impact*

Jesus was arrested by the high priests and brought before a *συνέδριον* led by the high priest Caiaphas.⁶⁴ There he was charged with threatening, 'I will destroy this Temple that is made with hands, and in three days I build another, not made with hands' (Mark 14.58), the content of which is repeated in the mockery of Jesus on the cross in Mark 15.29–30. This accusation is usually linked to Jesus' slightly earlier, violent demonstration at the Temple Mount, the so-called 'cleansing' of the Temple in which he clashed with the buyers and sellers of sacrificial animals and the money changers (Mark 11.15–17).⁶⁵ Many scholars have therefore concluded that Jesus was arrested (and some would

64 Mark 14.43, 47, 53–54. Luke 22.52 added the Temple officers. Matt 26.57 and John 11.49 added Caiaphas's name. For the historicity of the role of the high priest and its correct identification with Caiaphas, see P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, rev. ed. 1974) 44–59, 66–7.

65 Although scholars tend to associate the 'cleansing' with Jesus' concern for the Temple cult, some have suggested that Jesus opposed the behavior of the high priests. See C. A. Evans, 'Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?', *CBQ* 51 (1989) 237–70. For relating the 'cleansing' to Jesus' moral stance, see E. Regev, 'Moral Impurity and the

also add, crucified) because of a transgression against the Temple, be it the alleged statement foretelling its destruction and/or his offensive 'cleansing' of the Temple.⁶⁶

Interestingly, the gospels attest to the reaction of the early Christians to this charge. The author of the *Gospel of Thomas* (71), for instance, attributed to Jesus a straightforward threat to the physical existence of the Temple: 'I will [destroy this] house, and no one will be able to build it [again]'.⁶⁷ Unlike Thomas, however, all four evangelists felt uneasy with the allegation. Mark (14.57, 59) argued that it was false;⁶⁸ Matthew (26.61) limited the scope of the charge, insisting that Jesus declared only that he was *able* to destroy and rebuild the Temple; Luke omitted it entirely (see above); and John (2.19–21) omitted it from his description of the trial, placing it in the 'cleansing' of the Temple instead. Yet even *that* mention was transformed entirely in meaning as referring to 'the Temple of his body', namely, to Jesus' death and subsequent resurrection.⁶⁹ Moreover, Luke (6.11–14) argues that the allegations that Stephen said that Jesus would destroy the Temple were false and even heinous (see above). These treatments of the Temple charge may bear witness to its originality (whether or not Jesus actually said something of this kind is irrelevant to the determination of the actual charge leveled against him). In a similar vein, the evangelists' description of the dramatic 'cleansing' of the Temple is both brief and technical, and as such disregards the fact that this was Jesus' most public, provocative, and offensive performance to date.⁷⁰

Temple in Early Christianity in Light of Qumranic Ideology and Ancient Greek Practice', *HTR* 79 (2004) 383–411, here 397–402.

66 Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 331–6; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61–76; J. D. Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995) 65, 108–111; Bond, *Caiaphas*, 64–9. Others regard Jesus' attitude towards the Temple as one of the main reasons for his crucifixion, e.g., R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987) 285–306, 321; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 547–52.

67 Translation follows Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 134.

68 D. Juel, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1973; repr. Atlanta: Scholars, 1977) 124, concluded that 'perhaps Mark is suggesting that Jesus never made such a statement and that it is therefore false'.

69 R. Brown, *The Gospel according to Saint John I–XII* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966) 122–5.

70 Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 129–30 comments that 'it is astonishing that so little is made of the cleansing in Mark'. Although the evangelists claimed that due to the cleansing, the high priests and other Jewish leaders plotted to execute Jesus (Mark 11.18; Luke 19.47–48), this is in truth merely a conventional narrative device (e.g. Mark 3.6). Mark regarded this plot as stemming from Jesus' influence on the masses. In both Mark and Luke, Jesus continued teaching in the Temple. Matthew (21.14–17) extended the act of 'cleansing' with a scene of healing and a claim to messianism, arguing that it was the latter which offended the high priests and scribes.

Why did the authors of the gospels downplay Jesus' anti-Temple stance, even after the Temple had already been destroyed? Most likely they were reacting to the accusations of their Jewish contemporaries that not only Jesus, but his followers, too, were enemies of the Temple. Indeed, later traditions indicate that the Jewish-Christians were suspected of plotting against the Temple: According to the Gospel of Peter, for example, the apostles were accused of attempting to burn down the Temple, and a similar charge is made against Jewish heretics (*minim*) in early rabbinic literature.⁷¹

Returning to the Temple incidents described in Acts, these narratives would seem to provide a response to accusations of Jesus' sacrilegious intentions, showing that despite the severe measures taken against Peter, Stephen, and Paul, the suspicions that they rejected the Temple cult or desired its destruction were false. To the contrary, Peter and the apostles, and Paul (and according to Hegesippus, also James) all wished to participate in the Temple rituals at any cost.

Moreover, Jesus' alleged anti-Temple stance increases the historical plausibility of the narratives of the Temple conflicts described in Acts, as well as the association of James's execution with the Temple. Given the unsavory reputation of the Christians in the eyes of the Temple authorities, it is understandable that the high priests and their followers would regard Peter, Stephen, Paul, and James with suspicion and hostility when they entered the Temple or preached about it.

b. *The Attitude of the Sadducean High Priests Towards the Temple Cult*

In Acts, Hegesippus, *Recognitions*, and the *Second Apocalypse of James* the preaching and actions of the Christian leaders in the Temple are met with extreme sanctions by the high priests or other Jewish leaders in the Temple. The high priests are portrayed here as hard-hearted defenders of the Temple against somewhat insignificant or merely symbolic threats. I suggest in what follows that their characterization reflects a certain historical reality: the sensitivity of the Sadducean high priests to any possible violation of the sacredness of the sacrificial cult.

Ananus son of Ananus, the high priest who executed James, 'followed the school of the Sadducees' (*Ant.* 20. 199). The unnamed high priest who led the prosecution of Peter and the apostles is also associated with the Sadducees ('the high priest and all who were with him, that is, the sect of the Sadducees', Acts 5.17). Most scholars have concluded from the passage that he (and not only his associates) was a Sadducee and identified him with Joseph Caiaphas,⁷² the high priest

71 *Gospel of Peter* 7.26, ed. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, I (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 185; *t. Sanh.* 13.5 (ed. Zuckerman, 434).

72 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 334 translated καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ 'and all his colleagues'. The identification with Caiaphas is based both on Luke's chronology and the reference to him in the first prosecution (cf. Acts 4.6). See Bond, *Caiaphas*, 7-8, 13, 24; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 299; J. Jeremias,

who was responsible for Jesus' arrest, 'trial', and handing over to Pilate (note that Caiaphas also confronted James in *Recognitions*). It is more than possible that the unnamed high priest who prosecuted Stephen and Ananias son of Nedebaus—the latter of whom headed Paul's hearing before the Sanhedrin (Acts 23.2)—were also Sadducees.⁷³

The Pharisees, by contrast, were not involved in the measures taken against the Christian leaders described in Acts (although they did take part in James's execution in Hegesippus). In fact, Luke describes the Pharisees as *defending* the Christians: During the second judicial act against Peter and the apostles, when the members of the Sanhedrin expressed their willingness to execute them, Luke assigns to Gamliel 'a Pharisee in the *sunedrion*' a speech in which he calls for releasing them without penalty. Consequently, the final punishment was reduced to flogging.⁷⁴ And in Paul's hearing before the Sanhedrin, he declares himself a Pharisee who believes in resurrection, thus sparking a dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, resulting in the following pronouncement of some pharisaic scribes: 'We find nothing wrong with this man'. In this instance, the hearing ended without a decision (Acts 23.6–11). Indeed, the characterization of the Pharisees in Acts is always positive. However, in Luke's gospel, the Pharisees sometimes show respect toward Jesus, and sometimes either confront him or are rebuked by him.⁷⁵

Jerusalem at the Time of Jesus (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 229; J. Le Moyne, *Les Sadducéens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972) 345; D. Flusser, 'Caiaphas in the New Testament', *Atiqot* 21 (1992) 82, 84.

⁷³ The high priest who judged Stephen may have been Caiaphas, Jonathan son of Ananus, Theophilus son of Ananus, or Simon Cantheras. See Bond, *Caiaphas*, 181–82 n. 17 for references. All these priests were relatives of either Ananus son of Ananus or Caiaphas (of the family of Katros/Cantheras). For Ananias's identification with Ananias son of Nedebaus, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 717. Paul's conflict with Ananias implicitly allies the latter with Paul's opponents, and since the Pharisees defended Paul, it seems that Luke considered Ananias a Sadducee. Cf. J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967) 223. In fact, it is probable that all of the high priests from Herod's time through to 68 CE were Sadducees. For more on the high priestly families and their identification with the Sadducees, see M. Stern, 'Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes', *The Jewish People in the First Century*, II (ed. S. Safrai et al.; CRINT 1; Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976) 600–612; Schwartz, *Agriappa I*, 185–95; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 229–32.

⁷⁴ Acts 5.33–40. On the question of the historical reliability of the passage, see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 333–4. Since Gamliel is not mentioned by Josephus, it is possible that Luke followed an early tradition about Gamliel's role in this judicial procedure. As already mentioned above, in *Recognitions* a certain Gamliel is associated with James's followers.

⁷⁵ J. A. Ziesler, 'Luke and the Pharisees', *NTS* 25 (1979) 146–57; J. T. Carroll, 'Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees', *CBQ* 50 (1988) 604–21; Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 84–106. Note that in Acts some Pharisees became Christians and Paul is identified as a former Pharisee (Acts 15.5;

According to Josephus, James's trial and execution by Ananus was opposed by 'those of the inhabitants of the city who were considered the most fair-minded and who were strict in observance of the law (*peri tous nomous akribeis*)'. These people informed Agrippa II and Albinus of Ananus's unacceptable deed, leading to his dismissal from the high priesthood (*Ant.* 20.201–202). As Baumgarten and Mason note on this point, Josephus's wording is similar to his usual characterization of the Pharisees.⁷⁶ Since the passage deals with a legal case led by a Sadducean high priest, many believe that Ananus's opponents were none other than the Pharisees,⁷⁷ and that they resisted the Sadducean law invoked by Ananus.⁷⁸ It seems, therefore, that the Pharisees objected to the severe punishment of James for his alleged act against the Temple.

Why were the Sadducees particularly hostile on the matter of the involvement of the Christian leaders in the Temple?⁷⁹ Here the Sadducees' major religious (or halakhic) concern undoubtedly played a significant role. The Sadducees, and especially the Sadducean high priests, were more sensitive than most to any violation of the Temple's sacredness. In comparison to the Pharisees, for example, the Sadducees held a far stricter approach to the Temple's ritual purity,⁸⁰ and ascribed a greater significance to the priestly cult. They regarded both the Temple and the sacrificial cult as more sensitive and vulnerable to desecration, and in a certain sense, more sacred, than did the Pharisees. To the Sadducees, any possible violation of the cultic order, or any potential desecration of the Temple, was regarded as extremely dangerous.⁸¹ As such, they held that

23.6; 26.5; cf. Phil 3.5). In making this connection, Christianity is associated implicitly with authentic Judaism.

76 A. I. Baumgarten, 'The Name of the Pharisees', *JBL* 1983 (1983) 413–14; S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992) 176–7. Cf. Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 92, 109.

77 McLaren, 'Ananus', 7 n. 16 lists eight additional scholars who subscribed to this view, but nonetheless decides against it (pp. 7–12).

78 Martin, *James*, xliii; Bauckham, 'For What Offence', 223–4.

79 Luke also stressed the Sadducees' disbelief in resurrection as the reason for their persecution of the Christians; so, too, he portrayed the belief in resurrection as the common ground between the Pharisees and the Christians. See Acts 4.2; 23.6–9; 25.19; Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 114–16; Fitzmyer, *Acts* 333, 714–16. This attempt, however, is historically implausible: Although the Pharisees also believed in resurrection, the conflicts between them and the Sadducees centered around the realm of Jewish law and the Temple cult.

80 E.g., the burning of the red heifer, *m. Parah* 3.7; *t. Parah* 3.8 (ed. Zuckerman, 632).

81 E. Regev, *The Sadducees and their Halakhah: Religion and Society in the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Yad Yizhak Ben-Zvi, 2005 [Hebrew]) 132–81, 226–41, 383–5; Regev, 'The Sadducees, the Pharisees and the Sacred: Meaning and Ideology in the Halakhic Controversies between the Sadducees and the Pharisees', *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9 (2006) 126–40. For example, the Sadducees opposed the Pharisaic regulation of the annual

the masses should be restricted from approaching the sacred. For example, the Sadducees complained about the Pharisees' purification of the Temple candelabrum: The need to purify it, they argued, resulted only from the Pharisees' having permitted the laity to approach it within the Temple's sacred precinct, thus defiling it through their contact with it.⁸²

Sadducean high priests waged intense political battles to prevent what a non-Sadducee would regard as a minor violation of the Temple cult. Thus, Ishmael son of Phiabi led a delegation to Nero that appealed for the preservation of a screening wall that the priests had built to prevent Agrippa II from watching the sacrificial cult from his palace. Agrippa's observation of the priestly ritual was regarded by the Sadducees as sacrilegious, since it invaded the sacred realm.⁸³

This Sadducean cultic strictness demystifies many of the Temple episodes in Acts and underscores our reconstruction of James's execution; so, too, does it support their historical reliability. It helps to explain why the Sadducees reacted so harshly and maliciously towards the acts of Peter, Paul, and James in the Temple, and the supposed sayings of Jesus, Stephen, and James against it. It is not, therefore, the Sadducees' rejection of the Christian belief *per se* that underlies these conflicts, but rather their special sensitivity to threats against the Temple and to any possible violation of its sacredness.

5. Implications for the Early Jerusalem Church

On the narrative level, our analysis of the relevant texts has shown that the Temple incidents described in Acts in which Peter and the apostles as well as Paul were involved, and also the one described in Hegesippus concerning James, all attest to a concern for the Temple. True, a condemnation of the Temple in second-century traditions about James is found in the *Second Apocalypse of James* (in *Recognitions* there is similar condemnation that is not attributed to James), but even the *Second Apocalypse of James* and *Recognitions* presumes a

half-shekel donation to the Temple, which would have undermined the priests' exclusive cultic status (Regev, *Sadducees and their Halakhah*, 132–9).

82 *T. Hagigah* 3.35 (ed. Lieberman, 394).

83 *Ant.* 20.189–195. Ishmael followed the Sadducean laws of purity in *t. Parah* 3.6 (ed. Zuckerman, 632). See Regev, *Sadducees and their Halakhah*, 176–9. On the religious objection to Agrippa's observation of the Temple rituals, cf. D. R. Schwartz, 'Viewing the Holy Utensils (P. Ox. V, 840)', *NTS* 32 (1986) 153–9. Unnamed high priests demanded that the high priest's garments of the Day of Atonement be kept in the Temple instead of in the custody of the Roman governor, and succeeded in convincing Claudius to grant his support (*Ant.* 20.6–14). A quite different, but nevertheless relevant, case is the desperate call of the Sadducee Ananus son of Ananus for the defense of the Temple against the violent Zealots, who, he claimed, were polluting the Temple with bloodshed (*War* 4.162–206). Ananus also declared that he was willing to die for the sake of 'God and the Sanctuary' (*War* 4.191).

certain interest on the part of James in the Temple. It therefore seems that the earliest traditions concerning the early Jerusalem Church largely regarded the Temple in a favorable fashion.

The Temple conflicts described in Acts and the connection between James's actions and a certain transgression against the Temple all seem historically plausible, for several reasons: (1) Luke's extraordinary appreciation of the Temple runs counter to the Temple conflicts described in his narrative, in which Stephen and Paul are accused of holding an anti-Temple stance. Since Luke's narrative clearly aims to defy these accusations, it is virtually impossible that they were the figments of his own imagination. (2) The pattern of Christian attendance in the Temple leading to an arrest/trial/punishment is repeated too many times, both in Acts and in the later traditions about James, to be regarded as a merely literary device. Indeed, even if certain episodes have been reproduced or exaggerated, it is nonetheless reasonable to assume that they were based on older traditions that emerged from historical experience. (3) The Jewish perception of Jesus and his followers as enemies of the Temple, and (4) the Sadducean sensitivity to possible threats to the sacrificial cult.

If we take this conclusion one step further, there is reason to believe that the actual attitude towards the Temple displayed by Peter, Paul, and James was not very different from that of their fellow Jews.⁸⁴ Indeed, the sources discussed here do not justify the assumption that the Christian leaders' clashes with the high priests derived from the former's attempts to gain a measure of control over the Temple.⁸⁵ Nor do they support the view that the Jerusalem community regarded itself as a 'human Temple', which could serve as a substitution for the physical one.⁸⁶ In fact, the general picture deduced from both Acts and

84 C. K. Barrett, 'Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles', *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. W. Horbury; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991) 345–67; Schwartz, 'Temple and Temple Mount in the Book of Acts'. The fact that James, and eventually also Peter, refrained from eating with Gentiles on account of their observance of purity laws (Gal. 2.11–14) may also imply a similar concern for the sacrificial laws. Compare J. D. G. Dunn, 'The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11–18)', *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990) 129–82.

85 According to J. B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1992) 184: 'The activity of Peter and the apostles in Acts 1–5 may be read, in part, as their attempt to take control of the Temple', and Paul's entering the Temple is 'a final attempt to return the Temple to its proper use'. Cf. also the thesis of Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, applied to both Jesus and James.

86 R. Bauckham, 'James and the Jerusalem Church', *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 441–50; Bauckham, 'For What Offence?'; C. Grappe, *D'un Temple à l'autre: Pierre et l'Eglise primitive de Jérusalem* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992) 88–115, both inferred from the fact that Peter and James were described as 'pillars' and possibly other parts of the Temple structure (e.g. Gal 2.9; Matt 16.18) that the early Jerusalem Church understood itself as the eschatological

Hegesippus corresponds with a growing scholarly recognition of the early Christian appreciation of the Temple and the sacrificial cult.⁸⁷

It is ironic, then, that, according to Acts and the traditions about James, the early-Christian attempts to involve themselves in Temple life or to use its setting or ritual cult for their own interests resulted in clashes with Jewish leaders, and particularly the Sadducean high priests—and with tragic results. It is thus tempting to conclude that their somewhat naïve endeavor to combine Christian belief with common Jewish religious devotion was in fact what got them into trouble.

Temple. One may, however, question whether these expressions actually reflect Temple imagery or express reservations about the present Temple and the sacrificial cult.

87 J. Klawans, 'Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice', *NTS* 48 (2002) 1–17; A. L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006); J. Lieu, 'Temple and Synagogue in John', *NTS* 45 (1999) 51–69; K. S. Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran* (NovTSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2005).