

## Ascended Jesus and Cultic Atonement

Ascended Jesus and Cultic Atonement:  
Reading Luke-Acts within Second Temple Judaism

By Fady A. Mekhael, B.Sc., M.A., Th.M.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the  
Degree Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University © Copyright by Fady A. Mekhael, December 2024

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2024) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Ascended Jesus and Cultic Atonement: Reading Luke-Acts within Second Temple Judaism

AUTHOR: Fady A. Mekhael, B.Sc. (Alexandria University), M.A. (Evangelical Theological Seminary in Cairo), Th.M. (Duke University)

SUPERVISOR: Matthew Thiessen

NUMBER OF PAGES: XIV, 343

## LAY ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I explore how the author of Luke-Acts sees Jesus as an atoning sacrifice that enables repentance and brings forgiveness of sins, similar to ideas found in other early Jewish writings from the time. By viewing atonement as a way to purify the temple and recognizing the early Jewish concept of a heavenly temple, I aim to clarify the role of atonement in Luke-Acts.

## ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I examine the role of the Jerusalem temple in Luke-Acts, arguing for its positive depiction and centrality in cultic worship. While Lukan scholarship has recognized the temple's significance, its implications for worship practices have not been fully explored. This study demonstrates that the temple remains vital in Luke-Acts, in the ministries of Jesus, the twelve disciples, and Paul. A major focus is on sacrificial practices within the temple, where Luke presents the Jerusalem temple as the rightful place for these rituals. The dissertation dissects the Levitical sacrificial system, emphasizing the roles of specific offerings in achieving atonement. The purification process described involves both the temple and the worshipper, highlighting the restoration of their relationship with God. Using Umberto Eco's semiotic theory, especially concerning the cultural encyclopedia of texts, I explore the concept of the heavenly temple in Second Temple Judaism. I show that while Luke does not explicitly mention the heavenly temple, his language reflects a shared conceptual and cultural vocabulary with other early Jewish authors. Ultimately, the dissertation posits that Jesus's ascension represents a sacrificial act that facilitates the purification of both Jews and Gentiles, fulfilling prophetic traditions. Luke's subtle sacrificial language suggests an expectation that his audience would recognize these connections, situating Jesus within a broader sacrificial framework and underscoring the text's deep roots in early Jewish context.

## Acknowledgements

This project commenced amid the global COVID-19 pandemic, and its completion was the result of collective effort and support. I began my PhD program in Egypt at a time when international borders and flights were suspended. The invaluable contributions of my family and advisory committee were instrumental in making this accomplishment possible. My dissertation committee dedicated their time, energy, and scholarship to this project through their insightful feedback, discussions, and unwavering encouragement.

Matthew Thiessen, my advisor, endorsed the project from its inception and accompanied me through its various challenges and triumphs. His astute scholarly perspective significantly influenced the trajectory of this research, guiding it from its inception to its conclusion. With a profound understanding of the texts of Luke-Acts, Thiessen's scholarship on interpreting New Testament texts within a Jewish context shaped both the vision and methodology of this dissertation. His meticulous attention to detail, expertise with primary sources, and willingness to engage in repeated discussions were crucial in refining my work. Furthermore, Thiessen exemplified not only a rigorous academic supervisor but also a mentor who recognized the complexities of completing a PhD. Hanna Tervanotko, my second reader, played a critical role in helping me refine the scope of the dissertation. Her expertise in the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Judaism, and gender studies enriched my research significantly. The sharpness of the project would not have been achievable without her constructive feedback. Although Daniel Machiela did not ultimately serve on my dissertation committee as initially planned, I acknowledge his pivotal role in introducing me to the realm of Second Temple Judaism. His scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls deepened my passion for this field, particularly during our discussions on atonement in the Aramaic scrolls. I am also grateful to Isaac W. Oliver for accepting a position on my committee. The inspiration for this dissertation is drawn from Oliver's assertion that Luke-Acts are inherently Jewish texts. His extensive knowledge of Luke-Acts and early Jewish sources

provided a nuanced perspective and balanced analysis. Oliver was consistently available to address my inquiries and guide me through various challenges encountered during the research process. Much of the writing for this dissertation occurred following October 7, 2023, a date that profoundly affected the mental health of many individuals. Despite our differing backgrounds—Oliver as a Jew and myself as an Arab—we both found motivation in Luke-Acts to advocate for messages of peaceful coexistence.

I have also benefited from the guidance of other scholars who have assisted me in various capacities. I extend my gratitude to Eileen Schuller, who has been a steadfast conversation partner throughout the years. Schuller's extensive knowledge of early Jewish texts was instrumental in helping me navigate the field and articulate my ideas. Her impact is evident throughout the pages of this dissertation. The foundational questions of this research emerged during my Th.M. studies at Duke Divinity School, particularly while taking simultaneous classes with Joel Marcus and C. Kevin Rowe. I am grateful to both for opening the doors to critical New Testament scholarship. Marcus challenged me on the question of atonement in Luke-Acts, while Rowe taught me how to approach Luke's writings with analytical rigor.

Finally, I am grateful for the personal sacrifices made by my wife, Noha, and my son, Evan, who both chose to accompany me across the globe to facilitate the completion of this project. Their unwavering support and belief in me exemplified the essence of dedicated love. I am profoundly grateful for the journey we share. I wish to express my gratitude to my father, Atef Mekhael, who first instilled in me a passion for the New Testament. Though he passed away midway during my PhD program, his voice that these texts are the fountain of life continues to echo in my heart.

## Table of Contents

Introduction: Atonement and the Jewishness of Luke-Acts .....	1
Atonement in Context .....	1
Luke within Judaism .....	11
Thesis.....	17
Structure .....	17
“Within Judaism” .....	20
Methodology .....	21
Chapter1: The Centrality of Jerusalem’s Temple in Luke-Acts .....	26
Introduction .....	26
The Temple in the Gospel of Luke .....	29
The Temple in The Infancy Narrative.....	31
The Temple in The Ministry of Jesus .....	38
The Temple in Acts .....	51
The Temple in the Twelve’s Ministry .....	51
The Temple in Paul’s Ministry .....	56
Conclusion.....	64
Chapter 2: The Priestly Sacrificial System .....	65
Introduction .....	65
The Priestly Sacrificial System in History .....	67
P’s Sacrificial System in Luke .....	72
Literary Description of P’s Sacrificial System .....	74
Ascension Offering (Lev 1.2–17) .....	75
The Grain Offering (Lev 2.1–16).....	79
The Well-being Offering (Lev 3.1–17) .....	80
The Purification Offering (4.2–5.13).....	81
Reparation Offering (Lev 5.14–6.7).....	92
The Substitutionary Misconceptualization of Sacrifices .....	94
Conclusion.....	105
Chapter 3: The Heavenly Temple in Early Judaism .....	107
Introduction .....	107
The Heavenly Temple in Jewish Scriptures .....	110
The Heavenly Temple in Early Judaism .....	119



The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.....	119
The Book of Watchers.....	125
Jubilees .....	130
The Animal Apocalypse .....	135
4 Ezra .....	139
2 Baruch.....	145
Philo of Alexandria's Writings .....	151
The Epistle to the Hebrews .....	157
Revelation .....	164
The Testament of Levi .....	169
Conclusion.....	173
Chapter 4: The Heavenly Temple in Luke-Acts .....	175
Introduction .....	175
Jesus and the Jewish Council.....	177
Jesus and The Paradise .....	185
The Crucifixion Narrative .....	198
Stephen's Vision .....	211
Conclusion.....	224
Chapter 5: Ascension and Atonement in Luke-Acts.....	225
Introduction .....	225
The Sacrificial Context of the Ascension Narratives .....	228
The Restoration of Israel in the Ascension Narratives .....	236
The Cosmic Sacrifice .....	240
Ascension and Forgiveness .....	256
The Pouring of the Spirit.....	260
Eschatological Cultic Atonement .....	268
Jesus. The Gentile's Sacrifice .....	275
Conclusion.....	281
Conclusion: Ascension and Atonement.....	283
Summary .....	283
Further Questions .....	286
Theological Contribution .....	290
Bibliography.....	291

## ABBREVIATIONS

### 1. Ancient Authors and Works:

Aristotle:

*De. Phil.*                      On Philosophy

Dead Sea Scrolls:

<i>1Q19</i>	Book of Noah
<i>1Q22</i>	Words of Moses
<i>1Q29</i>	Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire
<i>1QM</i>	War Scroll
<i>1QpHab</i>	Pesher Habakkuk
<i>1QS</i>	Rule of the Community
<i>4Q400 – 4Q407</i>	Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice
<i>+11Q17</i>	
<i>4Q204</i>	Aramaic Fragments of Enoch
<i>4Q376</i>	Apocryphon of Moses
<i>4Q541</i>	Apocryphon of Levi
<i>4Q543-549</i>	Visions of Amram
<i>11QMelch/11Q13</i>	Melchizedek
<i>11Q19</i>	Temple Scroll
<i>CD</i>	Cairo Genizah Copy of the Damascus Document
<i>D</i>	Damascus Document

Dio Chrysostom:

*Or.*                                Orations

Josephus:

<i>Ag. Ap.</i>	Against Apion
<i>Ant.</i>	Jewish Antiquities
<i>J.W.</i>	Jewish War

Philo:

<i>Spec. Leg</i>	On Special Laws
<i>Moses</i>	On Moses
<i>QA Exod</i>	Questions and Answers on Exodus
<i>QA Gen</i>	Questions and Answers on Genesis
<i>Somn.</i>	On Dreams

Plato:

*Tim.*                              Timaeus

Plutarch

*De tranq.*                      On the Tranquility of Mind

Pseudepigrapha and Related Texts:

<i>1 En.</i>	1 Enoch
<i>2 Bar.</i>	2 Baruch
<i>4 Ezra</i>	4 Ezra

<i>Arist.</i>	Letter of Aristeas
<i>ADL</i>	Aramaic Document of Levi
<i>An. Apoc.</i>	Animals Apocalypse
<i>Apoc. Ab.</i>	Apocalypse of Abraham
<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	Gospel of Thomas
<i>Jub.</i>	Jubilees
<i>L.A.B.</i>	Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	Psalms of Solomon
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	Sibylline Oracles
<i>Similitudes</i>	Similitudes of Enoch
<i>T. Levi</i>	Testament of Levi

## 2. Journals, Major Reference Works, and Series:

<i>AB</i>	Anchor Bible
<i>AGJU</i>	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AJEC</i>	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
<i>AJS Review</i>	Association for Jewish Studies Review
<i>ANTC</i>	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
<i>AOAT</i>	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>AS</i>	Année Sociologique
<i>ATANT</i>	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>BAR</i>	Biblical Archaeology Review
<i>BBR</i>	Bulletin for Biblical Research
<i>BBRSS</i>	Biblical and Beyond Research Supplement Series
<i>BEATAJ</i>	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums
<i>BETL</i>	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib. Int.</i>	Biblical Interpretation
<i>Bib. Sac.</i>	Bibliotheca Sacra
<i>Bib.</i>	Biblica
<i>BJS</i>	Biblical and Judaic Studies
<i>BMW</i>	Bible in the Modern World
<i>BRL</i>	Biblical Research Library
<i>BS</i>	Biblical Seminar
<i>BTS</i>	Bibliotheca Theologica Studiorum
<i>BWANT</i>	Beihefte zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZNW</i>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBET</i>	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<i>CBQMS</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CNT</i>	Collection Nouveau Testament
<i>CRINT</i>	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CSCO</i>	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>CSR</i>	Contributions to the Study of Religion
<i>CTM</i>	Currents in Theology and Mission
<i>DCLS</i>	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies

<i>DCLT</i>	Developments in Christian Literature and Theology
<i>DJD</i>	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	Dead Sea Discoveries
<i>ECDSS</i>	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>ECL</i>	Early Christianity and its Literature
<i>EJL</i>	Early Judaism and Its Literature
<i>ET</i>	Evangelische Theologie
<i>Ev. Qu.</i>	Evangelical Quarterly
<i>Exp. Tim.</i>	Expository Times
<i>FAT</i>	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FRLANT</i>	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>GAP</i>	Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
<i>HBM</i>	Hebrew Bible Monographs
<i>HCS</i>	Hellenistic Culture and Society
<i>HR</i>	History of Religions
<i>HSM</i>	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTS</i>	Hervormde Theologiese Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	Hebrew Union College Annual
<i>HUCAS</i>	Hebrew Union College Annual Supplements
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int.</i>	Interpretation
<i>JAJ</i>	Journal of Ancient Judaism
<i>JANESCU</i>	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
<i>JAOS</i>	Journal of the American Oriental Society
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature
<i>JCPS</i>	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
<i>JCS</i>	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
<i>JCTCRS</i>	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
<i>JETS</i>	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
<i>JIBS</i>	Journal of Intercultural Biblical Studies
<i>JJS</i>	Journal of Jewish Studies
<i>JJTP</i>	Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy
<i>JPT</i>	Journal of Pentecostal Theology
<i>JQR</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review
<i>JR</i>	Journal of Religion
<i>JRS</i>	Journal of Roman Studies
<i>JSHJ</i>	Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus
<i>JSJPHR</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period
<i>JSJSS</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
<i>JSNT</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
<i>JSNTSS</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOTSS</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
<i>JSPSS</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	Journal of Theological Studies

<i>Jud.</i>	Judaica
<i>KENT</i>	Kommentar zu den Einzelbüchern des Neuen Testaments
<i>LBS</i>	Linguistic Biblical Studies
<i>LHB/OTS</i>	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
<i>LNTS</i>	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LSTS</i>	Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>MC</i>	Mesopotamian Civilizations
<i>MEA</i>	Münchener Ethnologische Abhandlungen
<i>MNTS</i>	McMaster New Testament Studies
<i>NCBC</i>	New Commentary on the Bible and the Church
<i>Neot.</i>	Neotestamentica
<i>NICNT</i>	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NICOT</i>	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NovTSup</i>	Novum Testamentum Supplements
<i>NSBT</i>	New Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>NTA</i>	Novum Testamentum et Antiquitas
<i>NTC</i>	New Testament Commentary
<i>NTL</i>	New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	New Testament Studies
<i>NTTSD</i>	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
<i>OCDSS</i>	Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>OTE</i>	Old Testament Essays
<i>OTL</i>	Old Testament Library
<i>PACS</i>	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
<i>PBM</i>	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
<i>PMS</i>	Publications in Mediaeval Studies
<i>PRS</i>	Perspectives in Religious Studies
<i>PTMS</i>	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique
<i>RBS</i>	Rabbinical Biblical Series
<i>RQ</i>	Revue Qumran
<i>SAAL</i>	Studies in Apocalypticism and Apocryphal Literature
<i>SANT</i>	Studien zur Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>SBL</i>	Studies in Biblical Literature
<i>SBLDS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>SCJ</i>	Studies in Christianity and Judaism
<i>SJLA</i>	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJT</i>	Scottish Journal of Theology
<i>SMLL</i>	Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics
<i>SNTA</i>	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia
<i>SNTSMS</i>	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SP</i>	Sacra Pagina
<i>SPA</i>	Studia Philonica Annual
<i>STAC</i>	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
<i>STDJ</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

<i>Stud. Neot.</i>	Studia Neotestamentica
<i>SVTP</i>	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
<i>TBN</i>	Themes in Biblical Narrative
<i>TENTS</i>	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
<i>TSAJ</i>	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
<i>TTPS</i>	Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series
<i>Tyn.Bul.</i>	Tyndale Bulletin
<i>UCOP</i>	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
<i>VT</i>	Vetus Testamentum
<i>VTSup</i>	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
<i>WAWS</i>	Writings from the Ancient World Series
<i>WBC</i>	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WMANT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WMAT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten Testament
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

## DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

I, Fady A. Mekhael, declare that this thesis has been researched and written by myself and myself alone.

## **Introduction: Atonement and the Jewishness of Luke-Acts**

For over two centuries, scholars have consistently maintained two key assertions regarding Luke-Acts. first, that its author was a Gentile, and second, that the text lacks an atonement theology. However, in recent decades, a growing number of scholars have begun to reassess the Jewishness of Luke-Acts. This shift follows developments in scholarship on Paul within Judaism and the Jewishness of the historical Jesus, leading to a renewed approach to Luke-Acts within the framework of early Judaism. Despite this reevaluation of Luke-Acts' Jewish context, the second assertion—that Luke-Acts does not include atonement theology—has largely remained unchallenged. This dissertation seeks to contest the long-standing consensus that Luke does not conceive of Jesus as offering his life as a sacrificial atonement. I will show that Luke does have atonement theology, properly defined and that he thinks Jesus offers himself as a sacrifice to purify his followers. As I will argue in the five chapters of this dissertation, situating Luke within Judaism helps solve this problem. But before I explain the scope and structure of this dissertation, I will review some major contributions about atonement in Luke-Acts and works that situate Luke within Judaism, which will help set the direction toward understanding Luke's atonement theology.

### **Atonement in Context**

The majority of scholars studying Luke-Acts have nearly universally claimed that Luke does not present a theology of atonement. For instance, Hans Conzelmann concludes that in Luke-Acts “there is no trace of any passion mysticism, nor is any direct soteriological significance drawn from Jesus' suffering or death. There is no suggestion of a connection with the forgiveness of sins... there is



no trace of the idea of atonement.”<sup>1</sup> J. M. Creed accentuates a similar proposition. “No *theologia crucis* beyond the affirmation that the Christ must suffer since so the prophetic scriptures had foretold.”<sup>2</sup> Henry Cadbury makes similar conclusions based on Luke’s omission of Mark 10.45 in the parallel section Luke 22.24–27, “which might seem to suggest a doctrine of atonement.”<sup>3</sup> The difference between Mark 10.45 and Luke 22.27 gave rise to much speculation about Luke’s theology.<sup>4</sup> Ernst

---

<sup>1</sup> Hanz Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 201. Conzelmann [*An Outline of the New Testament Theology*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1969), 134] calls the saying in Mark and its parallel in Matt 20:28 “a general dogmatic interpretation of the career of Jesus” that belongs to the “formulations of community doctrine.” Similarly, Henry Cadbury, by the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, after discussing the omission of Mk 10.45 in Luke’s gospel, claims that for Luke: “The cross of Jesus is for him no stumbling block as it was to Paul the Jew... the resurrection is therefore the significant thing about Jesus.” See: Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: Macmillan, 1927), 280. The claim that Luke focuses on the resurrection, instead of the cross, remained the standardized view during the century. Sixty years later, Joseph Tyson still claims that Luke “seems uninterested in piercing through to an understanding of the theological reason for the death or in analyzing what it was intended to accomplish. The benefits of forgiveness of sins and the Spirit are more closely connected with the resurrection than the death.” See: Joseph B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986), 170.

<sup>2</sup> J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1930), lxxii.

<sup>3</sup> Cadbury further claims: “In the gospels, the death of Jesus is told rather than explained. But Luke strikingly omits passages in Mark which might seem to suggest a doctrine of atonement, as modern theology would name it. Mark’s ‘to give his life a ransom for many’ is not in Luke’s parallel.” Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 280. Claims about Luke’s omission of the ransom saying in Mk 10:45 are mostly rooted in source-critical and form-critical works, in which Lk 22:27 is seen as the purest form of the historical saying, while Mk 10:45 reflects a more dogmatically developed saying that does not belong to the historical Jesus. Rudolf Bultmann argues: “A well-known dogmatic transformation can be seen in Mk 10.45, the original form of which may well be found in Lk 22.27. By dogmatic motive I naturally do not mean a conscious introduction of particular dogmas, but something which is for the most part an unconscious tincture of Christian ideas.” Bultmann further traces the development of the dogmatic insertion in relation to the nascent Hellenistic church: “A saying which originally referred generally to the greatness of service, was applied especially to the Christian Church in the Christian tradition. To that end it was provided with a foil in Mk 10.42 par and at the end a reference to the example of Jesus was added. Indeed at the end Lk 22.27 is doubtless original over against Mk 10:45, which has formed its conception of Jesus from the redemption theories of Hellenistic Christianity.” Hence, Luke, who depended on an older source than Mark, included the saying in its primitive form which emphasizes the greatness of service to others, not an atonement doctrine. Space does not allow for a full evaluation of form-critical methodology here, but the common assumption is that because Luke does not have the verse, it must be a later dogmatic addition from the church. But what if Mark is in fact older than Luke since Luke used Mark, a fact that no form critic denies? Many had to postulate an earlier source in the hands of Luke to justify that Luke did not include the λύτρον saying. That is, the non-existence of the λύτρον saying in Luke is what led the form critics to their historical evaluation of Mk 10:45. However, instead of asking why didn’t Luke include the saying in his gospel, the question became why did Mark add it to his gospel? See: Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 93.

<sup>4</sup> Space limitations does not allow for a full treatment of Luke’s treatment of Mk 10.45, however, while Luke does not use the precise language of Mark, he does include the thoughts. The narrative flow starts in Lk 22.1–2 where Luke presents two thoughts following each other: First, the Passover was near, and second, the chief priests and scribes wanted to put Jesus to death. In the following two chapters, Luke will present Jesus’s death. In Lk 22.7–13 Jesus asks his disciples to prepare the Passover sacrificial lamb, and in Lk 22.14–20, while eating the Passover with his disciples, he institutes the eucharistic supper. Jesus’s words in Lk 22.19–20 are especially significant: “Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, ‘This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of

Käsemann famously argued that Luke made a shift in his soteriological nexus from the cross (*theologia crucis*) to the outpouring of the spirit which led to the creation of the institutional church (*theologia gloriae*) in what he called “early Catholicism.”<sup>5</sup>

What led scholars to conclude that Luke does not have an atonement theology? In addition to the unexamined assumption that Luke’s narrative is hostile toward the temple, presumably in passages like Lk 13.31–35; 19.29–46; 21.20–28, and Acts 7, I suggest that an inaccurate understanding of

---

me.’ And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, ‘This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.’ There are two elements in Jesus’s words here that are equivalent to the meaning of λύτρον in Mk 10:45. First, Jesus says that he is giving his body “for you” (ὕπὲρ ὑμῶν). Thus, Jesus will die in Luke on behalf of others, which is communicated in Mark by λύτρον in Mk 10:45. In Mark 14.22 Jesus does not say that he is giving his body on behalf of his disciples. He simply says “This is my body.” The second element in λύτρον is the covenantal relationship between YHWH and Israel, which Jesus says is being renewed through his death in Mk 10:45. In Lk 22.20 Jesus emphasized the “new covenant” that he establishes with his followers. So both elements included in λύτρον in Mk 10:45 appear in Lk 22.19–20. We should not forget too that this is the same Passover sacrificial lamb table, which reminds the reader further of the initial Exodus from Egypt. As Luke places the quarrel over greatness between the disciples over the table of Passover, he might have not felt the urge to include Mk 10:45, especially since the same elements in λύτρον are included in the eucharistic/Passover supper. A few verses later, Jesus will be arrested and show up before the council, and in the following chapter he will die. It is important to note how Luke restructures the blocks of his passion narrative so differently than Mark. The inclusion of the quarrel over greatness among the disciples in the middle of the passion narratives (which actually starts with the desire to kill Jesus in Lk 22.1) should be the real question. That is, it is understandable why Luke omits Mk 10:45, so that he does not duplicate Lk 22.19–20. But it is not as clear why he placed this whole unit in the structure of his passion narrative. My answer is rooted in Luke’s consistent depiction of the disciples as not understanding Jesus’s predictions of his death (Lk 9.45; 18.34). Luke is also creative in his presentation of the confused disciples. For instance, he represents the Emmaus disciples as not being able to recognize Jesus (Lk 24.13–34). Luke adds that “their eyes were being kept from recognizing him” (v. 16). Luke uses the imperfect passive ἐκράτοῦντο to imply the disciples’ continuing unrecognition of Jesus. By this point of the narrative in the gospel, and building on the wider context, it is clear that Luke means that they did not understand who this stranger who walks with them is. Before, they could not understand Jesus’ sayings because it was hidden from them. Now they could not recognize Jesus himself because their eyes were taken hold of. The quarrel over greatness between the disciples, just after Jesus told them one more time that he will die soon, is another creative way of Luke to tell how his disciples did not understand what he says. Luke wants the reader to be shocked when they see the disciples fighting over who is greater just after Jesus announced his immediate death. The disciples are in the middle of the passion narrative, yet they do not comprehend it. Luke uses the same passage from Mark, then, in a totally different way. His aims are different than Mark’s, whose point is to show how costly it is to follow Jesus, even to death, a point that Luke makes in another place (Lk 14.25–33).

<sup>5</sup> Käsemann developed F. C. Baur’s suggestion that Lukan Christianity is the synthesis of Pauline Christianity and Petrine Christianity. Käsemann suggested that the focus on the cross, among other phenomena, was part of the early apocalyptic outlook of the first few decades of the Jesus’s movement, as evidenced in the writings of Paul. By the later decades of the first century CE, the early institutionalized Catholic nature of the nascent church began to be established. Käsemann argues that belonging to this institutionalized community, not the cross, becomes the focus of salvation in the deutero-Pauline letters and Luke-Acts. See: Ernst Käsemann, “Ministry and Community in the New Testament,” in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, ed. Ernst Käsemann, trans. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 63–94; idem, “An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology,” 169–195. For a critique of Käsemann, see Mark Allan Powell, *What Are They Saying about Acts?* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1991), 67–8.

Levitical atonement within the context of Second Temple Judaism contributed to the belief that Luke lacks an atonement theology. Specifically, the misunderstanding that sacrifices were substitutionary, where animals were to die in place of humans, was applied to Jesus. Looking into Mark 10.45, Ben Witherington concludes. “The concept of a substitutionary sacrifice is indeed connoted by the noun λυτρον and its verbal cognate in texts like Exod. 13.13–16 (LXX) and probably carries the same connotation in Mark 10.45. In view of the text in Exodus, it is certainly wrong to suggest that substitutionary sacrifice is a later idea that could not stand in the background of the material in both Isaiah and Mark 10.45. One must conjure with echoes not just of Isa. 53 in Mark 10.45 but also of other texts about sacrifice in the OT.”<sup>6</sup> Hence, if Luke does not explicitly speak about Jesus’s substitutionary atoning death, he lacks atonement theology, so the logic goes. Even the blood-sayings

---

<sup>6</sup> Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 289–90. He further claims: “Here we have enunciated the notion of substitutionary atonement. Jesus came to set people free from the wrong sort of servitude so that, like himself, they might become free servants of God, exchanging all false masters for a true one... Mark is simply contrasting the one who made the sacrifice with the many for whom he was the substitute.” A survey of the occurrences of the root λυτρ\* confirms that its essential definition in the Old Greek translations of the Jewish scriptures is the release payment (Exod 21.29–30, 30:13; Lev. 25.23–24; Num 3.46–51; Num 35.31–32; Deut 7.8; Ps. 107.2 (106.2 LXX), 44.26 (43.27 LXX), 77.15 (76.16 LXX); Isa 35.9, 43.2, 51.1–3; Mic 4.10; Zeph 3.15). It is primarily a monetary compensation to free oneself from a specific obligation that may come in the form of debt, punishment, or penalty. While the monetary transaction to obtain one’s freedom seems to represent how the root λυτρ\* was used, the more essential idea of being freed from a specific obligation or oppressive situation remains the dominant meaning of the term. A theological development of the use of λυτρ\* took place in the prophetic texts, in connection to the covenantal relationship between YHWH and Israel. YHWH freed Israel from slavery to Egypt without any payments in the past, and YHWH will free Israel from Babylon without any payments in the future. Salvation depends on the steadfast covenantal love of YHWH for Israel. In all Jewish texts, there is not a slight connection between the root λυτρ\* and the cultic sacrificial system. *No ancient Jewish Greek text ever uses λυτρ\* in connection with an animal sacrifice (or any other form of offering) as though this animal functions as a substitute for the human.* There are no instances where λυτρον and/or λυτρόω are used in connection with atonement, or ritual purity laws.

in Lk 22.20<sup>7</sup> and Acts 20.28,<sup>8</sup> while sometimes viewed to support the atoning death of Jesus,<sup>9</sup> have been consistently dismissed in ways that support interpretive frameworks of Luke-Acts that do not attach any salvific significance to the death of Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

More recently, some have sought to reverse this consensus view and present a case for Luke's atonement theology, especially the works of John Kimbell, Timothy Reardon, and Benjamin Wilson.<sup>11</sup> Kimbell's work approaches atonement in Luke-Acts from a traditional Protestant perspective, where "Luke presents the death of Jesus as an atoning death that brings about the forgiveness of sins."<sup>12</sup> He defines atonement as follows. "I use 'atoning' to refer to God's saving work that addresses the problem of human sin and its effects so that sinners may be restored to fellowship with Him. Atonement is, therefore, a broad term that can include more specific elements such as expiation (cleansing from sin

---

<sup>7</sup> While C. H. Dodd (*Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980] 288) ignores the saying completely in his commentary on Luke, Vernon Robbins comments: "The presence of this verse in Luke makes it all the more remarkable that there is no sacrificial language in the preaching in Acts." See: Vernon K. Robbins, "Priestly Discourse in Luke and Acts," in *Jesus and Mary Reimagined in Early Christian Literature*, ed. Vernon K. Robbins and J. M. Potter (Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 33.

<sup>8</sup> Jacob Jervell, commenting on Acts 20.28, notes that "Luke is aware of the sacrificial death of Jesus and does not deny it, but thrusts it into the background for some inscrutable reason." Jervell then concludes his discussion of the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts saying: "Luke clearly connects salvation with the death of Christ, but he does not say what the death is intended to accomplish." See: Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 98-9. Cf. I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971), 175. On the textual variants in the passage, see: Bart D. Ehrman, "The Cup, The Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts," in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman, NTTSD 33 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 156-77.

<sup>9</sup> I. J. du Plessis, "The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel—Focusing on Luke 22:19b-20," *Neot* 28 (1994): 523-40.

<sup>10</sup> C. F. D. Moule argues that it is not by chance that the blood saying in Acts 20:28 occurs in one of Paul's speeches in Acts, noting that Luke might be using features of Pauline theology in the letters to build his character of Paul in Acts. See: C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 171. J. Kodell similarly argues that both passages are either Pauline or liturgical that they do not represent Luke's view. See: J. Kodell, "Luke's Theology of the Death of Jesus," in *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit: Commemorating the Fiftieth Year of The Liturgical Press*, ed. Daniel Durken (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1979), 223. Cf. I. Howard Marshall, "The Place of Acts 20:28 in Luke's Theology of the Cross," in *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*, LNTS 427 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 154-70.

<sup>11</sup> I do not attempt to survey works on Luke's soteriology here, rather, how scholars approached atonement specifically in Luke-Acts. See: John Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2014); idem, "Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts: The New Covenant Sacrifice," *SBJT* 16 (2012): 28-48; Timothy W. Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation: Lukan Soteriology, Atonement, and the Victory of Christ*, LNTS 642 (London: T&T Clark, 2021); Benjamin R. Wilson, *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ: The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology*, BZNW 223 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016).

<sup>12</sup> Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*, 3.

and its defilement), propitiation (turning away God’s wrath), substitution (bearing the penalty for sin in the place of others so they do not have to bear that penalty themselves), and representation (dying and rising in union with sinners so that sinners themselves pass through death into reconciliation and life)... If any one of these elements is shown to be in view in Luke-Acts, I understand ‘atonement’ to be in view.”<sup>13</sup> In subsequent chapters, Kimbell advances his understanding of atonement as God’s treatment of God’s wrath. Kimbell argues: “God’s wrath against sinners is described in categories of retributive punishment. Sin deserves to be punished.”<sup>14</sup> Kimbell continues:

“Sin deserves judgment. Salvation, in a fundamental way, entails having this judgment removed. It is within this theological context that Luke presents Jesus as being condemned to the judgment of suffering and death, and yet having done no sin to deserve it. The human agents who carried this condemnation out, according to Luke, did so in accord with the predetermined plan of God. The most likely conclusion from all of this is that Jesus’ death was necessary within the divine plan of salvation as an atonement for sin, bearing God’s judgment for the sake of sinners. At the very least, these themes provide significant confirmatory evidence for a Lukan theology of atonement.”<sup>15</sup>

Kimbell’s work exemplifies the traditional Protestant view of atonement, rooted in the penal substitutionary model of atonement. Penal substitutionary atonement presents two central propositions. The first posits that retributive punishment is warranted as a consequence of the worshipper’s sin. The second asserts that a substitutionary mechanism is at work, whereby the sacrificial animal takes the place of the worshipper, bearing the punishment deserved as a result of the sin. Applying this perspective to Jesus would mean that “in dying on the cross, Jesus pays the penalty of death for all

---

<sup>13</sup> Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*, 3, fn. 4.

<sup>14</sup> Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*, 145.

<sup>15</sup> Kimbell, *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*, 146.

those who are saved, and so they are freed from their deserved punishment. God’s justice is satisfied by Jesus’s death.”<sup>16</sup> However, Kimbell’s analysis lacks engagement with the conceptual framework of atonement as presented in Jewish scriptures, and he does not explore the linguistic meaning or the functional role of atonement in Leviticus or in Second Temple Judaism. Kimbell’s model is premised on the notion that God punishes sinners for their sins, yet he does not provide a clear textual basis for this idea either within Luke-Acts or in ancient Israelite and Jewish thinking more broadly. Rather than deriving his interpretation from the text itself, Kimbell approaches Luke-Acts through the lens of sixteenth-century theology, imposing categories such as punishment, retribution, and substitution onto the narrative—categories that are not evidently present in the text in the way he assumes. This approach risks anachronistically projecting later theological constructs onto a first-century text, without adequately accounting for the historical and cultural context in which Luke-Acts was written.

Reardon’s work represents a more nuanced treatment of atonement in Luke-Acts. In his words: “My thesis is that Luke-Acts offers a complete, holistic, embodied, and political soteriology, cosmic in scope, that takes up space in the world and includes both what and how of salvation, taking Christos Victor form.”<sup>17</sup> Reardon adopts Irenaeus’s model of Christos Victor and enhances it politically as the best description of Luke’s atonement theology. Reardon prefers Irenaeus as his Christos Victor model does not include a ransom payment made to Satan to liberate enslaved humans. Instead, “Satan is conquered through Jesus’s obedience.”<sup>18</sup> Reardon conceptualizes atonement as a victory in a cosmic-spiritual battle. However, he does not perceive a strict dichotomy between the cosmic-spiritual struggle between Jesus and the forces of evil and the socio-political powers that oppress humanity. Reardon examines Zechariah’s Benedictus and subsequently engages with Luke-Acts to develop his Christos

---

<sup>16</sup> Stephen R. Holmes, “Penal Substitution,” in *T&T Clark Companion to Atonement*, ed. Adam J. Johnson (London: T&T Clark, 2017): 295–314 (295).

<sup>17</sup> Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation*, 27.

<sup>18</sup> Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation*, 29.

Victor model of atonement. “The salvation described in the Benedictus coheres with the Irenaean Christus Victor framework... The prophecy identifies the primary salvific need... as release, specifically from tangible enemies. Though the precise nature of these enemies remains obscure, the release itself... is characterized by God’s paradigmatic exodus deliverance and the context of Roman imperialism. Though no mention is made of Satan in Zechariah’s prophecy, I noted how Luke ties cosmic powers with the organization of social-political space, and the significance of Satan and other powers will become clearer as this investigation continues.”<sup>19</sup>

While I do not disagree with Reardon’s conclusion that Lukan salvation is depicted as a cosmic battle with socio-political implications, I question the extent to which this soteriological framework should be classified as “Atonement.” Reardon explicitly employs Irenaeus’s *Christus Victor* model, which, while potentially a useful lens for analyzing Luke-Acts, remains a later theological category imposed upon the text. Reardon effectively traces the theme of socio-political liberation in Luke-Acts, linking it to the concept of the Jubilee year as articulated in Jesus’s programmatic sermon in the synagogue (Luke 4.18-19). He interprets Jesus’s salvific ministry as “reordering mal-ordered (bound-by-Satan) realities and space, establishing God’s justness in the world and among people (and for the poor) through a cosmic comprehensive and social-political salvation.”<sup>20</sup> While this soteriological paradigm may be valid, I am not convinced that it should be called “Atonement,” at least as it is understood within the context of Jewish scriptures and Second Temple literature. Reardon defines atonement as follows:

Atonement does not culminate but begins with God’s forgiveness. Jesus does not satisfy a legal demand or offer God supererogatory restitution for humanity’s past sins through death, thereby

---

<sup>19</sup> Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation*, 64. For a different way to connect the theme of release in Luke-Acts to atonement, see: Matthew Forrest Lowe, “Cash and Release: Atonement and Release from Oppression in the Imperial Context of Luke’s Gospel,” in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew Pitts, TENTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 145–63.

<sup>20</sup> Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation*, 97.

making forgiveness available. Rather, the narrative opens with God's turning and offering forgiveness. Yet, importantly, this forgiveness is not a simple declaration that one accepts personally, receiving absolution; it demands an often costly response where one enters into a social reality. Forgiveness—a productive act, expecting repentance, formation, and the reordering of space—initiates a process of release, organizing bodies justly in space, whereby the world is reconciled with God, and thus does not forgo but “satisfies” and manifests God's justice. This atonement is not simply personal but social and cosmic. It is a spatial salvation where God's gracious offer of forgiveness is an offer to put things right, to reconcile the world.<sup>21</sup>

This theological analysis of the complexities of salvation in Luke-Acts illuminates significant elements of Luke's message; however, it overlooks the fact that atonement, in its most basic sense, is a cultic term that refers to a ritual process integral to ancient Jewish religious practices. Reardon's interpretation fails to consider that, in a Jewish context, forgiveness of sin and repentance are intrinsically linked to cultic sacrifice. Consequently, Reardon's treatment of the concept of atonement appears to be more reflective of later Christian doctrinal developments than of the original intent of Luke's text. By neglecting the Jewish context in which Luke's narrative was written, Reardon's approach risks imposing anachronistic theological categories onto the text, rather than engaging with its historical and cultural foundations.

A more nuanced analysis that considers the cultic context of atonement in early Judaism can be found in Benjamin Wilson's work. Wilson largely focuses on elucidating the significance of Jesus's death, demonstrating how Luke seeks to emphasize it as a salvific event. However, Wilson only briefly addresses the connection between Jesus's death and the sacrificial atonement practices within the

---

<sup>21</sup> Reardon, *The Politics of Salvation*, 27–28.



Jewish cultic tradition: “The frequent refrain that Luke has avoided any notion of atonement within his soteriological framework is actually a rather radical proposition. If the Lukan understanding of repentance and divine forgiveness is completely divorced from any conception of cultic atonement, then Lukan soteriology truly is a strange anomaly.”<sup>22</sup> As an example, Wilson says. “Upon the cross, Jesus’ prayer of forgiveness echoes the prescriptions for the  $\text{אָשָׁם}$  offering for sins committed in ignorance (Luke 23.34; cf. Lev 5.17– 18).”<sup>23</sup> Wilson does not develop the cultic understanding of atonement in Luke-Acts, as his focus is primarily on the cross as analogous to the act of slaughtering, which he identifies as the climactic component of the sacrificial offering, which might not be the case. Nonetheless, he establishes a crucial connection between Jesus’s death in Luke-Acts and the Levitical sacrificial system.

David Moffitt, however, provided the most accurate analysis of Jesus’s sacrificial offering of himself in Luke-Acts. In his article “Atonement at the Right Hand: The Sacrificial Significance of Jesus’ Exaltation in Acts,”<sup>24</sup> Moffitt argues that Luke emphasizes the salvific significance of Jesus’ exaltation, more than the traditional sacrificial interpretation which puts the climax point in the crucifixion event. Moffitt suggests that Luke connects the atoning benefits of forgiveness and purification with Jesus’ exaltation to God’s right hand. This perspective aligns with a broader understanding of Jewish sacrificial practices, where the culmination of sacrifice involves the priest presenting the offering to God, rather than the act of slaughter itself. Thus, Luke’s emphasis on Jesus’ exaltation reflects an awareness of these sacrificial elements, suggesting that the atoning work of Jesus is completed through his exaltation rather than his death alone.

---

<sup>22</sup> Wilson, *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ*, 177–78.

<sup>23</sup> Wilson, *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ*, 178.

<sup>24</sup> David M. Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand: The Sacrificial Significance of Jesus’ Exaltation in Acts,” *NTS* 62 (2016): 549–68.

This dissertation builds on Moffitt's argument and solidifies the claim that a better understanding of Jewish sacrificial practices can shed more light on Luke's atonement theology. Instead of imposing later anachronistic notions of atonement onto Luke's writings, I propose that Luke and Acts should be interpreted as Jewish texts, written by an author immersed in the cultural and religious context of Second Temple Judaism. Significant advances in scholarship concerning the Jewishness of Luke-Acts have emerged, which I will now examine.

### **Luke within Judaism**

Scholars almost universally have believed that Luke-Acts was the product of a Gentile author<sup>25</sup>, perhaps even a Gentile Godfearer.<sup>26</sup> During the second half of the twentieth century, the Jews in Luke-Acts became the center of scholarship.<sup>27</sup> James T. Sanders championed the position that Luke-Acts is an inherently anti-Jewish text,<sup>28</sup> while Jacob Jervell strongly advocated that Luke-Acts is a pro-Jewish work.<sup>29</sup> Between those two opposite positions, scholars approached Luke-Acts through different lenses across a wide spectrum. Luke's writings reflect thoroughgoing understanding of Jewish scriptures.<sup>30</sup> The *whole* scriptures, according to Luke, witness to Jesus's identity, and Luke is keen to show Jesus's

---

<sup>25</sup> See the arguments in Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960), xxxiv–xxxv. Though outdated now, Plummer's arguments have been influential in spreading the notion of Luke's gentleness. For instance, Luke's polished Greek style has been seen as an indicator of his Gentile environment, than as someone who has Semitic roots. However, recent scholarship has shown that the Hellenistic culture, including proficiency in Greek, has been dominant in Palestine. Jewish authors were capable of writing in Greek (e.g. Philo), even those who were against the Maccabean regime (e.g., 2 Maccabees). Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 1–8.

<sup>26</sup> François Bovon, *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, Vol. 1, trans. Christine M. Thomas, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 8.

<sup>27</sup> The numerous works of Joseph Tyson on the Jews in Luke-Acts shows the interest in the topic, especially as Tyson's position stands in the middle, where he argues that Luke has both anti-Jewish and pro-Jewish positions. See: Joseph B. Tyson, ed., *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988); idem, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992); idem, *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999). For a survey of the wider debates, see: François Bovon: *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), especially 348–86, 490–94, 515–31.

<sup>28</sup> James T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

<sup>29</sup> Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979); idem, "The Church of Jews and Godfearers," in *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 11–20.

<sup>30</sup> Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 191–280; Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001).

story as rooted in Israel's story.<sup>31</sup> The social identity perspective provided ample space for scholars to examine how Luke construes Jesus's movement identity in relationship to the wider Jewish context. Mitzi Smith, for instance, uses the social-identity category of otherness to analyze the relationship between the followers of Jesus and the Jews, where the Jews are consistently depicted as the external other.<sup>32</sup> According to Smith, the narrative is dominated by negative stereotypes of Jews, overshadowing any positive portrayals. Luke's portrayal of Jews is particularly problematic, reducing them to flat, monolithic antagonists who consistently oppose Paul's ministry to Gentiles. Smith characterizes these Jewish figures as static, stereotypical, and devoid of complexity.<sup>33</sup> Drawing upon Lawrence Wills' concept of imperial sociology,<sup>34</sup> Smith argues that Luke-Acts constructs Jews as a threat to the Roman order. This portrayal is achieved by characterizing Jews as prone to stasis, a condition marked by civil unrest and rebellion.<sup>35</sup> Smith finds both continuity and discontinuity between Jesus's movement and Judaism in Luke-Acts. She contends that the apostles' frequent interactions with Jewish communities can be explained by a sense of historical continuity with Israel. This is exemplified in Paul's consistent practice of entering synagogues and addressing Jewish audiences. Conversely, the portrayal of Jews as *others* becomes more pronounced, particularly in Luke's narrative. Smith contends that Luke's depiction of Paul's conversion to Gentile mission represents an abandonment of Judaism, thus establishing a clear discontinuity between the early Jesus movement and its Jewish roots.<sup>36</sup> Smith, however, ignores how Luke defines the Jews in his double work. Many Jews joined the Jesus

---

<sup>31</sup> As Nils Dahl puts it, Luke wanted to write a "Continuation of biblical history." Nils A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church: Essays*, ed. Nils A. Dahl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 84. Cf. Kenneth D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People*, LNTS 282 (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005).

<sup>32</sup> Mitzi J. Smith, *Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles: Charismatics, the Jews, and Women*, PTMS, 154 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011), especially here 57–94.

<sup>33</sup> Smith, *Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles*, 64–72.

<sup>34</sup> Lawrence M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," *JBL* 110 (1991): 631–54.

<sup>35</sup> Smith, *Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles*, 61–65. Cf. Willie James Jennings, *Acts: A Theological Commentary on the Bible*, Belief (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2017), especially here 171–72.

<sup>36</sup> Smith, *Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles*, 59–73.

movement<sup>37</sup> after hearing Paul's sermons on different occasions (e.g., Acts 13.45–65; 14.2–5; 17.17; 18.6). In fact, Paul himself identifies as a Jew in Acts (16.1; 18.2, 24; 21.39; 22.3). Similarly, Amy-Jill Levine adopts a perspective of Luke-Acts as an anti-Jewish work.<sup>38</sup> According to Levine, Luke rejects the main Jewish institutions, including worship spaces (both the Temple and the synagogue), diminishes circumcision, and devalues the Jewish law. Similar to Smith, Levine sees Jesus and his followers on a separate side from Judaism.<sup>39</sup>

On the other side of the debate, an increasing number of scholars have been supporting the view that Luke-Acts is a Jewish work, though it might be in argument with other Jewish groups. Christopher Stroup,<sup>40</sup> Joshua Jipp,<sup>41</sup> Isaac Oliver,<sup>42</sup> David Smith,<sup>43</sup> Joshua Smith,<sup>44</sup> Jason Moraff,<sup>45</sup> and others,<sup>46</sup> all argue to one degree or another, that Luke-Acts envisions a community of Jesus's followers who have

---

<sup>37</sup> I use the term "Jesus movement" to refer to the religious movement that Jesus started in the first century as part of first-century Judaism. The term was first used, to the best of my knowledge, in the title of Gerd Theissen's book *Soziologie der Jesusbewegung. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*, (Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1977), though *Jesusbewegung* never appeared in the English translation: *The Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978). Theissen uses the term to refer to the break off of Jesus's movement from first-century Judaism. I use the term in a different sense as a reference to the groups of Jews who followed Jesus and still viewed themselves as Jews.

<sup>38</sup> Amy-Jill Levine, "Luke and the Jewish Religion," *Int* 68 (2014): 389–402.

<sup>39</sup> She notes: "Luke separates 'Judaism' or 'the Jewish religion' from Israel's Scriptures, history, and ritual. Thus, Luke less separates Jews from Judaism than brackets Jews and Judaism on one side of history and Jesus and his proto-Christian followers on the other." See: Levine, "Luke and the Jewish Religion," 392–93.

<sup>40</sup> Christopher R. Stroup, *The Christians Who Became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City*, Synkrisis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020). Stroup dates Acts to the early second century (p. 18, 39), and situates it more within a Greco-Roman context, than within an early Judaism.

<sup>41</sup> Joshua W. Jipp, "The Paul of Acts: Proclaimer of the Hope of Israel or Teacher of Apostasy from Moses?" *NovT* 62 (2020): 60–78.

<sup>42</sup> Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*, WUNT 11/355 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); idem, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts* (Oxford University Press, 2021); idem, "The 'Historical Paul' and the Paul of Acts: Which Is More Jewish?" in *Paul the Jew: A Conversation between Pauline and Second Temple Scholars*, ed. Carlos A. Segovia and Gabriele Boccaccini (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 51–71; idem, "When and How Did the Ekklesiā Split from the Synagogue?" in *The Jewish Roots of Christianity*, ed. Gerald McDermott (Bellingham: Lexham, 2021), 104–27.

<sup>43</sup> David A. Smith, *Luke and the Jewish Other: Politics of Identity in the Third Gospel* (New York: Routledge, 2024).

<sup>44</sup> Joshua P. Smith, *Luke Was not a Christian: Reading the Third Gospel and Acts within Judaism*, (Leiden: Brill, 2024).

<sup>45</sup> Jason F. Moraff, *Reading the Way, Paul, and "The Jews" in Acts Within Judaism: "Among my Own Nation,"* LNTS 690 (London: T&T Clark, 2024).

<sup>46</sup> See: Gregory E. Sterling, "'Opening the Scriptures': The Legitimation of the Diaspora and the Early Christian Mission," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999), 217.

not abandoned Judaism. Stroup, for instance, adopts an ethnic analytical lens to look at the followers of Jesus as Jews, whether they are Jewish or Gentiles. According to Stroup, Luke's objective in Acts of the Apostles is to integrate Gentile followers of Jesus into the established framework of Jewish ethnic identity. However, the followers of Jesus are still distinct from the Jews who do not follow Jesus.<sup>47</sup> To be "Christian" is to belong to a certain type of Judaism, where "the Jews" in Acts refers to those who rejected Jesus.<sup>48</sup> Against Smith, Stroup does not see social identity as stable, but negotiable.<sup>49</sup> Hence, there could be Jews from different ethnicities in Acts 2,<sup>50</sup> as Stroup equates ethnicity with political territories. Stroup does not see Luke's critique of Jewish leaders as an attack on Judaism *per se* but as part of Luke's construal of the Jesus movement community as the ideal Jewish community, compared to other Jewish communities.<sup>51</sup>

Jipp is close to Stroup in his analysis of Paul in Acts, but he focuses more on Paul's relationship to Jewish customs and ancestral traditions. According to Jipp, the binary category of pro-Jewish and anti-Jewish is not the best way to describe Acts' position on Judaism and the Jews.<sup>52</sup> Jipp sees an internal tension in Acts, in which Paul's conviction of the resurrected Messiah leads to re-evaluation, not rejection, of Israel's religion. While Paul is committed to his ancestral traditions, he perceives God to be doing something new through Jesus. The messianic condition is what makes Paul a committed, Torah-observant Jew in Jipp's view. If one misses that condition, it is easy to see how Paul could be misunderstood as a "teacher of apostasy" from Moses.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Stroup, *The Christians Who Became Jews*, 17–39.

<sup>48</sup> Stroup, *The Christians Who Became Jews*, 31.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Eric D. Barreto, *Ethnic Negotiations: The Function of Race and Ethnicity in Acts 16*, WUNT 2/294 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

<sup>50</sup> Hence, Stroup compares Acts 2 with the Sebasteion, a temple complex in the city of Aphrodisias, which was completed during the reign of Nero in the first century, and features visual representations of sixteen different ethnic groups. The sculpted pieces in the Sebasteion temple were designed to show how the people of Aphrodisias were all united under Rome and set them apart from other conquered groups. See: Stroup, *The Christians Who Became Jews*, 49–52.

<sup>51</sup> Stroup, *The Christians Who Became Jews*, 71–127.

<sup>52</sup> Jipp, "The Paul of Acts," 60–62.

<sup>53</sup> Jipp, "The Paul of Acts," 64–67.

David Smith returns to the social identity of Jesus's followers in Luke-Acts, but instead of analyzing the communal identity in terms of its distinction from the others, he asks the question of connection to the other.<sup>54</sup> Jesus's followers go through the same faithfulness struggles that Israel went through, hence Luke's characterization of the Jews *includes* his portrayals of Jesus's disciples. Smith still admits that there is ambivalence in Luke's approaches toward the Jews who do not follow Jesus, though he focuses on the interconnectedness between Jesus's followers and the wider Jewish world to establish the nascent movement's identity. Luke's hope for Israel, then, never fails, yet he aims to instruct his readers on how to engage their Jewish fellows who do not follow Jesus.

Most of the scholarship on Luke-Acts affirmed Luke's ambiguous attitude toward the Jews and Judaism. It is not until Isaac Oliver's work that we see a full treatment of Luke-Acts as purely Jewish texts,<sup>55</sup> that should be placed among Second Temple literature.<sup>56</sup> Oliver's work builds on recent conclusions about the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity. The most important conclusion of that approach that interprets the origins of Christianity and Judaism as two separate religions is that they became two different religions sometime in the fourth century, if not later.<sup>57</sup> Oliver argues: "If there was no complete and final separation between Judaism and Christianity before the fourth century CE, then certainly the boundaries between the two remained fluid even after the destruction of the temple in 70, the period when Matthew and Luke most likely composed their works... From a historical point of view, there is no Jewish background of the New Testament because this

---

<sup>54</sup> Smith, *Luke and the Jewish Other*, 28.

<sup>55</sup> Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE*, 31–32; idem, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021). Cf. Christfried Böttrich, "Das Lukanische Doppelwerk im Kontext Frühjüdischer Literatur," *ZNW* 106 (2015): 151–83. Daniel Boyarin, who considered almost all the New Testament as Jewish literature and was a key voice pushing the parting of the ways later into the fourth century, still considered Acts as written by "A Gentile Christian author." Oliver reports: "I am delighted that after graciously agreeing to examine my research Boyarin no longer views Luke-Acts as Gentile Christian texts," (p. 15, fn. 46). See: Daniel Boyarin, "Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to which is Appended a Correction of my *Border Lines*)," *JQR* 99 (2009): 7–36 (33).

<sup>56</sup> Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE*, 412.

<sup>57</sup> See: Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, ed., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, TSAJ 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

literary corpus contains what were originally Jewish documents.”<sup>58</sup> Oliver then reads Luke-Acts as Jewish texts that adhere to the Torah “*in its totality*.”<sup>59</sup> Oliver concludes that Luke’s *halakha* is as Jewish as Matthew’s.<sup>60</sup> Thus, Luke maintains Sabbath observance, kosher food laws, and circumcision as identity markers of the Jews and the followers of Jesus. Luke might have contributed new interpretations of the Torah in light of Jesus, but he consistently sees himself as upholding it.

Most recently, Joshua Smith has focused on the author of Luke-Acts. As the title of his book *Luke Was Not A Christian* asserts, Smith opens his book stating that “evidence internal to Luke’s Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles strongly suggests that Luke was educated and enculturated primarily within a Jewish setting.”<sup>61</sup> The distinctive value of Smith’s work is that he focuses on the author of the text, not the text, where he gleans hints about the author from the text. Joshua Smith, first, shows that readers, can still hope to learn something about the author from a text, as “an author is never wholly separable from the text she creates.” Looking into Luke’s encyclopedic knowledge of Jewish scriptures, Smith argues that Luke innovatively interprets Jewish scriptures to show that the Gentiles have been grafted into the covenant promises YHWH made to Abraham. The eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles is inherent to Jewish scriptures in Luke’s view, as Smith argues. Moreover, Smith utilizes E. P. Sanders’ paradigm of common Judaism, that is, the Judaism that most ordinary Jews practiced in the Second Temple period, and argues that Luke fits in the category.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE*, 4.

<sup>59</sup> Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE*, 15 (emphasis original).

<sup>60</sup> In some cases, like healings on the Sabbath, Oliver finds Luke to be more adherent to Judaism than Matthew, where the former marginalize healings on the Sabbath, while the later takes a more polemical approach about the possibility of healings on the Sabbath. Oliver explains that Matthew’s polemical approach is driven by the internal, in-house, disputes with other Jewish groups. See: Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE*, 235–37.

<sup>61</sup> Smith, *Luke Was Not a Christian*, 1.

<sup>62</sup> Smith’s arguments are diverse and come from interdisciplinary fields. Perhaps the most innovative argument for the Jewishness of Luke-Acts lies in his use of cognitive linguistics in the sixth chapter. Smith argues that the term “Gentile” ἔθνος is a Jewish, insider term, that the Jews use to describe outsider non-Jews, which makes sense if Luke was a Jew. See: Smith, *Luke Was Not a Christian*, 191–229.

It is within this context of studying Luke-Acts within Judaism that I situate the present study. I assume that Luke and Acts are Jewish texts, most probably came from a Jewish author, who was reflecting on the meaning of Jesus vis-à-vis Judaism. What can we learn about Luke's thinking, assuming that he is Jewish? Luke shows how thorough knowledge of Jewish scriptures reveals that the Messiah must die, while simultaneously, repentance and forgiveness of sins will be available now to the Gentiles (Lk 24.46–47). Understanding repentance, sins, and forgiveness, in a Jewish context, sheds more light on Luke's theological thinking about a specific area: Atonement.

### **Thesis**

Leviticus does not advocate for a doctrine of penal substitutionary atonement, nor does it present atonement as a divine victory event. Instead, it delineates Priestly sacrificial offerings as a means of purification. I propose that Luke is well-versed in the Levitical sacrificial system and coherently applies its principles to the portrayal of Jesus. By situating Luke's narrative within the broader context of Judaism, we can address the complexities of atonement—a central objective of this dissertation. *My thesis is that Jesus, by offering himself as a sacrifice in the heavenly temple, achieves atonement and initiates the purification of both Jews and Gentiles within the early Jesus movement.* I unpack this thesis over five chapters.

### **Structure**

In the first chapter, I contend that Luke's portrayal of the Jerusalem temple is uniformly positive. This argument is substantiated by examining Luke's descriptions of the temple across various pivotal scenes. In the Gospel of Luke, I analyze ten scenes categorized into three principal sections: those within the infancy narrative (1.1–2.52), those situated in the central section of the Gospel (3.1–19.27), and those occurring in the final days of Jesus's life and following his resurrection (19.28–24.53). Furthermore, I maintain that the significance of the temple persists in the Acts of the Apostles, demonstrating its centrality in two major sections: the temple in the ministry of the Twelve and the



temple in Paul's ministry. My conclusion is that the temple is persistently depicted as a crucial and central locus of worship, even subsequent to Jesus's death, resurrection, and ascension, and the subsequent outpouring of the Spirit.

In the second chapter, I examine the most significant form of worship conducted within the temple, which is the offering of sacrifices, particularly as Luke designates the Jerusalem temple as the appropriate locus of worship. Initially, I examine the literary character of the Levitical sacrificial system, positing that, irrespective of its historicity during the Persian period and beyond, it represents the established sacrificial paradigm within the Second Temple period and in Luke's perspective. Subsequently, I analyze the Levitical sacrificial system, delineating all five types of sacrifices as detailed in Leviticus. Specifically, I elucidate the impact of four of these offerings on *kipper* (atonement): the ascension offering, the well-being offering, the purification offering, and the guilt offering. I will explain that the logic of purification operates on two distinct levels: the Sancta, as the direct object, is purified through blood, thereby facilitating the purification of the worshipper, who is the indirect object. This purification of the Sancta allows for the worshipper's repentance and consequent forgiveness of sins. Through both these stages, the relational dynamic between YHWH and the worshiper is restored. The primary aim of this chapter is to equip the reader with the understanding necessary to recognize how Luke employs the same logic of sacrificial purification and applies it to Jesus.

In the third chapter, I examine the concept of the heavenly temple as articulated in the Jewish scriptures and early Judaism. The chapter is structured to progress from explicit to implicit evidence, within Jewish scriptures and Second Temple literature. Within the Jewish scriptures, I delineate the evidence for the heavenly temple in passages from different books in the Jewish scripture. Regarding early Jewish sources, I provide evidence from ten early Jewish texts as well as two early Jesus-following Jewish texts, Hebrews and Revelation.

In the fourth chapter, I argue that Luke shares the same vocabulary and cultural encyclopedia with other early Jewish authors about the heavenly temple. Although Luke does not explicitly refer to the heavenly temple, he employs several descriptions that other early Jewish authors also use for this notion. The evidence for the heavenly temple is derived from three scenes in Luke-Acts: the encounter between Jesus and the Jewish council (specifically Lk 22.69), Jesus's entrance into paradise (Lk 23.43), and the details found within the crucifixion narrative. Further evidence comes from Stephen's speech and vision (Acts 7), wherein situating Luke within the context of Judaism elucidates Stephen's discourse regarding the Jerusalem temple.

Finally, in the fifth chapter, I examine Jesus's ascension as an entrance into the heavenly temple where he offers himself as a sacrifice that purifies the Jews and the Gentiles. Although Luke does not explicitly state this, he employs sacrificial terminology that is coherent within a sacrificial framework. After I survey the scholarship on the ascension event, I provide evidence supporting Jesus's sacrificial offering in the heavenly temple, drawing on key passages in Luke-Acts. First, I demonstrate that the ascension narratives in Luke and Acts are pervasively cultic, utilizing sacrificial vocabulary, and presenting Jesus as a priest. Second, I argue that the ascension of Jesus in Acts precipitates the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel and the purification of the Gentiles. The restoration of Israel's tribes is intrinsically linked to Jesus's ascension into heaven (Acts 1.10–11). I propose that Peter's Pentecost speech (Acts 2.16–21) associates heaven with sacrificial connotations. Subsequently, I illustrate that Luke attributes the availability of repentance and forgiveness of sins to the ascension of Jesus, in which Luke follows the same purification logic of the Levitical sacrificial system. Third, I elucidate that the purification of the Gentiles effected through the pouring of the Spirit, fulfills the prophetic tradition concerning the Gentile's sacrifice. I argue that Jesus's offering in Luke-Acts represents the eschatological sacrifice effectuating the purification of the Gentiles.

Hence, I conclude that Luke-Acts is a Jewish text that assumes certain features and descriptions about the heavenly temple and sacrificial language to apply it to Jesus.

### **“Within Judaism”**

But what does it mean to read Luke-Acts within Judaism? Rather than a limited definition of Judaism (Ιουδαϊσμός) as a religion, most scholars today define Judaism as a religio-ethnic cultural sphere that incorporates Jews, who set boundaries to distinguish themselves from other non-Jews.<sup>63</sup> The ethnic boundaries constituted social identity markers that defined the community’s culture and way of life. As Cohen asserts: “Surely the boundary erected by a group to maintain and protect its identity is an expression of that group’s culture.”<sup>64</sup> Hence, a Jew (Ιουδαίος)<sup>65</sup> means someone who belongs to a distinctive ethnic group, that shares a common ancestry that finds its roots in the land of Israel/Palestine.<sup>66</sup>

Four identity markers stand out among early Jews: Temple centrality, Torah-observance (including Kosher food laws and ritual purity laws), circumcision practice, and Sabbath-keeping.<sup>67</sup> To read Luke-Acts within Judaism, at least as I intend it, is to maintain that the text of Luke-Acts falls within the religio-ethnic boundaries that express the culture, practices, and tenets of Judaism. As Isaac Oliver and Joshua Smith have shown, Luke-Acts reflects deep loyalty to the Jewish Law and Sabbath.

---

<sup>63</sup> See the overview in Shaye Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, HCS 31 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 7–8. Cf. Steve Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512; Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Markus Cromhout, *Walking in Their Sandals: A Guide to First-Century Israelite Ethnic Identity* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2010); Seth Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization,” *JAJ* 2 (2011): 208–38; Stewart Moore, *Jewish Ethnic Identity and Relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With Walls of Iron?* *JSJSup* 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 7–44.

<sup>64</sup> Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 6.

<sup>65</sup> I do not see value in translating Ιουδαίος as “Judean” as many scholars do today. While their intention is to distinguish ancient Judaism from the modern religion of Judaism, I think “Judean” could still be as confusing as “Jew.” See: Daniel R. Schwartz, “‘Judaean’ or ‘Jew’? How Should We Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?” in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt*, ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, Stephanie Gripentrog, *AJEC* 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3–27.

<sup>66</sup> Cohen emphasizes that regardless of the factuality of whether someone belongs to the same group’s ancestry or not, what matters most is the belief that they really belong. See Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 8.

<sup>67</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1992).

In the present study, I will show the centrality of the Jerusalem temple in Luke's narrative, and Luke's adherence to the Levitical sacrificial system as the purification means for his audience. It is in this context of first-century Judaism that I argue that Luke depicts Jesus's sacrifice as a purifying offering in the heavenly temple.

I avoid using the term "Christian," and use, instead, followers of Jesus, or Jesus movement.<sup>68</sup> As the nascent movement grew out of Judaism, it remained within the boundaries of Judaism within the first century, and we do not see any traces of a separation between Jews and Jesus's followers in Luke-Acts.

## Methodology

Finally, a word about the method I use throughout this dissertation is in order. I approach Luke and Acts as first-century texts, where the focus is on the *text*, rather than the *author*.<sup>69</sup> I employ historical-critical and literary-linguistic analysis, in which I compare Luke-Acts to other early Jewish texts. My focus is on the narrative world that the text of Luke-Acts envisions, with little interest in the historicity of that narrative world. But the comparison work requires a word here. Luke is not explicit in his language, yet there is evidence that Luke thinks about Jesus in a sacrificial category. The descriptions, vocabulary, and connections he makes are rooted in sacrificial language. To show this

---

<sup>68</sup> Despite Luke's use of Χριστιανοί in Acts 11:26; 26:28, he does not leave a clue as to whether he approves this name or not. Obviously, outsiders use the name to call Jesus's followers, which might indicate that Luke does not prefer it. Regardless, Luke's recurring use of "The Way" indicates that it is his preferred way to name the Jesus movement.

<sup>69</sup> I do not intend to make any claims about the relationship between the text and the author due to the complexity of the matter. We cannot tell if the text has been produced by one author or more, and other than the grammatical masculine participle παρηκολουθηκότι in Lk 1:3, we cannot ascertain if the author is a male. What I shall focus on, however, is the text, which reflects centeredness around Judaism. While I do refer to Luke throughout this dissertation as the author of the text, I do not intend to refer to a real author as a historical figure, nor to communicate authorial intent, but as an implied author that we can infer from the text. On the distinction between the real and implied authors, and their relationship to texts, see: James Phelan, *Living to Tell about It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005); Ansgar Nünning, "Reconceptualizing the Implied Author: The Implied Author Revisited," in *Narratology beyond Literary Criticism: Mediality, Disciplinarity*, ed. Jan Christoph Meister (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 53–78; Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller, *The Implied Author: Concept and Controversy* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006). For a suggestion that the author of Luke-Acts is a female figure, see: Joan E. Taylor, "Paul's Significant Other in the 'We' Passages," in *Who Created Christianity? Fresh Approaches to the Relationship between Paul and Jesus*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Aaron W. White (Grand Rapids: Hendrickson, 2020), 125-56.

evidence, I use Umberto Eco's semiotic theory.<sup>70</sup> Umberto Eco's semiotic theory represents an intricate and comprehensive framework for analyzing and interpreting the complex processes through which signs, symbols, and meanings are produced and communicated.

Central to Eco's semiotic approach is the understanding of the sign as a dynamic and multifaceted entity that operates within a system of signification. He conceptualizes the sign as encompassing a relationship between the signifier—the tangible form that a sign takes, such as a word, image, or sound—and the signified, which refers to the concept or meaning that the signifier evokes. Unlike Ferdinand de Saussure, who posited a relatively stable and fixed relationship between the signifier and the signified, Eco diverges by emphasizing the inherent fluidity and multiplicity of meanings that a single sign can generate. For Eco, signs do not possess a static or singular meaning; rather, they are subject to continuous reinterpretation, influenced by the context in which they are encountered and the interpretative strategies employed by the observer.<sup>71</sup>

A cornerstone of Eco's semiotic theory is his notion of *unlimited semiosis*, a concept that encapsulates the endless and recursive nature of sign interpretation. Eco posits that the interpretation of one sign inevitably leads to the generation and interpretation of another sign, which in turn prompts further interpretation, creating an infinite chain of semiosis. This perpetual process challenges the notion that meaning can never be fully determined or pinned down to a single, final interpretation. Instead, meaning emerges as a dynamic, context-dependent construct, continually shaped and reshaped by the interplay of signs within a given interpretive framework.

---

<sup>70</sup> Umberto Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976).

<sup>71</sup> While Eco's semiotic system could theoretically be seen as a comprehensive global system of meaning, in practice, it relies on the idea that readers can focus on specific cultural contexts where certain meanings are recognized and understood. When decoding a word or phrase, we don't need to consider every possible interpretation; we only need to think about the meanings that are most likely and commonly accepted within that culture. See: Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics*, 112.

In Eco's view, the act of interpretation is deeply rooted in the cultural and social contexts in which signs are situated. Meaning is not an intrinsic property of the sign itself but is determined by the reader's ability to situate the sign within its appropriate *cultural encyclopedia*. Eco introduces the concept of the *model reader*, an idealized reader that a text implicitly presupposes.<sup>72</sup> The model reader is envisioned as possessing the requisite cultural background, knowledge, and interpretive strategies necessary to decode and make sense of the text in accordance with the author's intended meaning.

Eco conceptualizes the encyclopedia as the collective body of knowledge, cultural codes, and interpretive strategies that are available to a particular culture. This encyclopedia serves as the repository from which individuals draw when interpreting signs. In Eco's framework, the act of reading is understood as a process in which the reader navigates through a treasury of intertextual references, guided by the text's intertextual frame, or what Eco refers to as the *inferential walk*. This inferential walk directs the reader toward particular interpretations, helping to clarify the meaning of the text within the broader cultural encyclopedia.<sup>73</sup> Thus, the act of reading, in Eco's theory, is always a collaborative interplay between the text and the encyclopedia(s) through which interpreters move. The reader should take an inferential walk through a specific set of concepts, ideas, presuppositions, and shared social and historical conventions between the reader and the text. Every narrative text demands that the reader get clues of intertextuality and requisites that represent the intertextual framework.<sup>74</sup> That is, every narrative text has inside it signals as to what inferential walk the reader should take, which determines the intertextual framework of the narrative.<sup>75</sup> Eco characterizes an economic interpretation of a text as one that successfully actualizes the interpretive frames encoded within the

---

<sup>72</sup> Umberto Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979), 31.

<sup>73</sup> Umberto Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (London: Macmillan Press, 1984), 46-86.

<sup>74</sup> Eco, *The Role of the Reader*, 21.

<sup>75</sup> Eco, *The Role of the Reader*, 32.

text.<sup>76</sup> Such an interpretation is seen as efficient and effective because it aligns the reader's understanding with the potential meanings that the text offers, as guided by the inferential walk through the cultural encyclopedia.

Practically, this entails that the reader must consciously recognize the specific cultural and intellectual encyclopedia in which a text is situated. In the case of interpreting Luke's writings, situating Luke-Acts within the context of early Judaism necessitates an awareness of the encyclopedia that Luke shares with other contemporary authors. A prominent example I explore in this dissertation is the concept of the heavenly temple. Luke employs various descriptions and notions that, when contextualized within the appropriate encyclopedia of early Judaism, reveal that Luke shares the same categorical understanding of the heavenly temple as other Jewish authors of the period. Luke never explicitly mentions a heavenly temple, yet he employs descriptions of heaven as a sacred space that aligns with those used by other early Jewish authors. As readers, we need to immerse ourselves (inasmuch as we can) in the cultural encyclopedia that Luke shared with his ancient readers. And this ancient encyclopedia included for most a belief in a heavenly tent or temple. So Luke might evoke this tent/temple without being explicit precisely because he assumes his readers bring that assumption to his writings.

Therefore, a critical starting point for any thorough assessment of Luke-Acts is an examination of the role that the Jerusalem temple occupies within Luke's narrative framework. The temple is not merely a backdrop or a setting within the story; rather, it functions as a pivotal theological and narrative center that shapes and informs the broader themes and motifs of the text. By analyzing how the temple is portrayed, referenced, and symbolized throughout Luke-Acts, we can gain deeper insights into Luke's theological intentions, his understanding of Jewish traditions, and how he situates the early

---

<sup>76</sup> Eco argues that these the inferential walks are not just random choices made by the reader. Instead, they are guided by the structure of the text and are planned as essential parts of how the story is built. See: Eco, *The Role of the Reader*, 32.

Jesus movement within the religious and cultural landscape of Second Temple Judaism. This focus on the temple also allows for a more nuanced exploration of how Luke engages with and possibly reinterprets Jewish sacrificial practices, cultic rituals, and notions of atonement, thereby challenging long-standing assumptions about the absence of atonement theology in his writings.



## Chapter 1: The Centrality of Jerusalem's Temple in Luke-Acts

### Introduction

Jerusalem and its temple are central to Luke's narrative. The city represents the geographical center in Luke's narrative and functions as the destination of Jesus's major journey (Lk 9.51–19.41).<sup>77</sup> Similarly, the temple functions as the cultic, religious, and cultural center of Jerusalem within Luke's narrative. Luke uses both locations to communicate important plot developments.<sup>78</sup> In contrast, Matthew does not appear to be interested in geographical language, and Mark, though ambiguous regarding geographical language, highlights Jesus's movement northward to Galilee escaping the crowds or his enemies (Mk 6.30–9.1 and 9.2–11.11). Luke, however, focuses heavily on geography,<sup>79</sup> and the Jerusalem temple appears to be at the center of this geography. Scholarly consensus is that the geographical language serves as a vehicle for theological views, though scholars typically differ on the nature of those theological views.<sup>80</sup> Thus, examining Luke's geography of the temple will illuminate

---

<sup>77</sup> The nouns ἱεροσόλυμα and ἱερουσαλήμ appear 90 times in Luke-Acts, while they appear only 10 times in Mark, 13 times in Matthew, and 12 times in John. See: Bruce N. Fisk, "See My Tears: A Lament for Jerusalem (Luke 13:31–35; 19:41–44)," in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kevin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 150–52.

<sup>78</sup> James Scott encourages readers of early Jewish texts to construct geography from "inside" the texts' perspectives. We should not impose outside, anachronistic perspectives on early texts. In this context, he analyzes the genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3) and traces 72 generations between Jesus and Adam. The number refers to the nations of the world (Gen 10; *Jub.* 8–9). Scott also notes that Jesus sends 72 apostles, concluding that Luke might have intentionally appointed an apostle to each nation, which anticipates the universalistic mission to the gentiles. Another example would be the disciples speaking in languages on the Pentecost, which looks like a reversal of the confusion of tongues after the flood (though not a reversal of diversity). Scott's perspective has nothing to do with historical geography, but he gives us a perspective onto the geographical reality as imagined by Luke and other Jewish authors. See: James M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*, SNTSMS 113 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), especially 44–96; Andrés García Serrano, *The Presentation in the Temple: The Narrative Function of Lk 2:22–39 in Luke-Acts*, AB 197 (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2012), 217.

<sup>79</sup> Luke's interest in geographical language is apparent from his precision in Luke 24. The gospel ends with the Emmaus story (24.13, 28), the scene setting then changes to Jerusalem (24.33), then to Bethany (24.50), and then to Jerusalem again (24.52). This precise geographical language shows how Luke is invested in geography compared to the other gospels. See further: David Gill, "Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages," *HTR* 63 (1970): 199–221 (201).

<sup>80</sup> Conzelmann argues that Luke invented the journey from Jerusalem to Galilee, and then back to Jerusalem in order to serve as a vehicle for his teaching on the history-of-salvation value of Jesus's suffering. O'Neill traces a soteriological meaning in every geographical development in the narrative. See: Hans Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960) 60–73; J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 66–7.

his position towards the temple. The purpose of this chapter is to show the centrality of Jerusalem's temple in Luke–Acts and Luke's highly positive view toward it. The core argument in this chapter is that Luke does not offer a replacement for the Jerusalem temple and continues to view it as the central sacred space for worship throughout the Gospel and Acts. Laying out Luke's view of the temple is foundational for my thesis, as it is continuously a central place in his narrative with its various roles. Since Jewish sacrifices were offered within the temple premises, it is essential to understand Luke's view of the temple. Establishing the importance of Jerusalem's temple will allow us to see how Jesus offers himself as a sacrifice in Luke's narrative.

Scholars have provided different interpretations of Luke's view of the temple. Some argue that Jesus became the proper temple, replacing the old Jerusalem temple in Luke–Acts.<sup>81</sup> Other scholars view the nascent Jesus movement as the embodiment of the new temple, the new “house of prayer.”<sup>82</sup> Yet another view highlights the household as the new locus of worship with a new economic and symbolic system that represents the new temple.<sup>83</sup> Many scholars do not view these new representations of the temple exclusively. Divine presence could be available through Jesus and the so-called Christian community, especially with the outpouring of the spirit, which replaces the defiled

---

<sup>81</sup> Klaus Baltzer, “The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings,” *HTR* 58 (1965): 263–77; C. R. Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us’: The Temple in Luke–Acts,” *SVTQ* 44 (2000): 3–33; Gregory R. Lanier, “Luke’s Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation,” *JTS* 65 (2014): 433–62.

<sup>82</sup> See for example: Joel B. Green, “The Demise of the Temple as ‘Culture Center’ in Luke–Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23:44–49),” *RB* 101 (1994): 495–515; Geir O. Holmås, “‘My House Shall Be a House of Prayer’: Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts within the Context of Luke’s Apologetical Objective,” *JSNT* 27 (2005): 393–416; Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*, WUNT II/291 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 191–206; P. H. Rice, *Behold, Your House Is Left to You: The Theological and Narrative Place of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke’s Gospel* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016); H. Ganser-Kerperin, *Das Zeugnis des Tempels: Studien zur Bedeutung des Tempelsmotivs im lukanischen Doppelwerk*, NTA 36 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2000).

<sup>83</sup> See for instance: J. H. Elliott, “Temple versus Household in Luke–Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions,” in *The Social World of Luke–Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. J. H. Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 211–40; Daniel Marguerat, “Du temple à la maison suivant Luc–Actes,” in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?*, ed. Camille Focant (Lectio Divina, hors série; Paris: Cerf, 2003), 285–317. For a similar discussion of the relationship between the household and the temple, especially in Paul’s earliest communities, see D. L. Balch and A. Weissenrieder, *Contested Spaces: Houses and Temples in Roman Antiquity and the New Testament*, WUNT 285 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

temple, giving space now to the expansion of the Jesus movement to fill the universe.<sup>84</sup> *All these scenarios see an inherent problem with the Jerusalem temple as the Jewish sacred space of religious practices, thus suggesting a need to replace the temple.*<sup>85</sup> As Philip Esler argues: “The mission to the Gentiles only got underway when a few Jews in the Holy City were far-sighted enough to see that continued devotion to the Temple cult and the messiahship of Jesus were fundamentally incompatible.”<sup>86</sup>

Those negative assessments of the temple in the narrative of Luke–Acts are usually associated with the scholarly hypothesis that prevailed in twentieth-century scholarship that Luke is a gentile author.<sup>87</sup> However, in light of the claim of a growing number of scholars that Luke–Acts comes from a Jewish author,<sup>88</sup> it would make sense that Luke’s approach to the temple is a positive one from the beginning to the end.<sup>89</sup> From the infancy narrative of Jesus, Luke begins his gospel with events

---

<sup>84</sup> See for instance Deok H. Jung, “Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke–Acts,” *ExpTim* 128 (2017): 529–37.

<sup>85</sup> This does not mean that all scholars sought to find a replacement to the Jerusalem temple. Already in 1988 J. Bradley Chance criticized views that seek to establish Jesus and/or the church as the new replacement of the Jerusalem temple. See: J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, Temple and the New Age in Luke–Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 35–45.

<sup>86</sup> Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 163.

<sup>87</sup> See Hans Conzelmann, “Luke’s Place in the Development of Early Christianity,” in *Studies in Luke–Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 298; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 17<sup>th</sup> rev. ed., trans. Howard C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 147–51. Hence, scholars tended to view Luke’s focus on the temple as the means by which Jesus purifies Judaism. That is, Jesus purifies Judaism by getting rid of the temple! Conzelmann argues that Luke has made the cleansing of the temple episode as the ultimate goal of Jesus’s journey toward Jerusalem, and hence, the whole gospel. See: Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 75, 199. Cf. René Laurentin, *Jésus au temple: Mystère de Pâques et foi de Marie en Luc 2,48–50* (Paris : Librairie Lecoffre J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1966), 88–90.

<sup>88</sup> See especially Robert L. Brawley, *Luke–Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); Bart J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke–Acts*, SNTA (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989); Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE.*; idem, *Luke’s Jewish Eschatology*; Smith, *Luke Was Not A Christian*; Moraff, *Reading the Way, Paul, and “The Jews” in Acts within Judaism*.

<sup>89</sup> There are instances that at first glance seem to be negative representations of the temple in Luke–Acts. Steve Smith argues that there are four passages in the gospel (13.34–35, 19.41–44, 21.20–24, 23.28–31), along with Stephen’s speech (Acts 7), that show the destruction of the temple as the inevitable result of the rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, especially as Jerusalem religious leaders continue in their idolatrous attitude. Those Jewish leaders, as Smith argues, practiced the same old habit of viewing the temple as the place of divine localization. While I adopt a different interpretation of at least two passages that Smith discusses (23.28–31 and Acts 7), which I will treat in the fourth chapter, I do admit that Luke frames the destruction of the Jerusalem temple as the natural consequence of rejecting Jesus. However, Luke is not opposed to the temple *per se*; that is, the temple is not an idolic place by

happening in the temple, giving the readers glimpses of events happening inside the sanctuary, the most sacred place from a Jewish perspective. Luke also closes the gospel narrative with the disciples' return to Jerusalem where they “were continually in the temple blessing God” (Lk 24.53).<sup>90</sup> These observations show that Luke identifies the temple as the sacred place where all sorts of interactions between the divine and human realms happen. Some events that take place outside the temple in Mark and Matthew happen in the temple in Luke-Acts as I will show below.<sup>91</sup> As the narrative progresses in Acts, the temple is still the central location for the life of the disciples. The disciples regularly teach in the temple (e.g. Acts 3.11–4.2; 5.20–26, 42). Moreover, during Paul’s ministry in Acts, the temple remained the proper location of religious worship.

### **The Temple in the Gospel of Luke**

The temple plays a prominent role in several pericopes in the Gospel of Luke.<sup>92</sup> Some of these stories exist in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, but others only exist in Luke’s Gospel, which is particularly significant as they show Luke’s interest in the Jerusalem temple. The references to the temple occur in three major sections: those within the infancy narrative (1.1–2.52), those in the central section of the Gospel (3.1–19.27), and those that occur in the final days of Jesus’s life and after his

---

nature. It is a place that could lose its function and using it as a ritual locus when it lost its functional role could be viewed as a desire to magically control God’s actions. However, I have something to add to Smith’s argument: Luke believes that a heavenly temple does exist, which I will show the evidence for in the fourth chapter (see below). See: Steve Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Approach to Jesus’ Laments Over Jerusalem and Stephen’s Speech* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017).

<sup>90</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Jewish and Christian scriptures are from the NRSV. Occasionally I change this translation slightly to reflect what I think is the more accurate translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. N. H. Taylor, “The Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts,” *HvTSt* 60, (2004): 459–485 (475). Luke refers to the temple more than Mark, and the same number of times as Matthew. See Peter Head, “The Temple in Luke’s Gospel,” in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 106–9.

<sup>92</sup> Luke uses the noun ναός to refer to the interior sanctuary of the Temple where the priests normally perform their duties, including offering sacrifices and where YHWH indwells among his people (e.g. Lk 1.9, 21–22; 23.45; Acts 17.24). However, Luke also uses the noun ἱερόν which refers to the temple as a whole, the entire complex, and this noun is the more prominent in Luke-Acts (e.g. Lk 2.27, 37, 46; 4.9; 18.10; 19.45, 47; 20.1; 21.5, 37–38; 22.52–53; 24.53; Acts 2.46; 3.1–2, 8, 10; 4.1; 5.20–21, 24–25, 42; 19.27; 21.26–27; 22.17; 24.6, 12, 18; 25.8; 26.21). Luke also uses οἶκος to refer to the temple, at least three times (Lk 6.4; 11.51; 19.46; cf. 13.35). For the purpose of this chapter, I will focus on key incidents where all nouns have been used.

resurrection (19.28–24.53). The greatest concentration of references occurs in the first and third sections. Among these stories: 1) the annunciation of John in Zechariah's story (1.8–22; Lukan material); 2) Simeon and Anna in the temple (2.22–39; Lukan material); 3) the boy Jesus with the teachers (2.41–50; Lukan material); 4) the third temptation from the temple pinnacle (4.9–12; where Luke changes the order of the temptations to put the third and final temptation at the temple pinnacle); 5) Jesus's cleansing of the *leproi* and command to show themselves to the temple priest to make their purification offerings (Lk 5.14; 17.14) which shows Jesus's respect for the role of the priests and temple rituals;<sup>93</sup> 6) the story of the Pharisee and the tax-collector (18.9–14; Lukan material); 7) the cleansing of the temple (19.45–46); 8) the Lukan eschatological discourse, beginning with a statement about the temple (21.5–36); 9) the tearing of the temple veil (23.45); 10) the post-ascension disciples in the temple (24.53; Lukan material). Moreover, Luke omits the charge against Jesus that he would destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days (cf. Mt 26.61; Mk 14.58, 15.29),<sup>94</sup> and also omits the comparisons between Jesus and the temple (e.g., Matt 12.5–8).<sup>95</sup> The recurrence of the Jerusalem temple in these stories in the Gospel (and in other places in Acts) shows that Luke centers his narrative around the temple. The greater bulk of the gospel is shaped as a journey towards Jerusalem with the temple in its center (Lk 9.51–19.41). Naymond Keathley concludes that “in each instance, the temple is presented in the best possible light. It stands at the heart of pious Judaism; it is the place where the devout express their deepest religious commitments.”<sup>96</sup> I will discuss eight key pericopes in this

---

<sup>93</sup> Michael Bachmann argues that 5.14 and 17.14 should be interpreted in light of Luke's larger presentation of the temple and the priesthood, especially as it is set up in the story of Zechariah (Lk 1) and emphasizes the connection between the office of priest and its location in the temple. See: Michael Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums*, BWANTSF, Heft 109 (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kolhammer, 1980), 186.

<sup>94</sup> Luke, however, has a similar charge against Jesus, where the Jewish leaders claim they heard Stephen say: “Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place” (Acts 6.14). As I will discuss in the fourth chapter, Luke highlights that the claim comes from “false witnesses” (Acts 6.13).

<sup>95</sup> Chance concludes his comparison of the temple image in the three Synoptic Gospels in favour of Luke as the most positive evangelist among the three. See Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 19–21, 45.

<sup>96</sup> Naymond H. Keathley, “The Temple in Luke–Acts: Implications for the Synoptic Problem and Proto-Luke,” in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.*, ed. Naymond H. Keathley (Waco, TX: Baylor

chapter while leaving the Pharisee and the tax collector and the tearing of the temple veil to the fourth chapter.

### **The Temple in The Infancy Narrative**

Luke's infancy narrative of Jesus frequently focuses on the Jerusalem temple.<sup>97</sup> Three episodes in the infancy narrative take place in the Jerusalem temple.<sup>98</sup> In these episodes, the temple is the location of proper worship, prayer, and divine revelations. We read about the long-expected fulfillment of God's promises to the patriarchs of Israel, offerings, healing, and Jesus's first teaching opportunity (Lk 1.8–22; 2.22–38, 46–49). Luke opens his Gospel with a story about Jesus's relatives, who belonged to a priestly family. He introduces Zechariah who performs priestly duties within the inner sanctuary of the temple (1.5–24).<sup>99</sup> Zechariah offers the daily incense offering as a priest from the priestly order of Abijah. Luke also mentions that Zechariah is married to a woman named Elizabeth, herself a daughter of Aaron, Israel's first priest (Lk 1.5). Luke describes both Zechariah and Elizabeth as "righteous before God, living blamelessly according to all the commandments and regulations of the Lord" (Lk 1.6). Zechariah and Elizabeth's righteousness consists in their involvement with the temple and following the Jewish law. Luke describes Zechariah's ministry in terms of the *Tamid* offering. "Once when he was serving as priest before God during his section's turn of duty, he was chosen by lot, according to the custom of the priesthood, to enter the sanctuary of the Lord to offer incense" (Lk 1.8–9; cf. Exod 29.38–46; Lev 1.11; Num 28.1–8). Luke opens his work with sacrificial offerings in the

---

University Press, 1990) 81. Cf. Francis D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in Luke–Acts," *BTB* 11 (1981): 85–9 (89).

<sup>97</sup> Hans Conzelmann excluded the first two chapters of Luke from his investigation of the theology of Luke, which might shed more light on his position regarding Luke's views of the temple. See: Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 118, 172.

<sup>98</sup> Fitzmyer notes that the gospel "begins and ends in Jerusalem... [and] the infancy narrative itself ends with an episode involving Jerusalem." Joseph Fitzmyer, "Jesus in the Early Church through the Eyes of Luke–Acts," in *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*, ed. Joseph Fitzmyer, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 255.

<sup>99</sup> George J. Brooke, "Comparing Matthew and Luke in the Light of Second Temple Jewish Literature," *JSNT* 41 (2018): 44–57; Louis W. Ndekha, "Zechariah The Model Priest: Luke and The Characterization of Ordinary Priests in Luke–Acts," *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 74 (2018): 1–7.

temple and considers those who offer these Jewish offerings as righteous. In fact, the *Tamid* offering plays a central role in Luke-Acts and appears at crucial points to mark central developments as the narrative unfolds. In Zechariah's episode, Luke repeats the term "incense" three times in the span of three verses to highlight its value.<sup>100</sup> Brittany Wilson rightly observes that "Luke's description situates the first scene of his two-volume work within the Jewish sacrificial system, and he does so via a daily service that formed a core liturgy of the Jerusalem temple during the postexilic period."<sup>101</sup> The simple notion of incense smell "could image the cultic tradition as a whole" as Susan Harvey notes.<sup>102</sup> Wilson also highlights that the incense offerings demarcate the space as sacred, which prepares for the angelic encounter in the sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple.<sup>103</sup> Luke, thus, opens his gospel with a Jewish *Tamid* sacrificial setting, highlighting that Zechariah and Elizabeth are priestly figures who participate in the cultic system and that this is cultic participation contribute in part to their righteousness.

Luke then portrays the Jerusalem temple as the locus of divine revelation. There, while Zechariah is performing his priestly duties, God sends an angel to announce the miraculous birth of his son, John. The angel describes John's future in these words: "He will be great in the sight of the Lord. He must never drink wine or strong drink; even before his birth, he will be filled with the Holy Spirit. He will turn many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God. With the spirit and power of Elijah, he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord" (1.15–17). Luke might be portraying

---

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Anne F. Elvey, *The Matter of the Text: Material Engagements between Luke and the Five Senses*, Bible in the Modern World 37 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011), 110–15.

<sup>101</sup> Brittany E. Wilson, "The Smell of Sacrifice: Scenting the Christian Story in Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 83 (2021): 257–75 (261).

<sup>102</sup> Susan Ashbrook Harvey, *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 17.

<sup>103</sup> Wilson, "The Smell of Sacrifice," 262; see further Ashley Clements, "Divine Scents and Presence," in *Smell and the Ancient Senses*, ed. Mark Bradley, Senses in Antiquity (New York: Routledge, 2015) 46–59.

Zechariah and Elizabeth after figures like Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rachel.<sup>104</sup> The announcement reveals John's role in the divine plan for Israel, comparing John to the prominent figure of Elijah. While the content of the angel's announcement is stereologically powerful,<sup>105</sup> it is remarkable to note that this message is given in the temple. The salvation of Israel is announced in the temple. God communicates with Zechariah through the angel in the temple, which shows Luke's view of the temple as the legitimate place for humans to interact with the divine realm. The interaction between the angel and Zechariah continues the same pattern in which YHWH used to talk to Moses in the Dwelling Place (e.g., Exod 33.10–11).<sup>106</sup>

It is not implausible to think that the temple will serve as a place where this future salvation of Israel takes place. That this announcement is made in the temple illustrates that the fulfillment of God's historical salvation promises does not necessarily signal the end of that institution. Indeed, the temple is an appropriate place to look for God to fulfill the promises. Luke implies no antagonism or opposition between the temple and its activities and the long-predicted prophetic impulse for Israel's salvation. Luke does not offer any interpretive comments about the nature of the temple in this scene. The only hint of a value judgment regarding the temple and its cultus in this pericope is the description of Zechariah's character: he and Elizabeth are "both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and judgments of the Lord" (1.6). Their involvement with the temple cult contributes partially to their righteousness; there is overlap between being righteous before God and the expression

---

<sup>104</sup> See the discussion of infertility and its implications in ancient Israel and early Judaism in Candida R. Moss and Joel S. Baden, *Reconceiving Infertility: Biblical Perspectives on Procreation and Childlessness* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

<sup>105</sup> While the text does not say it directly, it is possible to think that the temple will serve as a place where this future salvation of Israel takes place. In Chapters Four and Five I will show that the salvation the angel announces in this passage will take place in the heavenly temple.

<sup>106</sup> I follow Liane Feldman's translation of מִשְׁכָּן as "Dwelling Place" rather than the Tabernacle. The value of this translation is that it emphasizes the tent as the place in which YHWH indwells, rather than the mere establishment. While Feldman does not capitalize the Dwelling Place, I do to emphasize the single entity of the מִשְׁכָּן. See: Liane M. Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice: Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source*, FAT 141 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 33.



of the piety in the temple. Luke also views the temple as the locus of divine revelation as we saw the angels appear to Zechariah, which seems to be an implicit approval of the temple as the proper place of divine announcements and communication with angels.

Divine announcements of salvation occur again in Luke's infancy narrative and, again, are made at the temple. After Jesus's birth, Joseph and Mary take Jesus on a journey toward the temple (2.22–38), possibly anticipating Jesus's long journey toward the temple in Luke 9–19. The goal of the journey is to present Jesus in the temple following the purification period from the post-birth blood (cf. Lev 12). Luke shows that Jesus's presentation in the temple comes as obedience to the Law where "Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord" (2.23; cf. Exod 13.2–15; Num. 18.15–16). However, the Jewish law does not require the designation to happen in the temple. In other words, *there is no known Jewish law that requires children's presentation in the temple.*<sup>107</sup> Why does Luke present Joseph and Mary taking Jesus to the temple then? Raymond Brown famously claims that Luke's knowledge of Judaism is "bookish" which leads to the inaccurate description of the parents' obligation to present the child in the temple.<sup>108</sup> However, it seems Luke *intentionally* shows Jesus present in the temple very early in his life. Jesus's presentation in the temple is associated with the offering of sacrifices according to the Law's regulations in the case of the poor, hence they offered "a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons" (2.24). I will discuss this association in a moment, but I first want to look into how Luke describes two new figures: Simeon and Anna. Simeon is a man of righteousness and piety, expecting the fulfillment of the historical salvation promises when the spirit comes upon him (2.25).<sup>109</sup> Luke records two times where the spirit communicates with Simeon: first,

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Seth Ward, "The Presentation of Jesus: Jewish Perspectives on Luke 2:22–24," *Shofar* 21 (2003): 21–39.

<sup>108</sup> Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of The Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (Doubleday: New York, 1997), 447–8; see the criticism in: Matthew Thiessen, "Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity," *NovT.* 54 (2012): 16–29 (17–18)

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Bart J. Koet, "Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29–32.34c–35) und Israels Geschick," in idem, *Dreams and Scripture in Luke–Acts: Collected Essays*, CBET 42 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 99–122.

that he would not die before he sees “the Lord’s Messiah,” (καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος; Lk 2.26) and second, when the spirit led Simeon to enter the temple to meet Jesus and his family (καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν; Luk 2.27). Luke wants the reader to understand that the spirit led Simeon into the temple to meet Jesus. In comparison, it is possible then that Luke wanted the reader to understand that the spirit led Joseph and Mary to bring Jesus into the temple: *The Torah law does not require them to present Jesus in the temple, so why exactly did they go to the temple?* I suggest that Luke intends to imply that the spirit might have guided Joseph and Mary to visit the temple. That is, both parties have been led by the spirit to visit the temple at the same time. Hence, the meeting between Jesus and Simeon is *orchestrated* by the spirit, to fulfill the promise made to Simeon that he will not die before seeing the Messiah. This conclusion is supported by Luke’s repeated notion. “When the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him what was customary under the law” (2.25). Luke has already mentioned the reason that Joseph and Mary had to bring Jesus into the temple, so why is he repeating it here again? The law does not require them to bring Jesus into the temple. In my judgment, it is to highlight that the parents were guided by the spirit, just as Simeon is said to be guided by the spirit.

Luke’s intention to show that the spirit led Jesus to the temple anticipates later events in Jesus’s ministry. The infancy narratives in Luke usually anticipate several events that will take place in Jesus’s adulthood, especially his sufferings and death as a savior of Israel and the gentiles. My suggestion is that Jesus’s entrance into the temple as a child and is proclaimed as the messianic savior that YHWH has prepared for Israel and the gentiles in the infancy narrative (2.30–32) anticipates his entrance into the heavenly temple to offer himself as a sacrifice. The spirit leads Jesus’s family into the temple at the same time when a purification sacrifice would be offered. As I will discuss later, Luke has a special interest in Jewish sacrifices, which is the central activity that takes place in the Jerusalem temple.

Luke also introduces Anna, an Israelite prophet from the tribe of Asher.<sup>110</sup> Luke writes that Anna “never left the temple but worshiped there with fasting and prayer night and day” (2.37).<sup>111</sup> Once again Luke shows his high estimation of the temple as a place where the faithful people of God worship him. Anna does not speak directly in the text, but Luke records that she gives thanks to God and speaks to all who were waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem, highlighting that the temple is a site of prophecy and the place where people can expect to see God’s salvation coming. Moreover, Luke highlights that she “was approaching while praising God” (2.38) at the same moment when Simeon and Jesus met. Why does Luke describe Anna as “approaching” (ἐπιστᾶσα) and especially “at that moment” (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ)? Luke’s description of Anna as a prophet might hint at an explanation. She, like Simeon and Jesus’s parents, has been led by the spirit to approach the place where Simeon holds Jesus in his arms, to see Jesus and announce his role as a redeemer of Israel. The temple is the central geographical point where Joseph, Mary, Jesus, Simeon, and Anna meet and proclaim God’s redemption.

Immediately following this episode, Luke depicts Jesus in the temple at the age of twelve.<sup>112</sup> Following the Passover festival, the boy Jesus stays in the temple, “sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. And all who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers” (2.46–47). When Joseph and Mary ask Jesus why he left them anxiously looking for him, Jesus answers, “Why were you searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father’s house?” (2.49).<sup>113</sup> The incident further affirms Luke’s positive view of the temple. First of all, Luke

---

<sup>110</sup> See Andrés García Serrano, “Anna’s Characterization in Luke 2:36–38: A Case of Conceptual Allusion?” *CBQ* 76 (2014): 464–480; Bonnie Bowman Thurston, “Who Was Anna? Luke 2:36–38,” *PRS* 28 (2001): 47–56.

<sup>111</sup> On the possible historical roots of Anna’s full-time residency in the temple as Luke describes, see: Richard Bauckham, “Anna of The Tribe of Asher (Luke 2:36–38),” *RB* 104 (1997): 161–91.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. John J. Kilgallen, “Luke 2:41–52: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher,” *Bib* 66 (1985): 553–9; Elisabeth Schüssler-Fioranza, “Luke 2:41–52,” *Int* 36 (1982): 309–403; Bradly S. Billings, “At the Age of 12: The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41–52), The Emperor Augustus, and the Social Setting of the Third Gospel,” *JTS* 60 (2009): 70–89.

<sup>113</sup> The Greek text (Οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με;) does not say “my Father’s house” but “my Father’s things” or “what are for my Father.” The reference is not to a single entity, as indicated by τοῖς, but to the Father’s possessions. Yet the use of the preposition ἐν makes it clear that what Jesus’s means here is the temple, hence the translation “my Father’s house.”

wants to show Jesus's parents as pious Jews, who again go on a journey with Jesus to the temple. This would be Jesus's second narrated trip to the temple in the gospel, this time to celebrate Passover, a major Jewish feast. For Luke, Jesus would have gone to the temple with Joseph and Mary several other times before this second narrated journey, as he mentions that it was their custom to visit Jerusalem during Passover each year (Lk 2.41–42).<sup>114</sup> Second, Jesus's parents find him in the temple listening to the teachers and questioning them, a description that further affirms the temple as a place for teaching and a site of learning as well.<sup>115</sup> There is no hint of hostility between Jesus and Israel's leadership which will later mark Jesus's dialogue with the religious Jewish authorities; indeed, the teachers are astounded by him. Luke portrays a mutually positive relationship between Jesus and "the teachers" (τῶν διδασκάλων, Lk 2.46) of Israel, and he places it in the context of the temple, further affirming that the temple is the proper place for the expression of faith by priests and teachers. Yet even more, Jesus's chiding question to his mother "Why were you searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?" betrays a theological assumption that Luke makes. Mary *should* have known that Jesus was in the temple, the place where he belongs, which again shows Jesus's high view of the temple. Luke does not criticize the Jewish leaders in the scene, only Mary, and it is because she did not recognize that Jesus must be in the temple. Implicitly, then, the reader who misses Jesus's relationship with the temple comes under Luke's criticism of Mary.

The scene not only reaffirms the temple as a place for prayer and worship but also adds the idea that the temple is a place, perhaps even the place par excellence, for teaching and learning the things of God.<sup>116</sup> Additionally, according to Jesus in Luke's narrative, the temple is the Father's house and God is

---

<sup>114</sup> Note the imperfect for ἐπορεύοντο and temporal phrase κατ' ἔτος, "every year," as well as κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς which all indicate that it has been a habitual custom.

<sup>115</sup> As recent studies have shown, the temple was the place of scribal activity too, which was often connected to priesthood. See Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, JSOTSup 291 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

<sup>116</sup> See Francis D. Weinert, "The Multiple Meanings of Luke 2:49 and their Significance," *BTB* 13 (1983): 19–22.

Jesus's Father. This is where Jesus belongs. the Jerusalem temple of YHWH, who is the father of Jesus. Eyal Regev rightly concludes. "Luke's Temple is the traditional Jewish Temple."<sup>117</sup> For Luke, the temple is where YHWH lives!

### **The Temple in The Ministry of Jesus**

The Jerusalem temple continues to be a prominent location throughout the Gospel of Luke. The baptism and transfiguration narratives share the same setting and shed more light on Luke's positive attitude toward the temple.<sup>118</sup> Following Mark, Luke pictures the opening of the heaven and the Spirit descending on Jesus in the form of a dove (3.22). The celestial opening marks the apocalyptic nature of the narrative (cf. Ezek 1.1; John 1.51; Acts 7.56; 10.11; Rev 19.11; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 22.1; T. *Levi* 2.6; 18.6–7, and T. *Jud.* 24.2). Mark underlines that Jesus had a special vision where he saw the heavens open, and the spirit descending on him (Mk 1.10), while Luke turns the vision into a public one by omitting Mark's verb εἶδεν (Lk 3.21–22). Luke adds τὸ ἅγιον to the description of the spirit (3.22), whereas Mark only uses τὸ πνεῦμα.<sup>119</sup> This addition shows Luke's interest in the separation between the holy sphere in contrast to the mundane or profane sphere.<sup>120</sup> Both Mark and Luke picture a voice from heaven declaring Jesus's sonship to YHWH. Luke builds the same setting in the transfiguration episode (9.28–36), where a similar divine voice "came out of the cloud" (9.34). However, Luke uniquely references "glory" (*doxa*) twice in his narrative, where Moses and Elijah appear "in glory" (9.31) and the disciples see Jesus's glory (9.32). Peter also mentions three tents for each of the three figures in the transfiguration (9.33). Luke's language here is vividly cultic, associated with the temple worship. Neither Mark nor Matthew uses glory language; Luke alone adds this detail. The Priestly Writer repeatedly refers to YHWH's presence above the ark-cover in the sanctuary (Exod 40.35) with

---

<sup>117</sup> Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019), 162.

<sup>118</sup> The following section on the baptism and transfiguration relies on: Gregory R. Lanier, "Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation," *JTS* 65 (2014): 451–52.

<sup>119</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, WBC 35A (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 161.

<sup>120</sup> Luke does not always use "holy" to describe the spirit (e.g., Lk 4:14).

the language of glory (MT: *kavod*; LXX: *doxa*).<sup>121</sup> As Benjamin Sommer argues, this glory language signifies the divine presence.<sup>122</sup> Further, the divine voice speaks out of the cloud (νεφέλη), connecting the transfiguration to the cloud that accompanies that Dwelling Place in the wilderness.<sup>123</sup> Finally, and most obviously, the language of tents evokes Israel's tent of meeting (the Dwelling Place), within the narrative world of P. Luke uses the same Greek word σκηνή which is typically used for the Dwelling Place. The baptism setting is similar to that of the transfiguration, with the divine voice coming from the cloud. The descending spirit is reminiscent of YHWH's manifestation upon the mountain (Exod 24.16). Both Luke and the Old Greek translator of P use the same verb καταβαίνω. The Hebrew text that the Old Greek translator rendered is וישכן כבוד־יהוה which uses the verb שכן, which denotes YHWH's dwelling. Exodus 24.16 also uses the language of glory, cloud, and the divine voice which "called to Moses out of the cloud." Altogether this evidence suggests that Luke intends to evoke the wilderness Dwelling Place (and maybe the temple) setting in the baptism and transfiguration scenes.<sup>124</sup>

In the temptation narrative, both Matthew and Luke agree on the *content* of the devil's temptation of Jesus (Mt 4.1–11; Lk 4.1–13). However, the most obvious difference between Matthew and Luke is the *order* of the temptations. While Matthew moves from the wilderness to the pinnacle of

---

<sup>121</sup> I use the Priestly writer, Priestly source, or simply P interchangeably, and broadly, to refer to textual layers that belong to a hypothetical source of texts that were included in the Torah by a later redactor. These strata originated within Priestly circles; hence the Priestly source reflects ritual concerns, communal practice of religion, the temple-based sacrificial cult, and regulates the life and work of the priests. P, like the Torah itself, is also composed by different authors, and has been edited and redacted over history, with the most significant addition coming from the Holiness School, which produced the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26). Another later addition comes from a different priestly school that added the festival calendar (Num 28–29). For most recent discussions of the state of P studies, see: Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007); Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen, eds., *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*, RBS 82 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010); Jürg Hutzli, *The Origins of P: Literary Profiles and Strata of the Priestly Texts in Genesis 1 – Exodus 40*, FAT 164 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023).

<sup>122</sup> Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 58–62.

<sup>123</sup> Further indicating that the Lukan setting is cultic is that the only time that the Old Greek translator uses νεφέλη in Leviticus is when YHWH tells Moses that he will appear in the cloud over the ark cover on Yom Kippur (Lev 16:2).

<sup>124</sup> As I will show in a later chapter, cultic vocabulary, including glory, cloud, heaven, and others, is prominent in Luke's writings.

the temple and then to the unknown high mountain, Luke moves from the wilderness to the unknown high mountain and finally places the temptation on the temple pinnacle as the third climatic temptation. The pinnacle of the temple (περύγιον; Lk 4.9) could be one of the two wings of the facade in front of the first chamber of the sanctuary. Josephus describes this facade as “of equal height and breadth, each being a hundred cubits; but the building behind was narrower by forty cubits, for in front it had as it were shoulders extending twenty cubits on either side” (*War* 5.207).<sup>125</sup> Jumping from this height would definitely result in death. Berger Gerhardsson noted that περύγιον usually translates כנף, meaning “wing.”<sup>126</sup> The Hebrew word, in turn, has usually been used in Jewish scriptures as a metaphor for YHWH’s protection, especially in connection with YHWH’s protection in the temple. The psalmist praises YHWH. “How precious is your steadfast love, O God! All people may take refuge in the shadow of your wings (περύγων). They feast on the abundance of your house, and you give them drink from the river of your delights” (Ps. 36.8–9; LXX 35.8–9). The Psalmist also asks YHWH. “Let me abide in your tent forever, find refuge under the shelter of your wings” (Ps. 61.5; LXX 60.5). Luke quotes from Psalm 91 (Lk 4.10–11) which also uses the metaphor of YHWH’s protection under his wing (Ps. 91.1–4; LXX 90.1–4). Thus, the devil is testing Jesus’s trust in God’s faithful protection that Jesus can seek in the temple. In other words, the temple is the wing of God where God protects the faithful.

It has been long noted that Luke changes the order of the temptation in order to terminate the temptation sequence at the temple (Lk 4.8).<sup>127</sup> Matthew’s ending of the temptation narrative on the high

---

<sup>125</sup> See the discussion in Günther Schwarz, “TO ΠΤΕΡΥΓΙΟΝ ΤΟΥΤ ΙΕΡΟÏ (Mt 4,5/Lk 4,9),” *BN* 61 (1992): 33–35; Stephen Hultgren, *Narrative Elements in the Double Tradition: A Study of Their Place within the Framework of the Gospel Narrative*, BZNW 113 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 110–11.

<sup>126</sup> Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son: Matthew 4:1–11 and PAR, An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966), 56–61.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Jacques Dupont, *Les tentations de Jesus au desert*, StudNeot 4 (Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1968), 67–70; Leander E. Keck, “The Spirit and the Dove,” *NTS* 17 (1971): 41–67; Petr Pokorny, “The Temptation Stories and Their Intention,” *NTS* 20 (1974) 115–27; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 507; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:178; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 76; Don B. Garlington, “Jesus, the Unique Son of

mountain, and Mark's brief description of the temptation in the wilderness, gives room to their notion that the angels continued to serve Jesus while he stayed in the wilderness (Mk 1.13; Mt 4.11).

However, because Luke ends the temptation in the temple, he omits the notion of the angels' service to Jesus. The focus in Luke is on the temple. As Richard Hays notes. "Luke arranges the order of the temptations so that the climactic third temptation occurs on the pinnacle of the temple in Jerusalem; this narrative ordering accords with the centrality of the temple in Luke's theological geography."<sup>128</sup> That is, Luke places Jerusalem temple as the climax of the temptation narrative in a way that coheres with the larger theological emphasis on the temple within Luke-Acts. While we have seen Jesus in the temple at the age of twelve as someone who belongs to the temple as the Father's house, in the temptation episode we see the testing of Jesus's loyalty to God reaches its climax in the temple.

A major section of Luke's Gospel is devoted to Jesus's journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9.51–19.47). Within this major section, the temple is still prominent in Jesus's ministry. A key passage is Jesus's healing of the ten men with *scale disease*, or *lepra* in the Old Greek translation, which is the same Greek term that Luke uses (17.11–19).<sup>129</sup> Those ten people could not approach Jesus, probably because

---

God: Tested and Faithful," *BSac* 150 (1994): 284–308 (298); Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 195; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 139; John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 104; Grant R. Osborne, "Testing God's Son: Deuteronomy and Luke 4:1–13," in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*, ed. Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 365–87 (382); M. J. Wilkins, "Temptation of Jesus," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green, Jeannine Brown, and Nicholas Perrin, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013), 952–59 (955); David B. Sloan, "Interpreting Scripture with Satan?: The Devil's Use of Scripture in Luke's Temptation Narrative," *TynB* 66 (2015): 231–50; Michael Morris, "Deuteronomy in the Matthean and Lucan Temptation in Light of Early Jewish Antidemonic Tradition," *CBQ* 78 (2016): 290–301. Against the interpretive view that Luke changes the order of the temptation in order to highlight the temple centrality, see: David K. Bryan, "The Center of Luke's Temptation Narrative," *CBQ* 82 (2020): 407–23.

<sup>128</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 266.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Hans D. Betz, "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11–19)," *JBL* 90 (1971): 314–28; Dennis Hamm, S.J., "What the Samaritan Leper Sees: The Narrative Christology of Luke 17:11–19," *CBQ* 56 (1994): 273–87. For a discussion of the nature of *lepra*, see: Pamela Shellberg, *Cleansed Lepers, Cleansed Hearts: Purity and Healing in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015) 29–94; Matthew Thiessen, *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels' Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First-Century Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020) 43–54. On the general social conditions of *leproi* in this incident and others in the gospels, see Myrick C. Shinall, "The Social Condition of Lepers in the Gospels," *JBL* 137 (2018): 915–34



they had been isolated outside the city according to the Torah laws (Lev. 13–14), yet they called out to him, asking for him to have mercy on them. Jesus instructed them to show themselves to the temple priests in Jerusalem (17.14).<sup>130</sup> According to the law, *leproi* had to receive confirmation from the priests that they had been purified before they could join the community again (Lev 14.1–31), which is the reason Jesus sends them to the priests in the Jerusalem temple. While on their way to Jerusalem, the ten patients were purified of *lepra*. One of the ten came back to thank Jesus for his healing and purification, and Luke states that he is a Samaritan. The Samaritan did not wait to receive the confirmation from the priests but returned immediately to give thanks to Jesus and God. Jesus wonders where the rest are and why only the “foreigner” (ὁ ἀλλογενής) came back.<sup>131</sup> Yet Jesus commends the Samaritan for his faith or faithfulness (ἡ πίστις) which saved him. At the core of the story is Jesus’s desire to follow the law,<sup>132</sup> where the priestly system in Jerusalem’s temple plays a role in the process of healing patients with scale disease. While the incident does not take place in or around the temple, it signals Jesus’s appreciation and respect for the temple’s priesthood. Jesus does not nullify the law, nor cancels the priestly role in the temple. Although Luke does not clearly mention the other rites that *leproi* should follow, there is nothing in the text that discourages the reader from envisioning the *leproi* offering the sacrificial offerings in the temple that were required for *leproi* to join the community back (Lev 14.10–31). Jesus has healed the scale disease of the *leproi*, but the ritual purification has not yet been completed. This purification must be performed in the temple. Thus, while the *leproi* have been

---

<sup>130</sup> On the language which Jesus and the ten *leproi*, including the Samaritan, talked, see: Stanley E. Porter, “Luke 17.11–19 and The Criteria for Authenticity Revisited,” *JSHJ* 2 (2003): 201–24.

<sup>131</sup> For recent evaluations of the relationships between the Samaritans and the Jews, see: Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016); Matthew Chalmers, “Representations of Samaritans in Late Antique Jewish and Christian Texts” (University of Pennsylvania PhD Dissertation, 2019). Chalmers’s work re-envision the inclusion of the Samaritans as a Torah-observant group that belongs to the Israelites, questioning the interpretive view of the Samaritans as “others” in the New Testament, which dominated New Testament scholarship. While not related directly to Luke 17, he applies his findings to the Gospel of Luke in the following article: “Rethinking Luke 10: The Parable of the Good Samaritan Israelite,” *JBL* 139 (2020): 543–66.

<sup>132</sup> On the prominent role of the Jewish law in Luke–Acts, see: Jacob Jervell, “The Law in Luke–Acts,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 21–36; Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

physically healed, they are not yet fully purified; at most, their bodies may have initiated the process of purification, but the impurity caused by their previous condition remains in the temple, necessitating purification. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the *leproi* to go to the temple and remove the impurity they had previously generated due to their condition. As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, ritual impurity is considered airborne and capable of reaching the altar within the temple. Jesus instructs the ten *leproi* to go to the temple to complete their purification process, which may indicate his concern for maintaining the purity of the temple. As Thiessen notes: “Luke’s story here emphasizes Jesus’s commitment to the legislation of Leviticus 13–14.”<sup>133</sup>

This is not the first time that Jesus heals a patient with a scale disease in the Gospel of Luke. Earlier, Jesus meets a person with *lepra*, who approaches Jesus asking to purify him (Lk 5.12).<sup>134</sup> Jesus touches the patient, saying, “Be made clean!” (Lk 5.13). Immediately, the man has been cleansed. Note that Jesus asks the man to show himself to the priest, and “to make an offering” for his cleansing (5.14). Jesus is clear about the Jewish sacrificial system, which is the main activity to take place in the temple. It is still valid, and following the Jewish law is as important to Jesus as to other first-century Jews.

Since his arrival in Jerusalem, Jesus taught in the temple on a daily basis (Lk 19.47; 20.1; 21.37–38; 22.53). While in the temple, Jesus follows daily happenings (cf. Lk 21.1). If the Lukan Jesus wants to oppose the temple, he would have been active in opposition outside the temple. The opposite is precisely the truth, as Regev concludes: “Jesus’s activities there are understood as the result of his valuing it as a holy place.”<sup>135</sup> The best example to show this is the cleansing of the temple in Luke’s Gospel. Jesus “entered the temple and began to drive out those who were selling things there, and he

---

<sup>133</sup> Thiessen, *Jesus and The Forces of Death*, 65.

<sup>134</sup> Shellberg, *Cleansed Lepers*, 31–33, 44–46.

<sup>135</sup> Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 163.

said, “It is written, ‘My house shall be a house of prayer,’ but you have made it a den of robbers.” Luke then adds: “Every day he was teaching in the temple” (Lk 19.45–47). While each of the Synoptic Gospels shares the quotation from Isa 56.7 and Jer. 7.11, Luke has two unique features that show his particular interest in the temple. First, Luke abbreviates Mark’s vivid and intensified descriptions of Jesus’s activities in the temple. Second, while Mark and Matthew both have Jesus exit the temple following the cleansing, Luke has Jesus stay in the temple to teach every day.

Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.
-Jesus enters the temple. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν (Mt 21.12)	-Jesus enters the temple. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν (Mk 11.15)	-Jesus enters the temple. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν (Lk 19.45)
-Intensified description of Jesus’s activity in the temple. ἐξέβαλεν πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψεν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς (Mt 21.12)	-Intensified descriptions in the temple. ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς κατέστρεψεν καὶ οὐκ ἤφειεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Mk 11.15-16)	-Softened description of Jesus’s activity in the temple. ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας (Lk 19.45).

-Jesus exits the city and the temple. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἐξω τῆς πόλεως (Mt 21.17).	-Jesus exits the city and the temple. ἐξεπορεύοντο ἐξω τῆς πόλεως (Mk 11.19)	-Jesus stays and teaches in the temple everyday. Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. (Lk 19.47)
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Luke omits all notions of the purchasers, the doves’ sellers, Jesus’s overturning of the market furniture, and Jesus’s interruption of anyone carrying vessels through the temple area. In fact, Luke’s abbreviated version of Jesus’s activity in the temple prompted scribes over the centuries to fill in the gaps. Manuscripts like A C W Θ add the clause ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγοράζοντας to v. 45, while D adds an even larger portion based on Mark. ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγοράζοντας καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξεχεεν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστερὰς.<sup>136</sup> Luke’s intention behind softening Jesus’s intensive activities as Mark describes them is informed by having Jesus teach in the temple every day. In other words, Jesus does not abandon the temple, it does not become obsolete after the cleansing but continues to be the center of Jesus’s teaching.

Marshall notes: “It is not clear whether Luke regards the action as having any deeper significance... Luke makes so little of the incident that it is hard to believe that he saw ... significance in it.”<sup>137</sup> But what significance we should look for in the incident? According to Marshall: “Whether he regards Jesus’ action as prophetic of the destruction of the temple... it is likely enough that he saw this nuance. The coming of Jesus to Jerusalem signifies judgment.”<sup>138</sup> While I agree with Marshall that Luke reduces Jesus’s actions in the temple compared to Mark, I do not see a reason to postulate the

<sup>136</sup> I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 721.

<sup>137</sup> Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 721. Nolland similarly concludes: “While in Mark the action is probably to be interpreted as symbolizing the coming destruction of the temple, in Luke it is difficult to find more than a protest and a token putting of things to rights... Luke is concerned to minimize any sense in which Jesus might be seen as critical of the Jerusalem temple.” Nolland, *Luke*, 3:937.

<sup>138</sup> Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 721.

destruction of the temple in this specific passage. The significance of the incident of Jesus expelling the merchants from the temple for Luke is this. it is an encounter against the merchants, not against the temple itself, let alone the *destruction* of the temple. Admittedly, Luke narrates Jesus’s prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem earlier (Lk 19.41–44) because it did not recognize the time of visitation. But there are a few things to note here. First, when Luke addresses Jerusalem’s destruction, he does not single out the temple but addresses the whole city. This will be apparent when I discuss Luke’s unique version of Jesus’s eschatological discourse. Second, Luke laments the destruction of Jerusalem. Jesus “wept over it” (Lk 19.41).<sup>139</sup> The destruction of Jerusalem is not a divine victory that Luke celebrates, but a punishment that he laments. Moreover, predicting the destruction of Jerusalem is one thing, and the vaporization of any eschatological hopes of its restoration in the future is a different thing. In this sense, Luke follows Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel who lamented the destruction of Jerusalem as a punishment during the Babylonian exile yet had high expectations of restoration in the future. Jewish authors from the Second Temple period also shared similar eschatological hopes for the restoration of Jerusalem and the second temple while admitting its present punishment (e.g. 2 *Bar.* 5.1; 8.1–5 and 4 *Ezra* 10.21–23).<sup>140</sup> The point is a text that reports the destruction of Jerusalem automatically means it celebrates this destruction. Luke mourns the destruction of the city and never abandons the inherent value of the temple.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Oliver, *Luke’s Jewish Eschatology*, 72-102. Oliver’s argument is that while Luke laments the present destruction of Jerusalem, he has eschatological hopes of national restoration of Israel and Jerusalem that goes hand in hand with the universalistic salvation of the gentiles. Israel, and Jerusalem, will be restored, not transformed, nor replaced by any other entity, in Luke’s views.

<sup>140</sup> See the discussion of Luke’s concept of history and its alignment with teleological eschatology in Kylie Crabbe, *Luke/Acts and the End of History*, BZNW 238 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019), 113–33.

<sup>141</sup> A passage from a Dead Sea scroll reads: “How solitary lies the large city Jerusalem, once full of people; the princess of all the nations has become desolate like an abandoned woman; all her daughters have been abandoned, like a woman without sons, like a distressed and abandoned woman. All her places and her squares are like a barren woman, and all her paths like an imprisoned woman, and her . . . like a bitter woman” (4Q179 2:4-7). This language of mourning Jerusalem sounds very much like Luke’s language of mourning Jerusalem.

Another redaction that shows the unique centrality of the temple in Luke is the location of Jesus's eschatological discourse.<sup>142</sup> While both Mark and Matthew situate the discourse on the Mount of Olives, Luke places it in the temple.<sup>143</sup>

Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.
-Jesus exits the temple.	-Jesus exits the temple.	-Jesus in the temple.
Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο, καὶ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς <u>τοῦ ἱεροῦ</u> (24.1)	Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ <u>ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ</u> (13.1).  -Jesus arrives at the Mount of Olives.	Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκεῖνων, διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν <u>ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ</u> (20.1)  -Jesus is still in the temple.  Ἀναβλέψας δὲ εἶδεν τοὺς βάλλοντας εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον

<sup>142</sup> Scholarship on Jesus's eschatological discourse in Mark 13, Matthew 24, and Luke 21 is massive. Some of the works that have been consulted for this treatment are: George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 322–37; C. Clifton Black, "An Oration at Olivet: Some Rhetorical Dimensions of Mark 13," In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric*, FS to G. A. Kennedy, ed. D. F. Watson (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 66–92; John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 103–19; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia* (Saint Louis: Concordia Academic, 2000); Brant Pitre, *Jesus, The Tribulation, and the End of Exile* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 362–79; C. Marvin Pate and Douglas W. Kennard, *Deliverance Now and Not Yet: The New Testament and the Great Tribulation*, SBL 54 (New York: Peter Lang, 2003); W. A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation in the Gospel of Mark* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1999); James Dawsey, "The Origin of Luke's Positive Perception of the Temple," *PRS* 18 (1991): 5–22; N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 459–64; idem, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 360–65; Scott McKnight, *A New Vision for Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 141–42; Ben Witherington, *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992), 179, 283; Alistair I. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen?* PBMS (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007), 225–27; Peter Webster Smuts, *Luke and the Olivet Discourse: A Redaction-Critical Study of Luke 21:5–36* (Ph.D. Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1996); Edward Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," *TynB* 56 (2005): 39–61; Gustavo Martin, "Procedural Register in the Olivet Discourse: A Functional Linguistic Approach to Mark 13," *Bib* 90 (2009), 457–83; Micah D. Kiel, "The Open Horizon of Mark 13," *JBL* 136 (2017): 145–162; W. Nicol, "Tradition and Redaction In Luke 21," *Neot* 7 (1973): 61–71; Andrew R. Angel, *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaokampf Tradition in the Period 515 BCE to 200 CE*, LSTS 60 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 135–39; John Nolland, "The Times of the Nations' and a Prophetic Pattern in Luke 21," in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels. Vol. 3, The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Thomas R. Hatina, LNTS 376 (London: T&T Clark, 2010); Michèle Morgen, "Lc 17.20-37 et Lc 21.8-11, 20-24: 'Arrière-Fond Scripturaire,'" in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1997), 307–26; Vittorio Fusco, "Problems of Structure in Luke's Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:7–36)," in *Luke and Acts*, ed. Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 72–92.

<sup>143</sup> Oliver, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology*, 93; Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts*, 81.

-Jesus arrives at the Mount of Olives.  Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν (24.3)  -Jesus starts the eschatological discourse.  βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· (24:4)	Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν <u>κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ</u> (13.3)  -Jesus starts the eschatological discourse.  βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· (13.5)	τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν πλουσίους (21.1)  -Jesus starts the eschatological discourse in the temple.  Καί τινων λεγόντων <u>περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ</u> (21:5)  - Jesus is still teaching in the temple.  Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας <u>ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων</u> (21.37)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mark and Matthew have Jesus exiting the temple and sitting on the Mount of Olives before he gives his eschatological discourse. Mark specifically adds that Jesus sits on the Mount of Olives “against the temple” (13.3; cf. 12.41),<sup>144</sup> then Jesus begins the eschatological discourse. Luke, however, maintains Jesus’s teaching in the temple before and after the eschatological discourse. The effect of Luke’s alteration of Mark’s language is a softening of Jesus’s tone. Jesus’s eschatological discourse in Luke does not communicate an opposition against the temple *per se*. In the same eschatological discourse, Luke omits any notion of defiling the Jerusalem temple.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>144</sup> Joel Marcus comments about Jesus’s posture against the temple: “The sitting posture is often associated in biblical texts both with teaching and with judgment... and in 12:36 (cf. 14:62) it is particularly linked with judgment on Jesus’ enemies. The proximity to the threatening words of 13:2 and the possibly negative nuance of *katenanti* (“opposite, against”) confirm this association, as does the judgmental context of Zech 14:4, which seems to be alluded to here.” See: Joel Marcus, *Mark 8–16: A New Translation, with Introduction, and Commentary*, AB 27A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 873. Compare the similar discussion in Timothy C. Gray, *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in its Narrative Role*, WUNT II/242 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 108–9.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. C. H. Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of the Desolation,” *JRS* 37 (1947): 47–54, who notes how Luke centered his version of the synoptic apocalypse around the city of Jerusalem, rather than around the temple.

Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.
-Jesus describes the desolating sacrilege.	-Jesus describes the desolating sacrilege.	-Jesus describes the generic fate of Jerusalem
Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς <u>ἐρημώσεως</u> , τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἐστὼς <u>ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ</u> (24.15)	Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς <u>ἐρημώσεως</u> ἐστηκότα ὅπου <u>οὐ δεῖ</u> (13.14)	Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων <u>Ἱερουσαλήμ</u> , τότε γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ <u>ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς</u> . (21.20)

Both Mark and Matthew refer to Daniel’s prophecy of an abomination of the temple structure. Mark’s language is implicit, indicating that the desolating sacrilege stands where it should not, a reference to the temple. Matthew also uses “the holy place” to refer to the temple as the location of the desolating sacrilege. Luke, however, changes the whole idea, by centering the narrative around the city of Jerusalem, not the temple.<sup>146</sup> Luke describes the siege of the city, and while it is logical to conclude that Luke includes the destruction of the temple as part of the city, it fits with his nuanced positive theology of the temple. While the temple will be destroyed eventually as part of the city, this destruction does not represent a negative divine judgment against the temple. Yet even then, Jerusalem will be restored upon the fulfillment of the gentiles’ time. “Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled” (21.24).<sup>147</sup> Luke echoes Zechariah’s message that the Gentiles will destroy Jerusalem (Zech 12.3), though he communicates a message of hope with it.<sup>148</sup> Luke’s narrative shows similarly hopeful statements about Israel and Jerusalem (e.g., Luke 2.38; 13.35; 24.21; Acts 28.23–28). Luke follows Israel’s prophets who predicted a time of salvation for the

<sup>146</sup> Smith notes that the “the material is structurally independent of Mark.” Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke –Acts*, 82; also E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, NCBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 244.

<sup>147</sup> Chance, *Jerusalem, The Temple, and The New Age in Luke –Acts*, 134.

<sup>148</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28A (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 1346.



Gentiles when they will worship YHWH in the Jerusalem temple (e.g., Isa 56.6–7).<sup>149</sup> *The Animal*

*Apocalypse*, a text from the second temple period, shows similar eschatological hopes for the divine visitation of the Gentiles (1 *En.* 90.37–38).<sup>150</sup> Regardless of the nature and timing of the fulfillment of the Gentiles' time, it is clear that Luke shares the same eschatological hope for Jerusalem.

The gospel ends with Luke depicting the disciples worshipping God in the Jerusalem temple:

“They worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and they were continually in the temple blessing God” (Lk 24.52–53). The disciples view the temple as the center where they should return after Jesus's ascension. It is the proper place to bless God. Luke shows the disciples in the temple “continually” (διὰ παντός),<sup>151</sup> making it a habit. That the disciples were “blessing God” in the temple shows their participation in the temple service, and shows Luke's high esteem of their participation in the temple service.<sup>152</sup> Doubtless, the disciples were only mirroring Jesus's attitude toward the temple. Yet the most important observation to note is that the Gospel of Luke starts and ends in the temple. The disciples' worship in the temple, thus, forms an *inclusio*, connecting its beginning to its end. From the first scene to the last scene, the temple is the geographical center of the gospel, the most sacred space on earth. Celebrating what God is doing in Jesus is the fulfillment of the promises God made in the

<sup>149</sup> I will come back to this passage from Isaiah, and how it connects to Luke-Acts's eschatological cultic atonement in the fifth chapter.

<sup>150</sup> On this passage, see: Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on The Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*, EJL 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 383–89; Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: “All Nations Shall be Blessed,” With a New Translation and Commentary*, SVTP 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 229; Matthew Thiessen, “Paul, the Animal Apocalypse, and Abraham's Gentile Seed,” in *The Ways That Often Parted: Essays in Honor of Joel Marcus*, ed. Lori Baron, Jill Hicks-Keeton, and Matthew Thiessen, ECL (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018), 69–70.

<sup>151</sup> Mark Kinzer argues that the Greek phrase διὰ παντός is the same one the Old Greek translator used to translate תָּמִיד (e.g. Lev 24.2; Num 28.10, 15, 23, 24). See Mark S. Kinzer, “Sacrifice, Prayer, and the Holy Spirit: The Tamid Offering in Luke-Acts,” in J. Harold Ellens, Isaac W. Oliver, Jason von Ehrenkrook, James Waddell, and Jason M. Zurawski, eds., *Wisdom Poured Out Like Water: Studies on Jewish and Christian Antiquity in Honor of Gabriele Boccaccini*, DCLT 38 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 464–75 (472).

<sup>152</sup> Bovon [Luke, 3:413] maintains that Luke is here using a figure of speech, suggesting that he was exaggerating, but in reality, the temple stopped being a place of sacrifice offering to the disciples. Bovon suggests that the gospel message will move from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth, which represents a distance from the temple service. However, as I will show below, the temple continues to be the worship center in the ministry of the disciples. Not only that, but Luke intentionally shows followers of Jesus offering sacrifices in Acts (see below). See also: Taylor, “Luke-Acts and the Temple,” 717.

past, and this is not contradicted by adhering to the Jerusalem temple. Anna could celebrate Jesus and worship in the temple day and night, and the disciples could witness Jesus ascending to heaven while returning to Jerusalem to bless God in the temple. Jesus's message and life are not a replacement for the temple in the Gospel of Luke.

### **The Temple in Acts**

In the Book of Acts, the temple plays a central role in the life of the Jesus movement, after the death, resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus, and even after the pouring out of the spirit.<sup>153</sup> The temple plays a prominent role in the ministries of the twelve disciples as well as in the ministry of Paul.

### **The Temple in the Twelve's Ministry**

The disciples return to Jerusalem after Jesus's ascension and receive the promise of the spirit (Acts 2.1–41). Luke pictures divided tongues of fire that appeared and rested upon each one of the disciples (Acts 2.3). The interpretation of the fire tongues has puzzled commentators,<sup>154</sup> but situating Luke within the second temple period context might shed more light on their nature. The metaphor occurs twice in 1 Enoch (1 *En.* 14.9; 71.5). Enoch ascends into heaven where he is confronted by the heavenly temple, and the sanctuary is surrounded by “tongues of fire” (γλώσσαις πυρός).<sup>155</sup> Glen Menzies notes that the function of the tongues of fire in 1 Enoch is “to delimit spheres of holiness as one approaches closer and closer to the presence of God.”<sup>156</sup> Thus, the sanctuary boundaries are marked by the tongues of fire. Others have also noted the cultic imagery of the rushing wind filling the space

---

<sup>153</sup> C. K. Barrett [‘Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles’, in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*, ed. William Horbury, JSNTSup 48 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991)] argues that Luke's view of the temple in Acts is inconsistent. Steve Walton [‘A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts’, in *Heaven on Earth*, ed. Alexander and Gathercole, 143] argues that Luke's view of the temple in Acts is mostly positive, though the temple as a religious institution is taken over by Jesus.

<sup>154</sup> See Blaine Charette, “‘Tongues as of Fire’: Judgment as a Function of Glossolalia in Luke's Thought,” *JPT* 13 (2005): 173–186, who views the fire tongues as a sign of judgment. Cf. Christy Cobb, “Entangled Tongues: A Poststructuralist and Postcolonial Reading of Acts 2:1–13,” *JBS* 4 (2022): 1–16.

<sup>155</sup> A similar idea occurs in *The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, 71.5. See: George W. E. Nickelsburg and Klaus Baltzer, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 262.

<sup>156</sup> G. Menzies, “Pre-Lucan Occurrences of the Phrase ‘Tongues of Fire,’” *Pneuma* 22 (2000): 27–60 (41); see also: Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand,” 562.

and the fire tongues coming from heaven and resting upon the disciples' heads being similar to YHWH's glory filling the Dwelling Place as a cloud (Exod 40.34–38; Lev 9.15–23; Num 9.15–23).<sup>157</sup> YHWH's glory dwelled in the sanctuary in the form of fire and cloud (Exod 40.1–15, 29–32; Lev 8.10–9.21. Cf. 2 Chr 5.1–7.7).

The immediate outworking of the reception of the spirit was the speaking in tongues, preaching to those assembled in Jerusalem for the Feast of Pentecost, and worship and prayer in the temple: “Day by day, as they spent much time together in the temple, they broke bread at home and ate their food with glad and generous hearts” (Acts 2.46).<sup>158</sup> Jesus's followers continue to maintain a lifestyle centered around the temple *even after they received the spirit*. In other words, the spirit does not lead the disciples away from the temple but draws them closer to it. Luke emphasizes that the earliest followers of Jesus in Jerusalem are pious Jews, who continue to worship God in the temple in the narrative of Acts and follow the Jewish law strictly (2.46; 3.1; 5.12; 10.9; 11.2; 15.1; 16.3; 21.20).

Moreover, in every instance where the followers of Jesus are accused of not living up to the Jewish law in the narrative of Acts, Luke is careful to show the falsity of these claims. For instance, Luke portrays John and Peter going into the temple during the ninth-hour service to participate in the worship: “One day Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, at the ninth hour” (Acts 3.1). As I will show later, this passage refers to the daily Jewish *Tamid* service, which includes the daily morning and evening sacrifices.<sup>159</sup> This is not just a passing introductory sentence in the pericope, nor a description of a private prayer.<sup>160</sup> Rather, it demonstrates that the leaders of the early

---

<sup>157</sup> Craig Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, Vol. 1: Introduction and 1:1–2:47 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 801–04; Chance, *Jerusalem*, 42–43.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. I. Howard Marshall, *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Leicester: IVP, 1980), 357; Joel B. Green, “Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, MNTS (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 188–201.

<sup>159</sup> Eyal Regev, “Temple Prayer as the Origin of the Fixed Prayer (On the Evolution of Prayer During the Period of the Second Temple),” *Zion* 70 (2005): 5–30 (Hebrew).

<sup>160</sup> Joshua Schwartz argues that the disciples went for a private prayer in the temple. See: Joshua Schwartz, “Temple and Temple Mount in the Book of Acts: Early Christian Activity, Topography and Halachah,” in *The Beginnings of*

Jesus movement continued to participate in Jewish services, including sacrificial offerings, in the temple, even after Jesus's death and resurrection. Other Jewish authors make similar associations between prayer time and the *Tamid* service. Daniel is said to be "speaking in prayer... at the time of the evening sacrifice" (Dan 9.21). Judith prays at the same time: "At the very time when the evening incense was being offered in the house of God in Jerusalem, Judith cried out to the Lord with a loud voice" (Judith 9.1). Luke similarly positions the disciples participating in the temple prayers simultaneously at the time of the *Tamid* service. That the disciples still go to the temple following Jesus's death, resurrection, and ascension means that the temple remains the fitting place to worship.

In the same incident, Peter and John healed a lame crippled man "from his mother's womb" (Acts 3.2) by the Beautiful Gate of the temple, which is the entry point from the Court of the Gentiles into the inner courts of the temple (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 5.201).<sup>161</sup> Luke is keen to record details like the name of the gate when he does not mention the name of the healed man.<sup>162</sup> Luke uses the Greek word, *χολός*, for "Lame" which is the same word the Old Greek translator used to communicate that a lame person should not draw near to offer in the temple (πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃ ἂν ᾗ ἐν αὐτῷ μῶμος οὐ προσελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος χολός ἢ τυφλός ἢ κολοβόρριν ἢ ὠτότμητος; Lev 21.18).<sup>163</sup> One result of healing the lame man is that he can now draw near to offer the sacrifice, as he has been healed. Implicitly, Luke affirms the temple cult in this context. Moreover, the healing of the man in the temple premises might have reminded the readers of Israel's salvation promise that YHWH made: "Here is

---

*Christianity*, ed. J. Pastor and M. Mor (Jerusalem: Yad ben Zvi), 279–95. See also Barrett, "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles," 357.

<sup>161</sup> For a summary of the different opinions about the location of this gate, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation, Notes and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 277–78; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, 2 Vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 2002), 1:179–80; C. J. Cowton, "The Alms Trader: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3.2," *NTS* 42 (1996): 475–76.

<sup>162</sup> For the role of crippled characters in the development of Luke's narrative, see: S. John Roth, *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSupp 144 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). On the social status of lame people in first-century Judea, see: Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 65. More than anything else, Luke shows his readers that he knows the temple!

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Deut. 15:21.

your God. He will come with vengeance, with terrible recompense. He will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be opened; then the lame shall leap like a deer, and the tongue of the speechless sing for joy” (Isa 35.4–6).<sup>164</sup> Luke already presented Jesus as fulfilling this promise when John’s disciples asked if he was the Messiah. Jesus answered John’s disciples: “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight; the lame walk; those with a skin disease are cleansed; the deaf hear; the dead are raised; the poor have good news brought to them” (Lk 7.22). The man that Peter and John heal embodies the fulfillment of this promise; the lame man represents Israel who receives the savior now.<sup>165</sup> Most importantly, the healing of the man happens within the temple complex.<sup>166</sup> Does the name of the gate, “the Beautiful” have anything to do with the healed man? Luke may want to communicate the idea that the man became whole. Regardless, the man’s response, which Luke records, is emphatic on the temple: “Jumping up, he stood and began to walk, and he entered the temple with them, walking and leaping and praising God. All the people saw him walking and praising God, and they recognized him as the one who used to sit and ask for alms at the Beautiful Gate of the temple” (Acts 3.8–10). The man’s response shows that the proper place to give thanks to God is in the temple, from which he was previously barred. Reminiscent of all the announcements about Israel’s salvation that took place in the temple in the infancy narrative, the man’s healing further emphasizes that the salvation of Israel is happening now, and this salvation is happening in the temple.

---

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12–26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame,” *PRSt* 11 (1984): 199–217; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 109–22.

<sup>165</sup> Dennis MacDonald argues that the picture of Israel as a lame man occurs several times in Isaiah, e.g. Isa 26.19, 29.18–19, 61.1–2. See: Dennis R. MacDonald, “Toward an Intertextual Commentary on Luke 7,” in *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*, eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, LNTS 493 (London: T&T Clark, 2014), 130–152, here at 136–37.

<sup>166</sup> In both, the conventional text and D-Text of Acts, the healing happens within the temple premises.

Luke signals that this miracle is a representative of all other miracles that Jesus's disciples did in the temple: "Many signs and wonders were done among the people through the apostles. And they were all together in Solomon's Portico" (Acts 5.12). Just as Luke specified the Beautiful Gate of the temple for the healing of the lame, so now he specifies Solomon's Portico where more miracles happened.<sup>167</sup> The shadow of Peter healed all patients without touching them (5.15). Israel's leaders might be jealous, but the temple is not dismissed as the location of the divine indwelling. The high priest and others became jealous of Jesus's disciples, so they put them in jail. An angel freed them saying: "Go, stand in the temple and tell the people the whole message about this life" (5.20). Angels still play a prominent role in Acts (e.g., 8.26; 10.3–6), even in the temple.<sup>168</sup> The angel does not instruct them to avoid the temple but commands them to go back and proclaim the message of life in the temple.<sup>169</sup> The disciples were not surprised by the angel's request, and nothing in the text indicates that the angel's request to minister in the temple was irregular. The temple is the appropriate location for religious teaching and practice in the angel's view. The disciples "entered *the temple* at daybreak and went on with their teaching" (5.21) and "*every day in the temple* and at home they did not cease to teach and proclaim Jesus as the Messiah" (5.42). The disciples' teaching attracted crowds to their teaching, so the message about Jesus as the Messiah starts in the temple, and spreads among the crowds in the temple.<sup>170</sup> Remarkably, the way Luke describes the disciples' commitment to the daily worship in

---

<sup>167</sup> Luke again uses the detail of Solomon's portico to show the reader that he knows the temple.

<sup>168</sup> On the angels' roles in Luke's narrative, see: Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT II/94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Turid Karlsen Seim, "Children of the Resurrection: Perspectives on Angelic Asceticism in Luke-Acts," in *Asceticism and the New Testament*, eds. Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush (Routledge: New York, 1999) 115–126; John B. F. Miller, *Convinced that God had called us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God's Will in Luke-Acts*, BIS 84 (Brill: Leiden, 2007), especially here 177–78; Rebecca Dean, "What if a Spirit or an Angel has Spoken?" Narrative Modelling of the Treatment of Dreams and Visions in The Acts of the Apostles" (Ph.D. Diss., Oxford University, 2018).

<sup>169</sup> See the discussion in Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, SBLMS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 130–31.

<sup>170</sup> Beverly Roberts Gaventa notes: "The repetition of the word 'temple' here underscores the conflict between the apostles and the authorities over who better perceives the will of the God of this same temple." That is, Luke wants to show that the disciples are honest in their loyalty to the temple, in contrast to the leadership. See Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Acts of the Apostles*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 106.

the temple shows that these incidents that Luke narrates are not the only occasions on which the disciples visited the temple.<sup>171</sup> Luke made similar summaries about Jesus's teaching in the temple as discussed, which puts the disciples on the same level of temple loyalty.<sup>172</sup> The temple is the location of teaching about the message of life, that Jesus is the Messiah, just like how Jesus stayed in the temple with the teachers of Israel when he was twelve and then again after the cleansing of the temple.<sup>173</sup>

### The Temple in Paul's Ministry

The temple is still central in the life and ministry of Paul in Acts.<sup>174</sup> Following his extensive missionary work in Asia Minor, the apostle Paul returned to Jerusalem with the intention of briefing James<sup>175</sup> and other prominent elders on the outcomes of his ministry among the Gentiles (Acts 21.17–20a).<sup>176</sup> As part of this meeting, the elders raise certain objections that have been put forth by members

---

<sup>171</sup> So Barrett, "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles," 345–367. Barrett addresses these scenes historically and arrives at the conclusion that the disciples' approach to the temple was positive from a historical perspective.

<sup>172</sup> So Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 164.

<sup>173</sup> Stephen's speech (Acts 7) has been a major point of confusion about the role of the temple in Luke-Acts, due to Stephen's harsh statements about the temple (Acts 7.48). I will discuss Stephen's statement about the temple in the fourth chapter below in the context of the heavenly temple in Luke-Acts.

<sup>174</sup> On Luke's characterization of Paul, see: Jacob Jervell, *Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984); John Clayton Lentz, *Luke's Portrait of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Stanley E. Porter, *Paul in Acts*, LPS (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999); Christopher Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, NovTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Daniel Marguerat, *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letter*, WUNT 1/310 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), see especially related to the temple 106–129; Arco den Heijer, *Portraits of Paul's Performance in the Book of Acts: Luke's Apologetic Strategy in the Depiction of Paul as Messenger of God*, WUNT 11/556 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021).

<sup>175</sup> James, a prominent figure in early Christianity, was identified as the brother of Jesus, and led the Jerusalem Council. In Acts, Luke introduces James as a key figure in resolving major controversies (cf. his role in Acts 15 and in the current passage). Additionally, in early Christian tradition, James is recognized as a Nazirite, a Jewish individual consecrated to maintain an exemplary level of Torah observance (see Eusebius' *Hist. eccl.* 2.23.5). Kalervo Salo notes about his role in this section: "James, whose authority as a law-abiding Jew is not questioned in the early Church, can serve as witness to Paul's faithfulness to the law." See: Kalervo Salo, *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1991), 266; cf. Richard Baukham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Baukham, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 415–80.

<sup>176</sup> On this passage, see: G. P. Carras, "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 693–708; Richard Baukham, "The Final Meeting of James and Paul: Narrative and History in Acts 21, 18–26," in *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer: Parcours de Nouveau Testament: Mélanges offerts à Daniel Marguerat pour son 60e anniversaire* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2003), 250–59; David E. Aune, "Paul, Ritual Purity, and the Ritual Baths South of the Temple Mount (Acts 21:15–28)," in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, ed. P. Spitaler (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2011), 125–61; David Rudolph, "Luke's Portrait of Paul in Acts 21:17–26," in 56

of the Jewish community with regard to Paul's work among non-Jewish individuals. In the passage, Luke reports the content of the claims made against Paul, stating that he taught “all the Jews living among the gentiles to forsake Moses and... not to circumcise their children or observe the customs” (Acts 21.21). In response, the elders suggest a plan to demonstrate that these claims are false: “We have four men who are under a vow. Join these men, go through the rite of purification with them, and pay for the shaving of their heads. Thus all will know that there is nothing in what they have been told about you but that you yourself observe and guard the law” (Acts 21.23b–24). The four men under the vow in question were required to undergo purification before they could participate in the temple service, and in order to show the Jews in the temple that he was committed to the temple’s purification laws, Paul was to join the four men in their rite and pay for the shaving of their heads, which was a necessary part of the purification process. Luke already mentioned that Paul was under a vow, and had his hair cut (Acts 18.18), which means that Paul would have been familiar with the rites.<sup>177</sup> Paul consents to the request of the elders and proceeds the following day to undergo the purification process, subsequently entering the temple and “making public the completion of the days of purification when the sacrifice would be made for each of them” (Acts 21.26). Luke mentions that Paul and his fellows remained in the temple for seven days, apparently to complete the purification rite.

It is unclear whether the reference made by Luke pertains to the Nazirites’ vow and its law or some other form of vow.<sup>178</sup> Nevertheless, the act of shaving head hair, the requirement to offer a

---

*The Early Reception of Paul The Second Temple Jew: Text, Narrative, and Reception History*, ed. Isaac W. Oliver and Gabriele Boccaccini, LSTS 92 (T&T Clark: London, 2019), 192–205.

<sup>177</sup> Bart J. Koet, “Why did Paul shave his hair (Acts 18, 18)? Nazirite and Temple in the book of Acts,” in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*, eds. M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 129–42; idem, “Purity and Impurity of the Body in Luke-Acts,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, JCPs 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 93–106.

<sup>178</sup> Barrett posits that Luke’s lack of detailed knowledge about the purification process was attributable to his unclear understanding of the nature of the vow, its associated laws, and the purification procedures. However, upon closer examination of Luke’s text, it becomes evident that he presupposes his readers’ comprehension of the ritual purity laws. Notably, Luke does not explicitly mention the reason why four men required purification, but he could have easily assumed that his readers would instantly understand that the four individuals had come into close proximity with a corpse. It is plausible that Paul himself had undergone similar experiences of impurity resulting from his



purification offering, and the duration of seven days are all indicative of the Nazirite vow and its law. As per this law (Num 6.1–21), the Nazirite is required to shun any proximity to death. Although not explicitly mentioned in the Nazirite law, any person who touches a corpse remains impure for seven days (Num 19.11–12; cf. Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.205; *m. Naz* 7.3;18a; *Numbers Rabbah* 10.13).<sup>179</sup> Hence, if the Nazirite come in contact with a corpse, they are considered impure and must undergo purification. The purification process entails shaving one's head on the seventh day (Num 6.9) and the offering of two sacrifices: purification offering and ascension offering (Num 6.11).<sup>180</sup> Paul goes through the purification process, then enters the temple with the four other Jewish followers of Jesus who needed to offer sacrifices for their vows. Luke says: "Paul took the men, and the next day, having purified himself, he entered the temple with them, making public the completion of the days of purification when the sacrifice would be made for each of them" (Acts 21.26).<sup>181</sup> This incident further suggests that Paul held the temple and its customs in high regard and did not intend to undermine or contradict its sacrificial system. Using this narrative, Luke seeks to establish Paul's innocence of any charges of opposing Judaism or its religious institutions. By presenting Paul's defense before Roman authorities in

---

missionary journeys among gentiles or other causes, which necessitated a seven-day period of purification. Jacob Neusner offers a different perspective from rabbinic literature, which deemed Nazirites as arrogant and weak, hence concludes that Luke does not really understand that when he pictures James advising Paul to keep a Nazirite vow, he is ill-advising him. Yet as Chepey notes, rabbinic evidence, which Neusner bases his case on, comes from a later period. Chepey also questions the claim that rabbinic literature has a single voice on this matter. See: Barrett, *Acts*, 2:1011. Cf. Jacob Neusner, "Vow-Taking, The Nazirites, and the Law: Does James' Advice to Paul Accord with Halakah?" in *James the Just and Christian Origins*, ed. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans, NovTSup 98 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 59–82. For further discussion of the Nazirite law in second temple Judaism and Luke-Acts, see: Stuart D. Chepey, *Nazirites in Late Second Temple Judaism: A Survey of Ancient Jewish Writings, the New Testament, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Writings from Late Antiquity*, AJEC 60 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), especially here 165–174; idem, "Is the Timing Respecting Paul and the Four Men Under a Vow in Acts 21:23–27 Plausible?: Possible Implications from Josephus and Philo on the Nazirite Vow and First-Fruits," *CTR* 9 (2012): 69–75.

<sup>179</sup> Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia, 1990) 46; Phillip J. Budd, *Numbers*, WBC 5 (Dallas: Word Books, 2002), 72.

<sup>180</sup> Ascension offering is the name I prefer for the wholly burnt offering. I explain the reasons in the next chapter on sacrifices. On the purification offering in the Nazirite vow context, see: Roy E. Gane, "The Function of the Nazirite's Concluding Purification Offering," in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, ed. Naphtali S. Meshel, Jeffrey Stackert, Baruch J. Schwartz, and David P. Wright (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 9–17.

<sup>181</sup> Bovon (*Luke* 3, 20) argues that in Luke-Acts "the first Christians maintained a connection to the temple, but there is no text indicating that they continued the practice of blood sacrifice." Paul's involvement in the sacrificial offering in Acts 21.26 shows that Bovon's conclusion is wrong

the following chapters of Acts, on the basis of this incident, Luke aims to assert the ongoing validity of the temple and its laws in the context of Paul's ministry. Moreover, Luke provides a clear declaration of Paul's adherence to Jewish laws and customs as a Torah-observant Jew, who not only upheld these practices himself but also taught fellow Jews to remain faithful to them.<sup>182</sup> In the middle of all his missionary work among the Gentiles, Paul still respects the binding authority of the ritual purity laws, the temple, and the priesthood. Not only Paul, but the elders of the nascent Jesus movement in Jerusalem seem to comply with the temple and its ritual purity laws.

Following the events in the same incident, certain Jews from Asia accused Paul publicly: "Fellow Israelites, help! 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" (Acts 21.28; cf. 24.5; 25.8). In the remainder of the book of Acts, Luke portrays how Paul counteracts these allegations and defends himself against the accusations of opposing speech directed at the people of Israel, the law, and the Jerusalem temple.<sup>183</sup> Yet I will highlight a few defenses of Paul that Luke establishes as a narrator. First, Luke attributes the accusations only to a certain group of Jews from Asia Minor. He repeats the same notion later - *τινὲς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι* (Acts 24.19). This identification narrows the conflict between two different voices within Jewish circles, not that Paul is to be viewed as an outsider. Luke further emphasizes this point by having Paul declare that he is Jew like them in his first defense in front of other Jews (Acts 22.1). Second, Luke explains why this group of Jews was misinformed about Paul: "For they had previously seen Trophimus the Ephesian with him in the city, and they supposed that Paul had brought him into the temple" (Acts 21.29). Luke makes it

---

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Andreas Heimbichner, "Missionary Flexibility or Continuity: Paul's Purity Ritual in Acts 21:18–26 in Light of a Jewish Second Temple Period Background" (Ph.D. Diss., North-West University, 2020).

<sup>183</sup> Cf. Eyal Regev, "Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History," *NTS* 56 (2010): 64–89; Earl Schwartz, "The Trials of Jesus and Paul," *JLR* 9 (2015): 501–13.

clear that Trophimus accompanied Paul in Jerusalem, but not into the temple.<sup>184</sup> Hence, they “supposed” (ἐνόμιζον)<sup>185</sup> that Paul took Trophimus into the temple. The use of νομίζω implies that Luke sees the accusation as a false one. Before all of his defenses, Luke shows that Paul is innocent of all the accusations. The whole city gathers around Paul to kill him, yet the Romans save him. But Luke’s point is clear. Contrary to the claims of these Asian Jews, Paul submits to the temple’s authority and the customs.

When the Romans rescued Paul, he addressed the Jews in Hebrew regarding his experience with Jesus. He asserts his Jewish identity, being “brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, educated accurately according to our ancestral law, being zealous for God” (Acts 22.3). He goes on to claim that, like everyone present in the crowd, he too is a Jew (22.3c). Something new just happened to him, as Ananias told him: “The God of our ancestors has chosen you to know his will, to see the Righteous One, and to hear his own voice” (22.14). Though Paul worships the same God as Israel’s forefathers, he is experiencing a novel phenomenon; following the messiah. For Paul, in the context of Acts, following Jesus does not contradict his Jewish identity.

In the remaining part of his discourse, Paul narrates to the Jews a vision he had in the temple upon his return to Jerusalem. Paul recounts that Jesus appeared to him while he was praying in the temple: “After I had returned to Jerusalem and while I was praying in the temple, I fell into a trance and saw Jesus saying to me, ‘Hurry and get out of Jerusalem quickly... for I will send you far away to the gentiles’” (Acts 22.17–21). This incident highlights that Paul continues to see the temple as the appropriate place of worship. His religious life does not relinquish its significance, even after his initial encounter with the risen Jesus. This observation reinforces the conclusion that fidelity to the Jerusalem

---

<sup>184</sup> A gentile who enters the temple would have been executed immediately, even without a trial. See Peretz Segal, “The Penalty of the Warning Inscription from the Temple of Jerusalem,” *IEJ* 39 (1989), 79–84.

<sup>185</sup> Fitzmyer translates the verb “assumed.” Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 698.

temple and following Jesus are not mutually exclusive in Acts. Additionally, Jesus's appearance to Paul in the temple resonates with the earlier part of the gospel, where Jesus refers to the temple as the "Father's house." The fact that Paul first saw Jesus in heaven, followed by this vision of Jesus in the temple, the same place where Jesus had previously referred to as the Father's house, implies a correlation between heaven and the temple. Furthermore, Jesus summons Paul to embark on a mission towards the Gentiles while in the temple. It is plausible that Luke strategically positions Paul's vision in the temple to address the accusations leveled against him regarding the entry of Gentiles into the inner courts of the temple. Such a move would have been considered a desecration of the temple.<sup>186</sup>

However, by showing that *within* the temple Jesus commissions Paul with the task of ministering to the Gentiles, Luke intends to emphasize that Paul's actions are in line with God's will. As Steve Walton comments: "It is precisely at the heart of the Jewish faith that Paul receives his call to include the Gentiles in the renewed people of God."<sup>187</sup> Luke's portrayal of Paul's divine appointment to the Gentiles in the temple serves to validate Paul's ministry, thereby addressing the critique of his detractors and affirming his mission as legitimate. The only other Jew to receive a missionary commission in a vision in the temple is Isaiah (Isa 6.1–13). In the vision, Isaiah hears YHWH's voice: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" to which Isaiah responds: "Here am I; send me!" (Isa 6.8). However, Isaiah's mission is to go to Israel. Paul receives a similar vision in the temple, yet Jesus sends him to the Gentiles. As Carl Holladay notes: "A Scripture-minded audience like the crowd gathered in the temple courtyard can easily hear echoes of Isaiah's prophetic commission in Paul's description of his temple vision."<sup>188</sup> Putting all these points from this passage together reinforces the conclusion that the temple is the focal point of both Paul's life and ministry. While following Jesus,

---

<sup>186</sup> Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 35.

<sup>187</sup> Steve Walton, "A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts," 77.

<sup>188</sup> Holladay, *Acts*, 426. On the wider theme of the gentile mission through citations from the Jewish scriptures in Acts, see: James A. Meek, *The Gentile Mission in Old Testament Citations in Acts: Text, Hermeneutic, and Purpose*, LNTS 385 (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

Paul continues to hold the Jerusalem temple in high regard as a place of worship. The temple is also the site where Paul receives his divine commission to undertake his mission among the Gentiles. Thus, it is evident that the temple plays a vital role in Paul's religious and ministerial activities.

In another round between Paul and some of the Jewish leadership in front of Felix the governor, in Caesarea, Tertullus the attorney of the Jewish group accused Paul saying: “He even tried to profane the temple” (Acts 24.6). Paul defends himself in several steps. First, Paul reasserts that he came to Jerusalem to worship God (24.11). He reminds the governor, and the other Jews, that he believes the Jerusalem temple is the right place for worship. Second, Paul emphasizes that he did not argue with anyone while in the temple, nor when he was in the synagogues, nor when he was in Jerusalem generally (24.12). Paul just went to worship in the temple, neither said nor did anything wrong about the temple. Third, Paul declares: “I worship the God of our ancestors, believing everything laid down according to the law or written in the prophets” (24.14). He worships the same God and underscores the fact that it is the same God of the Jews by calling God “God of the fathers” (λατρεύω τῷ πατρίω θεῷ).<sup>189</sup> He also submits to the binding authority of the Jewish law and prophets' scriptures.<sup>190</sup> Fourth, Paul confirms his loyalty to Israel's sacrificial system: “I came to bring alms to my people and to offer sacrifices ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου παρεγενόμενῃ καὶ προσφοράς” (24.17). This is especially important to note since this dissertation is about Jesus's sacrifice in Luke-Acts. *Luke* portrays Paul continuing to offer sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple, even after the death, resurrection,

---

<sup>189</sup> Jacob Jervell says: “The very centre of Luke's theology is his notion about God as the God of Israel. He designates God as the 'God of this people, Israel' (13:17, cf. Luke 1:68; 20:37); 'the God of the [our] fathers' (Acts 3:13; 5:30; 7:32; 22:14; 24:14).” Jervell, *The Theology of Acts*, 18.

<sup>190</sup> While Luke's Paul mentions the two main categories of Jewish scriptures, the Law and the Prophets, he does not mention what came to be known as the Writings. Earlier, Luke pictures Jesus teaching his disciples from “law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms” (Lk 24.44). It is possible that the Psalms here refers to the whole Writings section, or that the Writings section was not fully recognized in first-century Jewish circles. Even the text of the Torah and the Prophets was fluid at this period. See: Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 711; Molly M. Zahn, “Torah, Tradition of,” in *Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, 2 Vols., ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 2:804–806.

*and ascension of Jesus, and even after the pouring of the spirit.*<sup>191</sup> Almsgiving also functioned as sacrifice-offering in the Second Temple period and in Luke-Acts.<sup>192</sup> Fifth, Paul says: “They found me in the temple completing the rite of purification, without any crowd or disturbance” (24.18). Paul simply went into the temple to perform the purification rituals he needed along with his other four fellows. He did not cause any trouble to anyone.

In all his confrontations with this Jewish group, Paul always maintained: “I have in no way committed an offense against the law of the Jews or against the temple” (Acts 25.8). These are words of a pious Jew. In front of King Agrippa, Paul insists: “I have belonged to the most accurate sect of our religion and lived as a Pharisee” (Act 26.5). He does not mean that he stopped being a Pharisee, as he stated earlier in his argument with the Jewish group: “I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees” (23.6).<sup>193</sup> Luke could have easily used these accusations to offer his negative view of the temple if this were his view. It offers him a good opportunity to abandon the role and functionality of the temple. However, the temple’s role stays positive till the very end of Luke’s narrative, where the early followers of Jesus continue to worship, pray, and offer sacrifices as the proper act of worship.

---

<sup>191</sup> Contra Martin Hengel, “The Geography of Palestine in Acts,” in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham, The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 42, who concludes that the early followers of Jesus avoided offering sacrifices in the temple. See also Peter W. L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 296–99.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Kyoung-Jin Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke’s Theology*, JSNTSupp 155 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998); Timothy W. Reardon, “Cleansing through Almsgiving in Luke-Acts: Purity, Cornelius, and the Translation of Acts 15:9,” *CBQ* 78 (2016): 463–82; Matthew Thiessen, “A Worthy Cornelius and Divine Grace: Complicating John Barclay’s Paul and the Gift,” *CBQ* 84 (2022): 462–79.

<sup>193</sup> Cf. Phil. 3.5. On Paul’s Pharisaism, see: Lentz, *Luke’s Portrait of Paul*, 51–56; Dieter Lührmann, “Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition,” *JSNT* 36 (1989): 75–94; J. A. Overman, “κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος: A Short History of Paul’s Pharisaism,” in *Pauline Conversation in Context: Essays in Honor of Calvin J. Roetzel*, ed. J. C. Anderson, P. Sellew, and C. Setzer (Sheffield Academic Press: London, 2002), 180–93; Antonio Pitta, “Paul, The Pharisee, and The Law,” in *Paul’s Jewish Matrix*, ed. Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor, (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), 99–122; Paula Fredriksen, “Paul, The Perfectly Righteous Pharisee,” in *The Pharisees*, ed. Joseph Sievers and Amy-Jill Levine (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021) 112–35.

## Conclusion

For Luke, the temple is the dwelling place of God. As such, it is the place where Jesus belongs and teaches. The salvation of Israel and the Gentiles is announced in the temple, and the mission toward the whole world starts there. In 70 CE, the Romans destroyed the temple, and Luke, according to the scholarly consensus,<sup>194</sup> wrote his two-volume work after the fact. Still, Luke writes about the temple with admiration and reverence, even though it is part of the past. As I will show, the destruction of the second temple did not prevent Jewish writers from thinking and writing about the temple. New creative ideas about the temple were introduced during the Second Temple era. Jewish authors thought about the heavenly temple before and after the second temple's destruction. I will show how Luke follows the same path as those Jewish authors thinking about the temple in heavenly terms. However, before that, we must investigate the most recurrent activity that took place in the Jerusalem temple, namely, offering sacrifices. I turn now to discussing the sacrificial system as the central activity that took place in the Jerusalem temple.

---

<sup>194</sup> See the discussion on the date in Michael Wolter, *The Gospel According to Luke*, Vol. I: Luke 1–9:50, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 11–12. A minority of scholars argue for a pre-70 date for the authorship of Luke-Acts. See: Jonathan Bernier, *Rethinking the Dates of the New Testament: The Evidence for Early Composition* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2022), especially here 35–85.

## Chapter 2: The Priestly Sacrificial System

### Introduction

In Chapter One, I examined the centrality of the Jerusalem temple in Luke-Acts as the sacred location of Jewish worship. Throughout his narrative, Luke shows that the temple is the key location of God's communication with humans, the place for daily worship, and the place where angels from heaven talk to humans on earth on behalf of God. However, the central activity that took place in the temple, and the Dwelling Place (or tent of meeting) prior to the construction of the first temple, was the offering of sacrifices. In order to understand Luke's theology of Jesus's sacrificial death better, we first need to understand what sacrifice is in ancient Jewish thinking and what it is not.<sup>195</sup> Consequently, in this chapter, I will describe the sacrificial system as Leviticus, especially the Priestly source (hereafter P), describes it, and how P envisions its practice, whether in the tent or in the first temple.

Scholars of early Judaism and early Christianity thought about questions that could be grouped into two categories: historical questions and interpretive questions.<sup>196</sup> Some scholars focused on

---

<sup>195</sup> There has been a lot of theorizing about sacrifices in the ancient Mediterranean world generally, and early Jewish sacrifices particularly in different fields. Offering sacrifices is a human phenomenon attested across a wide range of cultures and religions in the ancient world, and even to modern times, thus anthropologists and religious studies scholars like René Girard, Henri Hubert, Marcel Mauss, and others have been attracted to it. Many of these theories, especially those that appeared in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century, focus on the origins of the sacrificial system, either reducing it to a single primitive offering, while researching its meaning and function or just focusing on some sacrifices deemed to be more significant than others. See: René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977); idem, "Generative Scapegoating," in *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, Rene Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*, ed. R. G. Hamerton-Kelly (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1987), 73–105. Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss, "Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice," *Année sociologique* 2 (1899): 29–138. For an evaluation of Hubert and Mauss's theory from an anthropological perspective, see: I. Strenski, "The Social and Intellectual Origins of Hubert and Mauss's Theory of Ritual Sacrifice," in *India and Beyond: Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought*, ed. D. van der Meij (London: Keagan Paul International, 1997), 511–37.

<sup>196</sup> Scholars focused on various streams of evidence for studying sacrifices: archaeological, cultural-comparative, and literary resources. On the scope and limitations of each group, see: Liane M. Feldman, "The Idea and Study of Sacrifice in Ancient Israel," *RC* 14 (2020): 1–14 (2–3); Ziony Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001), 267–349. On the archaeological evidence, see: Glenn M. Schwartz, "Archaeology and Sacrifice," in *Sacred Killing: The Archaeology of Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*, ed.

65



historical questions such as the following.<sup>197</sup> what was the origin(s) of sacrifices? How did sacrifice develop in ancient Israelite society? How did the system as we have it now in Leviticus take its shape? Other scholars focused more on interpretive questions such as the following.<sup>198</sup> What is the meaning of sacrifice in the religion of ancient Israel? What did the Israelites think they were doing when they offered sacrifices? What are the impacts of offering sacrifices on the relationship between YHWH and the worshippers? Jewish scholarship, above all, the work of Jacob Milgrom,<sup>199</sup> attended specifically to the sacrificial terminology to answer these sorts of interpretive questions.

---

Anne M. Porter and Glenn M. Schwartz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 1–32; On comparative studies, see: R. K. Yerkas, *Sacrifices in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (New York: Scribner, 1952).

<sup>197</sup> E.g., R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*, WMANT 24 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967); idem, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift. Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, FRLANT 62 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954); Homo Necans, *Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 32 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972); Josef Drexler, *Die Illusion des Opfers. Ein wissenschaftlicher Überblick über die wichtigsten Opfertheorien ausgehend vom deleuzianischen Polyperspektivismusmodell*, Münchener Ethnologische Abhandlungen 12 (Munich: Anacon-Verlag, 1993); B. Janowski, *Stellvertretung: Alttestamentliche Studien zu einem theologischen Grundbegriff*, SBS 165 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997); Christian A. Eberhart, *Studien zur Bedeutung der Opfer im Alten Testam*, *Verbrennungsriten im kultischen Rahmen*, WMANT 94 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002).

<sup>198</sup> See: Gary A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in the Social and Political Importance*, HSM 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); Frank H. Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time, and Status in the Priestly Theology*, JSOTSupp 91 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); Philip P. Jenson, “The Levitical Sacrificial System,” in *Sacrifices in the Bible*, ed. Roger T. Beckwith and Martin J. Selman (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1995), 25–40; David Janzen, *The Social Meanings of Sacrifices in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings*, BZAW 344 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004); Ithamar Gruenwald, *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*, BRLJ 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Roy Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005); William K. Gilders, *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004); Isabel Cranz, *Atonement and Purification: Priestly and Assyro-Babylonian Perspectives on Sin and its Consequences*, FZLT II 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Jay Sklar, *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*, HBM 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005); Alfred Marx, *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament: Formes et fonctions du culte sacrificiel à Yhwh*, VTSup 105, (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>199</sup> Jacob Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*, SJLA 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1983); idem, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3A (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008); idem, “Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering?” VT 21 (1971): 237–39; idem, *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I: The Encroacher and the Levite—The Term ‘aboda*, University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies 14 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970); idem, “Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly «Picture of Dorian Gray»,” RB 83 (1976), 390–99 (391); idem, “Further on the Expiatory Sacrifices,” JBL 115 (1996): 511–14; idem, *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*, CC (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004). See also Baruch A. Levine, *In The Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*, SJLT 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1974). Other Jewish scholars used mixed approaches. See: Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Services in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

I will focus on the literary description of the sacrificial system as we have it in Lev 1–7

investigating two interpretive questions in this chapter. What does offering sacrifices mean according to the text of Leviticus? And what impact do the sacrifices have on the relationship between YHWH and the worshipper as reflected in the text of Leviticus? As I survey the sacrifices, I will give special attention to the interpretive comments in the text of Leviticus that illuminate the function of the different sacrifices. Additionally, I will survey all five sacrifices in Lev 1–7 without the assumption that the text of Leviticus views one of them as more important than the other. The purpose of this chapter is to understand the sacrificial system, its meaning, and its function within the wider religious context of Israel, in order to understand what Luke means by Jesus’s death as a sacrifice. But before I turn to the sacrificial system in Leviticus, a word about the methodology I follow.

### **The Priestly Sacrificial System in History**

Leviticus 1–7 is the main section on Israel’s sacrificial system in Jewish scriptures. It is a literary product of a circle of priests, experts in sacrificial rites. The section belongs to the Priestly source,<sup>200</sup> which has been identified since the work of Wellhausen.<sup>201</sup> P starts at Gen 1.1, and scholars still debate where it exactly ends, though the inclusion of parts of Numbers would be the minimalist position, while the inclusion of parts from Joshua would be the maximalist position.<sup>202</sup> Scholars also

---

<sup>200</sup> See Baruch Levine, “Leviticus: Its Literary History and Location in Biblical Literature,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, and Sarah Smith Bartlett (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 11–23; Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 196–221. See also the collected articles in Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Farewell to the Priestly Writing? The Current State of the Debate* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022). On the post-exilic date of P, see: Avi Hurvitz, “The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology,” *RB* 81 (1974): 24–56; idem, “Dating the Priestly Source in Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew: A Century after Wellhausen,” *ZATW* 100 (1988): 88–100; idem, “Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of The Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age—A Response to J. Blenkinsopp,” *ZATW* 112 (2000): 180–191; Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing The Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), especially for P, 169–92; Konrad Schmid, “Textual, Historical, Sociological, and Ideological Cornerstones of the Formation of the Pentateuch,” in *The Social Groups Behind the Pentateuch*, ed. Jaeyoung Jeon (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021), 29–54.

<sup>201</sup> See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Edinburgh: Black, 1885; repr., Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).

<sup>202</sup> For an overview of scholarly discussions about where P ends, see Jason M. H. Gaines, *The Poetic Priestly Source* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 282–83; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 31.

debate the status of the Holiness Code (hereafter H), which is a collection of laws related to holiness, which covers Leviticus 17-26 (and, for some scholars, parts of Numbers) within P.<sup>203</sup> Following Liane Feldman's most recent construction of P, I include H as a stratum of P.<sup>204</sup> While H might have originated in a different circle, it seems to have been included as part of P in the time immediately before P's inclusion into the Pentateuch. Regardless, it is significant to note that P is a literary text. Liane Feldman notes, "not only that the legal and ritual materials in the Priestly Narrative are thoroughly literary, but that they were composed as literature. They are not simply repurposed older materials; they are essential components of the story and its various elements. To separate the narrative and the ritual components of the Priestly Narrative is to destroy the internal structure and logic of the story."<sup>205</sup> Hence, the ritual texts are part of a special narrative literary context, where they have a function in the story world of the text.<sup>206</sup> This means that P should not be automatically read as a historical description of the sacrificial performance in ancient Israel, but rather as a narrativized ritual.<sup>207</sup> We are not certain whether the practices that P describes were historically performed before the Second Temple era.<sup>208</sup> As Watts argues, rhetorical analysis shows the sacrificial legislations in P are

---

<sup>203</sup> Cf. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, especially here 96–98, where Knohl argues for the inclusion of some parts of Numbers 25–30 into H. For a brief history of research on H, see: Julia Rhyder, *Centralizing the Cult: The Holiness Legislation in Leviticus 17–26*, FAT 134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 25–64.

<sup>204</sup> See Liane M. Feldman, *The Consuming Fire: The Complete Priestly Source, from Creation to the Promised Land* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2023), which is also the major reconstruction of P that I follow. Some scholars tend to see H as a later redactional layer added to P, while others tend to view the document as an integral part of H. For a fine example of this debate, see the collection of articles in: Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden, eds., *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009); cf. Anthony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 21–90.

<sup>205</sup> Liane M. Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice: Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source*, FAT 141 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 5. Feldman argues that to separate narrative and ritual texts within P, as has been habitual through most traditional scholarship, especially since Martin Noth, "is to destroy the internal structure and logic of the story." (5).

<sup>206</sup> Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice*, 17.

<sup>207</sup> Feldman notes that the literary incorporation of rituals within texts makes them different from performed rituals in real life: "Literary ritual must be understood as something wholly different from practiced ritual. It is not simply a transcription or even a transformation of practiced ritual; it needs to be understood as a separate entity requiring a new mode of interpretation" (Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice*, 195). On the notion of narrativized rituals, see Bryan D. Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*, LHBOTS 480 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 34–72.

<sup>208</sup> By the 1980s, scholars recognized the significance of the literary study of the Pentateuch and abandoned the quest after the historical kernel of the Pentateuch. See: Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic 68

*prescriptive* rather than *descriptive*.<sup>209</sup> The author(s) of P are prescribing how the sacrificial system should work, not describing what happened in the past.<sup>210</sup> According to Watts, readers should listen carefully to the rhetorical persuasive language of Leviticus, rather than look for its core historical kernel.<sup>211</sup> Sacrificial offerings were central to the religious practices among Jewish groups in the

---

Books, 1981; repr. 2011); Joel Rosenberg, “The Garden Story Forward and Backward: The Non-Narrative Dimension of Gen 2–3,” in *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Joel Rosenberg (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), 47–68; Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987); Suzanne Boorer, *The Vision of the Priestly Narrative: Its Genre and Hermeneutics of Time*, AIL (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016).

<sup>209</sup> The conceptualization of ritual texts as prescriptive, rather than descriptive, has been championed in the twentieth century by Baruch Levine. See especially: Baruch A. Levine, “Ugaritic Descriptive Rituals,” *JCS* 17 (1963): 105–11; idem, “The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch,” *JAOS* 85 (1965): 307–18; idem “The Descriptive Ritual Texts from Ugarit: Some Formal and Functional Features of the Genre,” in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O’Connor (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 467–75, especially here 469. However, it should be noted that the descriptive and prescriptive categories have been problematized. To what extent can one say that the text of Lev. 1–7 is prescriptive rather than descriptive? Do we mean the whole text? Or specific references? To complicate it further, is it possible that a text can be both descriptive and prescriptive at the same time? For a critique of the categories, especially within Levine’s work, see: David M. Clemens, *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice*, Vol. I: Ugaritic and Ugarit Akkadian Texts, AOAT 284/1 (Münster: Ugarit- Verlag, 2001), 105–6.

<sup>210</sup> Yitzhaq Feder, though, compares the textualization of the Hittite ritual traditions and the Hebrew Priestly ritual texts and finds similarities that shed more light on the function of ritual texts from both worlds. Feder concludes: “The similarity in form, content, and function between the two corpora suggests to me that they derive from a similar Sitz im Leben, as aids to ritual practice.” Feder suggests that the textualization of the sacrificial system as preserved in Lev 1–7 might have originated during the exile, to preserve the practices from being lost or forgotten. Feder argues: “These instructions were written down during the exilic period (or soon thereafter) when the rituals were no longer practiced to ensure the preservation of these traditions... one cannot rule out a more ideological motivation, whereby the detailed instructions of Lev 1–7 were intended to stress that the ritual procedures must conform to the divinely revealed instructions.” The evidence on which Feder bases his conclusions is the casuistic structure of the ritual texts, the chronologically arranged ritual instructions, lists of paraphernalia, and the laconic references to the component rites of the ritual in both sets of texts. See: Yitzhaq Feder, “The Textualization of Priestly Ritual in Light of Hittite Sources,” in *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch: A Systematic and Comparative Approach*, eds. Christophe Nihan and Julia Rhyder, (University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021), 121–150 (143, 145).

<sup>211</sup> See: James W. Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); idem, *Understanding the Pentateuch as a Scripture* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 242–43. On the functionality of the rhetoric of the law generally in the Hebrew Jewish scriptures, see: James W. Watts, *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch*, BS 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Watts approaches sacrifices as part of a larger persuasive discourse, by asking the question: “Who was trying to persuade whom of what by writing these texts?” (*Ritual and Rhetoric*, xv). Watts argues that Leviticus is the creation of an Aaronide priestly circle who were seeking to establish and reinforce their legitimacy and authority. Hence, the first seven chapters of Leviticus were not put together simply to provide a picture of the correct ritual performance of sacrificial offerings, but to persuade the readers of the normative authority of the system as the product of the Aaronide priesthood. According to Watts, some of the sacrifices were already existing when the Aaronide priests put this stratum of P, while they introduced new forms of sacrifices, like the purification and reparations offerings. The authors and/or redactors of Leviticus were seeking to gain acceptance of their new sacrifices by emphasizing the importance of sin and guilt. Watts offer further evidence from the incident of Nadab and Abihu, Aaron’s sons, to support his conclusion that Aaronide priests sought complete obedience. The mistake of Nadab and Abihu is simply that they followed different instructions; offering “strange” fire (p. 107). The idea that P is the product of Aaronide

Second Temple period,<sup>212</sup> especially as those groups gradually viewed the Torah as an authoritative text.<sup>213</sup> My claim is as follows: *Different early Jewish groups viewed the textualized Levitical*

---

priestly circle dominated P scholarship since Wellhausen. Watts refined the case for this historical claim, offering further evidence based on P's persuasive rhetoric. Roy E. Gane, however, criticizes Watts's approach, making a case that there are traces of ten different didactic strategies in Leviticus, which Gane sees as the key role of the final form of the text. According to Gane, the text's goal is to educate its readers, presumably, how to perform the ritual action. For the history of the idea of an Aronide priestly agenda behind Leviticus, see: Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 404–5; Richard E. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: Summit, 1987; repr., New York: HarperOne, 1997), 188; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 13. For the criticism of the idea, see: Roy E. Gane, “Didactic Logic and the Authorship of Leviticus,” in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*, ed. Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen, RBS 82 (Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 197–221; idem, “Was Leviticus Composed by Aaronide Priests to Justify their Cultic Monopoly?” in *Exploring the Composition of the Pentateuch*, ed. L. S. Baker Jr., Kenneth Bergland, Felipe A. Masotti, and A. Rahel Wells, BBRSup 27 (University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2020), 195–212.

<sup>212</sup> Wesley Bergen notes: “We know that sacrifices did take place in ancient Israel over many centuries, but we have no firm evidence that Leviticus 1–7 was seen as a handbook for the performance of these rituals.” See: Wesley J. Bergen, *Reading Ritual: Leviticus in Postmodern Culture*, JSOTSup 417 (T&T Clark: London, 2005), 110.

<sup>213</sup> By authoritative, I do not mean the modern religious notion of close-ended canonical status. Rather, I mean the open-ended appreciation of a wide number of texts. Due to space limitations, I will not offer comprehensive evidence supporting the authoritative status of the Torah in the Second Temple period. However, the rewriting of Torah books and sections in the second temple literature shows evidence of the authoritative status of the Torah during this period. Jubilees and the Temple Scroll are representative examples to this phenomena. Another document that is especially relevant to Leviticus is the Words of Moses (1Q22), which rewrites the Sabbath and Jubilees legislations based on Lev 25.1–7, harmonized with Deut 15.1–11. For further discussion, see: Jonathan Kaplan, “Leviticus and the Rewriting of the Torah in 1QWords of Moses (1Q22),” in *Torah in Early Jewish Imaginations*, eds. Ariel Feldman and Timothy J. Sandoval, FAT 171 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023), 111–24. On the meaning of authoritative texts in early Judaism, especially Leviticus, see: Robert A. Kugler, “Rethinking the Notion of ‘Scripture’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Leviticus as A Test Case,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, eds. Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, Sarah S. Bartel, VTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 342–57. On the evidence of the rewritten scriptures, see: Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961); Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); Steven D. Fraade, “The Temple Scroll as Rewritten Bible: When Genres Bend,” in *Hā-ʾīsh Mōsheh: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, ed. Binyamin Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George J. Brooke, STDJ 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 136–5; Ariel Feldman, “1Q22 (Words of Moses),” in Ariel Feldman and Liora Goldman, *Rewritten Scripture: Law and Liturgy*, ed. Devorah Dimant, BZAW 449 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 225–61; Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Period Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020). On the normativity of the Torah as an identity marker in early Judaism, see: Stephen Westerholm, “Whence ‘The Torah’ of Second Temple Judaism,” in *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period: The Debate over Torah and Nomos in Post-biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, eds. Peter Richardson and Stephen Westerholm, SCJ 4 (Waterloo, ON: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991), 19–44; Martha M. Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the Book of Jubilees,” in *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond*, TSAJ 151 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 49–60; Bernd U. Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter, eds., *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of ‘Torah’ in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 163 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Markus Witte, Jens Schröter, and Verena M. Lepper, eds., *Torah, Temple, Land: Constructions of Judaism in Antiquity*, TSAJ 184 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021); *Torah: Functions, Meanings, and Diverse Manifestations in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. ); William M. Schniedewind, Jason M. Zurawski, and Gabriele Boccaccini, EJJ 56 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021).

*sacrificial system as an integral part of their religious performance, and Luke shares this view.*<sup>214</sup> Jews during the Second Temple era, offered sacrifices that are described in Leviticus. There is evidence from prophetic literature that, during the Babylonian exile, even when there was no temple, grain and incense offerings (ומנחה ולבונה) were still offered (Jer. 41.1–5). Returnees from the Babylonian exile also offered sacrifices, though they abandoned building the temple, to which Haggai objected (Hag 2.14–19; cf. Zech 7.1–3). Upon the completion and dedication of the second temple (516 BCE), the temple cult was reinstated, and purification offerings (חטאה) were offered on behalf of all Israel (Ezra 6.17), and the Passover sacrifice (הפסח) was offered as part of the celebration (6.19).<sup>215</sup> Jewish texts from the Second Temple period demonstrate knowledge of sacrifices, including details that occur also in P. The *Letter of Aristeas* attests to the ascension offering and the pleasing odor ascending from it being offered in the temple (*Arist.* 87). The letter notes the offering must be without blemish (a fact that Philo also shares, cf. *Spec. Leg.* 1.166) and mentions the cut sacrificial portions of the flesh (92–93). Philo sets out the whole sacrificial system and interprets it in a symbolic way that appeals to his Hellenistic context (*Spec. Leg.* 1.161–275). Philo situates the Levitical sacrificial system in the life of Moses, which shows that he bases it on Leviticus: “Moses, having promulgated these and similar laws about the priests, proceeds to enact others concerning animals, as to what beasts are suitable for sacrifice” (*Spec. Leg.* 1.161). Philo knows the daily, weekly, monthly, and festival offerings (1.169). Philo also knows the fragrant incense offerings (1.171), and names both the whole-burnt offering, and the purification offering (1.194–199), both from P.<sup>216</sup> Josephus also situates the sacrificial system within the law, giving details of the cutting, cleaning, and salting of different sacrifices (*Ant.* 3.224–236).

---

<sup>214</sup> For full survey of literary and archaeological evidence for this claim, see: Yonatan Adler, *The Origins of Judaism: An Archaeological-Historical Reappraisal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022).

<sup>215</sup> S. Japhet, “The Temple of the Restoration Period: Reality and Ideology,” in S. Ahituv and A. Mazar, eds., *The History of Jerusalem: The Biblical Period*, (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2000), 345–82 [Hebrew].

<sup>216</sup> On Philo’s interpretation of the sacrificial system, see: William K. Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifices: Its Nature and Function (According to Philo),” in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, eds. Jennifer W. Knust and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 94–105.

Josephus mentions that one Passover he witnessed the offering of 256,500 lambs! (*J.W.*, 4.9.3). It will be difficult to survey all the evidence for the priestly sacrificial system in the second temple period. However, as I examine P's sacrificial system in order to illuminate Luke's position on Jesus's death, it is of utmost importance to look at Luke's view of P's sacrificial system.

### **P's Sacrificial System in Luke**

There is compelling evidence that Luke knows some form of the book of Leviticus or at least some form of the Priestly sacrificial system. As I discussed in the last chapter, Luke has a special interest in Jewish priesthood. He begins his gospel in the temple, with Zechariah, a priest from the priestly tribe of Abijah (cf. 1 Chron. 24.10), chosen to do the service (Lk 1.5–10). Luke also notes that Zechariah's wife, Elizabeth, is a daughter of Aaron, thus belonging to the priestly bloodline.<sup>217</sup> Luke mentions that the casting of the lots resulted in choosing Zechariah to offer the incense offering in the temple (cf. *m. Tamid* 5.2–6.3). P regulates that the incense offering should accompany the whole burnt offering (Exod 30.1-9), which is to be offered twice a day (Lev 1; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.64–67). Luke shows knowledge of both offerings, which confirms not only his knowledge of P's sacrificial system but also that this sacrificial system was operative in the Jerusalem temple before its destruction.

Another good place that demonstrates Luke's knowledge of some form of the Priestly sacrificial system is the presentation of Jesus in the Jerusalem temple (Lk 2.22–24). First, Luke knows the Law of Moses, which defines the duration of the postpartum purification. The only place in the Torah that defines the postpartum purification duration for the mother who gave birth to a son is Leviticus 12. According to this law, the mother is unclean for seven days, then on the eighth day the son should be circumcised, then the mother remains unclean for thirty-three more days (Lev. 12.2–3). During this period: “She shall not touch any holy thing, or come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed” (Lev. 12.4). If the newborn is a daughter, the mother remains unclean for

---

<sup>217</sup> According to Exod 6.23, Aaron's wife's name is Elizabeth too.

eighty days in total (12.5). In both cases, when the purification duration has been completed, P requires the following: “She shall bring to the priest at the entrance of the tent of meeting a lamb in its first year for a burnt offering, and a pigeon or a turtledove for a purification offering” (Lev 12.6). Thus, the mother should offer the two offerings, then the priest shall offer them as *kipper* for her (12.7). However, if the mother is poor and cannot afford the sheep, P states that. “She shall take two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a burnt offering and the other for a purification offering” (12.8). The priest then offers the two turtledoves or the two pigeons, one as a burnt offering, and the other as a purification offering. Luke says about Mary and Joseph. “They offered a sacrifice according to what is stated in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons” (Lk 2.24). First, Luke confirms that this is what is written in the law of the Lord (τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου). Second, Luke quotes Lev. 12.8, which implies that Mary and Joseph were poor, so they opted to offer the pair of turtledoves or the two pigeons, one for the purification offering, and the other for the burnt offering. Based on this incident, it is safe to conclude that Luke knows some form of Leviticus or at least its sacrificial system, that P’s sacrificial system was operative in the Jerusalem temple in the first century, and that Luke adheres to the authority of P’s sacrificial system.<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>218</sup> There is external evidence that supports the probability of Luke’s knowledge of Leviticus’s laws; mainly the text form of Leviticus that we find in manuscripts from the Judean desert and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 4Q23 (4QLev-Num<sup>a</sup>), ca. middle to the late second century BCE, though fragmentary, preserves a continuous text that includes portions of H (Lev 18.16–21; 19.3–8; 24.11–12) where P texts precede and follow it. 4Q24 (4QLev<sup>b</sup>), ca. middle of the first century BCE, shows P text (Lev 25.28–29) following H text (Lev 24:2–23) immediately. Several other manuscripts show similar continuity between what is perceived to be P and H texts, such as 1QpaleoLev-Numa; 1QpaleoLev<sup>b</sup>; 2QpaleoLev; 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup>; 4QLev<sup>c</sup>; 4QLev<sup>d</sup>; 4QLev<sup>e</sup>; 4QLev<sup>g</sup>; 6QpaleoLev; 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>; 11QLev<sup>b</sup> all dating before the first century C.E., when Luke supposedly wrote his double work. Evidence from the Old Greek translation, commonly known as the Septuagint, shows a continuous text of Leviticus that incorporates both P and H together before the first century BCE. While manuscripts that pre-date Luke does not represent direct evidence that he knew Leviticus, the combination with the lack of any other sacrificial system, and the internal witness from Luke’s text, makes it plausible that Luke might have known some form of the laws in the Levitical system. See Robert A. Kugler, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *Leviticus at Qumran: Text and Interpretation*, VTSup 173 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 1–9; Emanuel Tov, “4QLev<sup>c,e,g</sup> (4Q25, 26a, 26b),” in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 257–261; Eibert Tigchelaar, “A Partial Reedition of 4Q26a (4QLeviticus<sup>e</sup>): A New Fragment and a Reinterpretation,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 234–239. On the LXX manuscripts in Qumran for Leviticus, see: Eugene C. Ulrich, “The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumrân, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut),” in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William* 73



While one cannot firmly conclude the form of Leviticus that Luke knew, there is a plausible probability that Luke knew some form of the Priestly sacrificial system. I will now survey the different sacrifices and situate them within the Priestly *kipper* theology.

### **Literary Description of P's Sacrificial System**

YHWH communicated the details of the sacrificial system to Moses on the day of the consecration of the tent, immediately after YHWH manifested his presence in the tent (Exod 40.35). Leviticus begins with YHWH calling Moses and speaking to him from the tent (Lev 1.1). YHWH commands Moses to consecrate the tent and the serving priesthood on the same day of the erection of the tent (Exod 40.9–15). The consecration of the tent and the priesthood happens in Lev 8.1–5, thus it seems that YHWH revealed the sacrificial system to Moses on the same day of the erection of the tent. This is significant as the ministry of the sacrifices will be the main worship activity in which Aaron and his children will be involved within the tent.

The sacrificial system includes five sacrifices. the ascension sacrifice (or the whole-burnt sacrifice; Lev 1), the grain offering (or the cereal offering; Lev 2), the well-being sacrifice (or the peace sacrifice; Lev 3), the purification sacrifice (Lev 4.1–5.13), and the reparation sacrifice (or the guilt sacrifice; Lev 5.14–6.8). Following the details of the sacrifices, YHWH gives Moses the regulations for the priests on how to handle the different parts of the sacrificial animals.

Scholars have offered different interpretations of sacrificial offerings throughout the last two centuries, but some details are agreed upon in the sacrificial system. For instance, all sacrifices entail the offering of an animal that is being slaughtered by the worshipper, with the only exception being the

---

Wevers on *His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. A. Pietersma and C. Cox (Mississauga, ON: Benben, 1984), 71–8; idem, “The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of their Value,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, eds. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 49–80; Sarianna Metso and Eugene Ulrich, “The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, eds. Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugel, and Sarah Smith Bartel, VTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 256–57.

grain offering, which could either be offered on its own (as in Num 5.15) or offered accompanying animal sacrifices (as in Lev 23.13; Num 15.1–12). The blood of the animal sacrifice is to be applied to the objects that need to be purified, depending on the kind of sacrifice and its purpose (e.g., inside the tent). Priests share in the consumption of most sacrifices, and worshippers are not allowed to consume their sacrifices, *except* for the peace offering.

Another set of details that are explained in Lev. 1–7 is the ritual steps of offering the animal sacrifices, which could be summarized as follows: (1) the worshipper brings their animal toward the Dwelling Place, (2) lays their hand(s) on it, (3) and slaughters it, (4) then the priest takes the blood and applies it where it should be applied in the Dwelling Place, (5) cuts the animal into parts and arranges the fats on the altar to burn it, and finally (6) prepares any edible meat and gets rid of the other remains. There are variations in the details of each sacrifice (e.g., compare the descriptions of offering the purification offering in Lev 4 and Lev 5.1–13), and of course, these details do not apply to the grain offering. However, the same pattern remains operative in all sacrifices. In fact, the similarities between all sacrifices are one reason for the continuous debates on the meaning of sacrifices. Moreover, when we discuss the meaning of these sacrifices, it should be clear what era exactly we mean. These texts went through several redactional stages as they were transmitted through centuries. One interpretation of sacrifices at one redactional stage could differ from another interpretation at another redactional stage.<sup>219</sup> I will discuss the meaning of sacrifices from the point of view of the final form of P which Luke knew.

### **Ascension Offering (Lev 1.2–17)**

The first sacrifice we see in P is the עלה, which means “that which ascends,” implying that the whole offering is transformed into smoke that ascends to heaven (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 3.225). Hence, I

---

<sup>219</sup> In fact, we do not know what other non-priestly Israelite groups might have initially thought about sacrifices, or even later down through time.

translate it here as the *ascension* offering. What is the meaning and purpose of the ascension offering? While being the first listed sacrifice could be merely coincidental, it could also signify that it is the preeminent sacrifice in the Priestly sacrificial system. During main festivals, it is the main sacrificial offering. The ascension offering was offered at different times and for different purposes, but one form of it has been offered on a *regular* basis in the temple, every morning and evening, and came to be known as the *Tamid* (Exod 29:38–42; Num 28:1–8). Milgrom also argues that עלה is the earliest form of sacrifice as it appears in the earliest resources (e.g., Gen 8.20; Judg 6.26).<sup>220</sup>

The worshipper should offer a male from the cattle, the sheep, or goats (Lev. 1.1, 5, 10–13) or, for the poor, a male bird (Lev 1.14–17), without blemish. The worshipper should bring the appropriate animal to the entrance gate of the tent, and it should be offered “for acceptance on your behalf” (Lev 1.3). The worshipper then lays one hand on the head of the animal. P states: “It shall be acceptable on your behalf” (Lev 1.4). This is the first interpretive comment, appearing twice in a brief section to emphasize its significance, that we see about sacrifices. the ascension sacrifice functions for the acceptance of the worshipper before YHWH. Leviticus 1:4 also briefly mentions that the purpose of the ascension offering is “as *kipper* for him” לכפר עליו.<sup>221</sup> Nowhere else in P do we hear that the ascension offering’s purpose is to effect *kipper*, yet P might be expecting readers to understand that this *kipper* function is implicit.<sup>222</sup> It is possible that the ascension offering effects *kipper* in the purification process of the parturient’s purification, where the priest offers both, the ascension offering and the purification offering to effect *kipper*. והקריבו לפני יהוה וכפר עליה (Lev 12. 7. Cf. Lev 14.20). In Job 1.5 we learn that the purpose of the ascension offering is effect *kipper* for any sins, which might lead to the conclusion

---

<sup>220</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 174.

<sup>221</sup> I will discuss the meaning of *kipper* below in the context of the purification offering.

<sup>222</sup> Andrew Rillera classifies the *regular* ascension offering as a non-*kipper* sacrifice, but never discusses Lev. 1:4. See Andrew R. Rillera, *Lamb of the Free: Recovering the Varied Sacrificial Understandings of Jesus’s Death* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2023), 12, 90.

that the ascension offering is in fact the earliest form of sacrifice in Israel, and it is the one from which other sacrifices were developed (cf. Job 42.8).

The animal then is to be slaughtered, probably by the worshiper, though we are never told that, then the priests take the blood, and dash it against all the sides of the altar which is located in the outer courtyard by the entrance of the tent (1.5). The blood flows into the gutter surrounding the altar and drains into the ground. Though there is no explanation given for pouring the blood on the altar, it is the application to the altar that signifies that it belongs to YHWH. Following this step, the priests place the animal parts on the altar fire after arranging the wood on the altar (1.7–9). The whole animal is to be burnt, with the exception of the hides of the larger animals (1.6, 7.8) and the removal of the crop of the birds with its contents (Lev 1.16). The sacrificed animal is described as “an offering by fire,” which is best understood as a *metamorphosis* process.<sup>223</sup> This process means that the fire does not just destroy the animal, but also transforms the animal into a new ethereal essence, the smoke. This smoke ascends from the earthly realm to the heavenly realm where YHWH will smell as a “pleasing odor.” The idea of the rising smoke exists in the Torah since Noah’s sacrifice, where YHWH “smelled the pleasing odor” (Gen 8.21). There, the effect of YHWH’s smelling the odor is that YHWH said, “I will never again curse the ground because of humankind.” Thus, the sacrificial language articulates the effect of the sacrifice on YHWH: it will please YHWH and render the worshiper acceptable before YHWH.

These interpretive comments on the function of this sacrifice, to please YHWH so that the worshiper may be accepted before YHWH, contribute to the meaning of this offering in P. The sacrifice produces acceptance (וּנְרִיצָה לוֹ), which is the goal of *kipper* (note the purposeful ל in לִכְפֹּר עָלָיו). P uses the technical term קָרְבַּן and the verb קָרַב to communicate the idea of coming closer to YHWH in the sacrificial act. The function of the offering is to bring YHWH and the worshiper closer to each other.

---

<sup>223</sup> Christian Eberhart, *The Sacrifice of Jesus: Understanding Atonement Biblically* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018), 67.

YHWH and the worshipper, then, belong to different worlds and need to meet at some place. The sacrifice brings both parties closer to each other.

The climax of the rites is the burning of the sacrificial animal parts. The burning rite produces a pleasing odor, which attracts YHWH to the worshipper. Later on, when other sacrifices effecting *kipper* were introduced, the ascension offering might have ceased to be seen as primarily effecting *kipper* as we see in P. However, as it stands in the sacrificial system of P, the ascension offering is more of a gift to YHWH. Num 15.3 lists the ascension offering as an optional sacrifice that the worshipper offers out of a free will decision. The *kipper* sacrifices were obligatory to deal with impurity and sin as I will discuss below. Yet it is still significant to note that at some point, the ascension offering did effect *kipper* in the Priestly sacrificial system. L. Michael Morales argues that the ascension offering was the center of Israel's sacrificial system.<sup>224</sup> It is the first offering that sums up the whole cultic action of *kipper*.<sup>225</sup> The ascension offering plays a prominent role in Israel's life. Beginning with Noah and Abraham, the offering is pictured as the only sacrifice they could offer. In Exodus, the ascension offering is depicted as essential to Israel's worship (10.25). The offering should be offered day and night for the daily service at the tent; thus, all other offerings were somehow incorporated into it. Morales summarizes the significance of the ascension offering as if "the daily life of Israel was lived out within the context of the flames of these ascension offerings."<sup>226</sup> Two aspects contribute to the meaning of the ascension offering. First, it is wholly consumed on the altar, which might symbolize self-denial and total submission to YHWH.<sup>227</sup> The ascension offering shows the selfless surrender to YHWH.<sup>228</sup> The second aspect is the ascensional perspective of the offering. Thus, the offering is not

---

<sup>224</sup> L. Michael Morales, "Atonement in Ancient Israel: The Whole Burning Offering as Central to Israel's Cult," in *So Great a Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*, ed. Jon C. Laansma, George H. Guthrie, and Cynthia L. Westfall (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 27–40.

<sup>225</sup> James W. Watts, "'ōlāh: The Rhetoric of Burnt Offerings," *VT* 56 (2006): 125–37 (126).

<sup>226</sup> Morales, "Atonement in Ancient Israel," 29.

<sup>227</sup> Morales, "Atonement in Ancient Israel," 34.

<sup>228</sup> Morales, "Atonement in Ancient Israel," 35.

destroyed on the altar but etherealized to ascend in smoke to heaven. This is what Morales calls the “ascension theology” which lies at the heart of Israel’s religion.<sup>229</sup> Anticipating the treatment of Jesus’s sacrificial death in the last chapter, Luke uses this ascension-sacrifice theology in his presentation of Jesus’s death, resurrection, and ascension.

### **The Grain Offering (Lev 2.1–16)**

The grain offering appears in Lev 2.1–16, and it is essentially called מנחה, which means “offering.” The same root could be used to mean tribute, but in a cultic context, it is an offering that consists of vegetables, not animals (hence, no blood rituals). The worshipper should offer choice flour, that is, sifted grain, not ground fine, all baked into unleavened cakes, while the worshipper pours oil on it, and adds frankincense to the mix. The worshipper brings this mixture to the priests, who take a handful of it, and place the portion on the altar fire, which turns “into smoke on the altar, an offering by fire of pleasing odor to the Lord” (2.2). The expression “offering by fire” appears again in v. 3. The priests should keep a portion to themselves which they consume. In contrast to the ascension offering, the grain offering is not wholly burnt, and we begin to see the idea of an eaten offering with the grain offering. Clearly, the fact that the priests must eat a portion of the offering indicates that the offering is food. Humans participate in the sacrificial meal. YHWH also smells the pleasing odor of the frankincense, which attracts YHWH to the worshipper and the sacrifice. Yet YHWH’s attraction to the offering might also mean that YHWH participates in the meal. After all, all offerings are food, and the worshippers might have perceived YHWH sharing the sacrificial meal with them.

P adds an interpretive comment to the grain offering, which is the “memorial” portion (אזכרה) of the offering (Lev 2.2). Milgrom does not find it easy to determine which meaning is intended, but takes the notion as “referring to the fact that the entire cereal offering should really go up in smoke... in

---

<sup>229</sup> Morales, “Atonement in Ancient Israel,” 36.

other words, it is a token portion.”<sup>230</sup> The grain offering of the suspected adulteress wife is also called the “grain offering of remembrance” (מנחת זכרון; Num 5.15), where the iniquity is to be remembered. Another possibility could be that the memorial is an invitation from the worshipper to YHWH to remember the worshipper by means of the offering.<sup>231</sup> The worshipper, after all, is the one who is seeking YHWH’s favor and acceptance.

### **The Well-being Offering (Lev 3.1–17)**

The well-being offering is also called the peace offering, and the rituals of the offering appear in Lev 3.1–17. This offering could be a male or female animal from the herd, and just like the ascension offering, it must be “without blemish.” The worshipper should lay their hand on the head of the animal, and slaughter it by the entrance gate of the tent. Just like the ascension offering, the priests should dash the blood against all the sides of the altar. This offering is an “offering by fire” to YHWH, and the priests shall arrange the parts of the animal on the fire, beside the ascension offering on the wood, to produce a pleasing odor to YHWH. The animal could also be a sheep or a goat. The regulations of the sacrifice that YHWH gives to Moses highlights that all the fat belong to YHWH; no one should eat from the fat throughout all generations (3.17). Lev 7 shows that worshippers could actually eat other parts of the sacrifice (Lev 7.11–36). This is the only sacrifice in which the worshipper partakes in eating the sacrifice. From its name, זבח שלמים, the purpose of this sacrifice is to bring and maintain peace, most probably between YHWH and the worshipper, which is fully represented in the sacrifice as a meal. Both YHWH and the worshipper partake in the festive meal together. The fat of the sacrificed animal is the core gift that is given to YHWH on the altar, probably because it was considered the richest part. The worshipper who partakes in the sacrificial meal has to be careful, as there are dangers when the worshipper partakes in the meal. For instance, the worshipper has only two days to eat the

---

<sup>230</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 181.

<sup>231</sup> Eberhart, *The Sacrifice of Jesus*, 78.

sacrificial meat, and on the third day the worshipper should burn the rest (7.17). If the worshipper eats the rest on the third day, his sacrifice will not be acceptable, the sacrifice would be an abomination, and the worshipper would incur guilt (7.18). The sacrificial flesh also could be contaminated if it touches any unclean object (7.19), in which case it should be burned. The worshipper who participates in the sacrificial meal must be clean, otherwise, the worshipper could be cut off from their kin tribe (7.20–21). Finally, eating bloody meat would result in the cutting off of the person (7.26).

There are different types of well-being offerings (Lev 7.11–21). They could be offered as thanksgiving, where the worshipper thanks YHWH for blessings and peace. They could also be votive sacrifices, where the worshipper offers the sacrifice out of their free will. They could be offered during significant events like the ordination to the priesthood, the consecration of the tent, or the inauguration of the tent (Lev 9.4, 18, 22). In each case, the sacrifice should be accompanied by unleavened cakes, unleavened wafers, and oil (cf. Num 6.17; 15.8–10).

### The Purification Offering (4.2–5.13)

The purification offering (חטאת) is one of the *kipper* sacrifices that remove impurities.<sup>232</sup> The Hebrew term חטאת has usually been translated as “sin offering.”<sup>233</sup> However, Jacob Milgrom convincingly argues that חטאת is often offered in non-sinful situations, like recovery from childbirth (Lev 12.6–7), the completion of the Nazirite vow (Num 6.13–14), and the dedication of the new altar

---

<sup>232</sup> On the purification offering, see: Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, *A Study of Hata' and Hatta't in Leviticus 4-5*, FAT II/2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); idem, *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); Alfred Marx, “Sacrifice pour les péchés ou rites de passage? Quelques réflexions sur la fonction du ḥaṭṭā't,” *RB* 96 (1989): 27–48; Noam Zohar, “Repentance and Purification: The Significance and Semantics of Ḥaṭṭā'th in the Pentateuch” *JBL* 107 (1988): 609–18; Bradley H. McLean, “The Interpretation of the Levitical Sin Offering and the Scapegoat” *SR* 20 (1991): 345–56; Gary A. Anderson, “The Interpretation of the Purification Offering חטאת in the Temple Scroll (11QTemple) and Rabbinic Literature,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 17–35; John Dennis, “The Function of the חטאת Sacrifice in the Priestly Literature: An Evaluation of the View of Jacob Milgrom,” *ETL* 78 (2002): 108–29; Christophe Lemardelé, “Le sacrifice de purification: un sacrifice ambigu?” *VT* 52 (2002): 284–89; John Nolland, “Sin, Purity, and the חטאת Offering,” *VT* 65 (2015): 606–20; Caio Peres, “Bloodless ‘Atonement’: An Exegetical, Ritual, and Theological Analysis of Leviticus 5:11–13,” *JHebS* 20 (2020): 1–36

<sup>233</sup> Feder still uses the name “sin offering” in his writings.



(Lev 8.15). In Milgrom's words, הטאת "is prescribed for persons and objects who cannot possibly have sinned."<sup>234</sup> Understanding הטאת as a purification offering whose goal is to restore purification situates it well within similar offerings from the ancient Near Eastern context. According to Milgrom: "Now it is possible to see this sacrifice against its true ancient Near Eastern setting. Israel was part of a cultic continuum which abounded in purifications both of persons and buildings, especially sanctuaries."<sup>235</sup> According to Milgrom, then, the proper understanding of הטאת reveals how this sacrificial offering should be understood as purifying the sanctuary, not sinners.<sup>236</sup>

The purification of the sanctuary is accomplished by the blood manipulation. Yet what is the function of the blood manipulation rite? It must be noted that the text does not explain the function of the blood ritual. There seem to be two distinctive rites here. First, the priests shall offer the blood (הקריבו), then sprinkle (זרקו) the blood on the altar. While it is fashionable in scholarship to interpret the meaning of blood manipulation in different sacrifices based on Lev 17.11 ("For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you for making *kipper* for your lives on the altar, for, as life, it is the blood that makes *kipper*"), the passage belongs to the later redactional layer, H, and thus represents a later interpretation of the meaning of the blood manipulation rituals. William Gilders, instead, sees a series of connections through uninterpreted gestures: the worshipper is connected to the animal through the hand pressing gesture, the animal is connected to the altar through its blood, the altar belongs to

---

<sup>234</sup> Jacob Milgrom, "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering?" VT 21 (1971): 237–39 (237).

<sup>235</sup> Ibid, 239.

<sup>236</sup> Other cultures around Israel focused on the sinner's purification, not the sanctuary or the temple. For instance, Šurpu, the Assyro-Babylonian document of purification incantations, concentrates on the sinner's purification through a complicated process. Isabel Cranz investigates the ritual objects, activity, and space in Šurpu. In the ancient near eastern context, sin and guilt have been viewed and represented as a physical substance. Sin leaves its scars on the sinner's body, so water, taken out of a well in the temple, is necessary to purify the sinner. In addition to water, grain has been used as a gift-giving, and frankincense was burnt to attract the gods. These ritual actions occur in specific ritual places, like subterranean sweet water ocean, the vast seas, and the high mountains. These places were used so that the evil substance could be disposed to remote areas, away from the inhabitant community. Thus, Šurpu exorcists focused on purifying the sinner and heal his body from sin's physical consequences. Cranz's work reveals that ancient near eastern cultures knew the difference between sanctuaries' purification and sinners' purification. These two categories were not mixed but differentiated carefully. Thus, when P seems to focus on the sanctuary's purification, then P means it. See: Cranz, *Atonement and Purification*, 68–115.

YHWH, thus the worshipper is connected to YHWH.<sup>237</sup> All the cultic actions in this series have the same goal, according to Gilders, which is indexing a relationship between the worshipper and YHWH. However, Gilders does not explain the nature of the relationship between YHWH and the worshipper, or the mechanics of how the blood ritual establishes that connection between YHWH and the worshipper. Perhaps this is the reason why the author(s) of H added Lev 17.10–11.<sup>238</sup> As I have shown above, Luke probably would have known some form of the laws included in both P and H, thus it seems plausible to conclude that for Luke, the blood manipulation ritual effects *kipper*. Lev 17.10–11 says: “If anyone of the house of Israel or of the aliens who reside among them eats any blood, I will set my face against that person who eats blood and will cut that person off from the people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you for making *kipper* for your lives on the altar, for, as life, it is the blood that makes *kipper*. Therefore, I have said to the Israelites, ‘No person among you shall eat blood, nor shall any alien who resides among you eat blood.’” Yet what does it mean that the blood makes *kipper* (כִּי־הַדָּם הוּא בִּנְפֶשׁ יִכַּפֵּר)? To answer this question, we need to understand first the meaning of *kipper*.

The Piel of the verb *kipper* (כָּבַר) has produced a long and complicated history of discussion among scholars.<sup>239</sup> Initially, *kipper* has been associated with the Arabic term *Kafara*, meaning to hide.

---

<sup>237</sup> William K. Gilders, *Blood Rituals in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 78–84. Most recently, James Greenberg argued similarly that there is an unbroken chain of physical touching, from the worshiper to the animal to the altar, and YHWH is finally reached through the pleasing aroma. Greenberg notes: “the sacrificial remedy requires an unbroken chain of physical touch between the offerer and the altar, mediated by the priest using the sacrificial animal’s flesh and blood... By creating an unbroken chain of physical touch between the offerer and the altar, YHWH forgives the offerer, and his anger is appeased.” Greenberg finds an identification between the altar and YHWH, which then creates protection to the worshiper from YHWH’s anger. See: James A. Greenberg, *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus: The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited* (University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2019), 33–34.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Baruch J. Schwartz, “The Prohibitions Concerning ‘Eating’ the Blood in Leviticus 17,” in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, ed. Gary A. Anderson, Saul M. Olyan, JSOTSup 125 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 34–66.

<sup>239</sup> For a history of the research on *kipper*, see: Bernd Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur priesterschriftlichen Sühnetheologie*, WMANT 55 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), especially here 15–26.

Usually, sacrifices have been taken to create a cover for sins, so YHWH cannot see them anymore.<sup>240</sup>

Scholars, however, have observed a connection between the Hebrew כָּבַר (in its Piel form) and the Akkadian *kappuru* (in its D-stem form), which basically means “to wipe off” or “remove by wiping.” Hence, Gilders concludes: “The basic meaning of *kpr* is almost certainly ‘wipe’.”<sup>241</sup> Thus Gilders translates the verb as “effecting removal.” Milgrom notes the parallelism in אֶל־תִּכְפֹּר עַל־עוֹנָם וְחַטָּאתָם “do not *kipper* their guilt and do not wipe off their sin” (Jer, 18.23), where *kipper* is paralleled by wipe off. Milgrom also notes the parallelism in לֹכֵן בְּזֹאת יִכָּפֵר עוֹן־יַעֲקֹב וְזֶה כָּל־פְּרִי הַסֵּר חַטָּאתוֹ “Therefore, Jacob’s guilt will be atoned יִכָּפֵר, and this will be the full fruit of removing his sin” (Isa 27.9), where *kipper* parallels remove. Milgrom further notes that *kipper* is accompanied by טָהַר and חָטָא where they are used synonymously (e.g. Lev 14.48–54).<sup>242</sup> Hence, Milgrom concludes that the blood manipulation ritual functions to wipe off the contamination of the sanctuary. Based on the observations of Milgrom and Gilders, Feldman concludes: “The basic meaning of כָּפַר in the priestly narrative is “to decontaminate.” With very few exceptions, the use of this verb always signals the decontamination of the altar or of some part of the tent of meeting.”<sup>243</sup> Exod 30.10 illustrates the removal meaning of *kipper*: “Once a year Aaron shall perform the rite of atonement on its horns. Throughout your generations he shall perform the atonement for it once a year with the blood of the atoning sin offering. It is most holy to YHWH” (וְכָפַר אֶהְרֶן עַל־קַרְנָתָיו אֶחָת בַּשָּׁנָה מִדַּם חַטָּאת הַכֹּפְרִים אֶחָת בַּשָּׁנָה יִכָּפֵר עָלָיו לְדֶרְתִּיכֶם) (קֹדֶשׁ־קִדְשִׁים הוּא לַיהוָה). The verse speaks of the Day of Atonement, where Aaron should make *kipper* on the horns of the ark-cover from the blood of the purification offering. The *kipper* action here is not the

<sup>240</sup> David Z. Hoffman, *Das Buch Leviticus: Übersetzt und Erklärt*, 2 Vols. (Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1905), 1:123; J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament* (Bern, 1940), 63–66. This view has been supported by the parallelism between “do not cover up” וְאֶל־תִּכְסֵּם (Neh 3.37) and “do not *kipper*” אֶל־תִּכְפֹּר (Jer 18.23).

<sup>241</sup> Gilders, *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible*, 28.

<sup>242</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1080. In this passage, the text uses both verbs in the context of the blood manipulation ritual, the regular context for *kipper*. Gilders argues that *kipper* “is the general term, the ‘hypernym,’ while verbs such as *ḥiṭṭē*’ (purify), *ṭihar* (cleanse) and *qiddēš* (consecrate) are more specific.” Gilders, *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible*, 137.

<sup>243</sup> Feldman, *The Story of Sacrifice*, 188.

slaughtering of the animal, nor the whole offering process, but it is narrowed by the text to something that the priests make using the blood.

In every case in the Priestly document, the object of *kipper* is the sanctuary. The prepositions used with *kipper* enforce that.<sup>244</sup> When its direct object is not a human, *kipper* takes the direct object marker (את) to indicate that the sanctuary or the tent is the object. Yet when the object of *kipper* is a person (indirectly) the Hebrew text always uses the preposition “on” על or the more technical בעד in the sense of “on behalf of” (cf. Lev 16.6, 24, 30, 33; Num 12.21).<sup>245</sup> Milgrom demonstrates that the blood of the חטאת is never applied to a person, whether they are a worshipper or a patient. Careful analysis of the prepositions used with *kipper* on Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement) in Lev 16 shows that the object of purification is the sanctuary, not humans. Milgrom concludes that on Yom Kippur when the priest offers the purification offering: “The priest purges the most sacred objects and areas of the sanctuary on behalf of the person who caused their contamination by his physical impurity or inadvertent offense.”<sup>246</sup> A good example is P’s concluding comments on Yom Kippur: “He shall make *kipper* for the sanctuary, and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar, and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly” (Lev 16.33; וכפר את־מקדש (הקדש ואת־אהל מועד ואת־המזבח יכפר ועל הכהנים ועל־כל־עם הקהל יכפר). P uses the direct object marker את to indicate that the direct object of *kipper*, which is performed on Yom Kippur, is the sanctuary, the tent, and the altar, while uses the preposition על to indicate that the beneficiaries of *kipper* are the priests and the assembly. Sacrifices, then, were not offered to provide forgiveness for the wrong act *per se*, but to

<sup>244</sup> Milgrom, “Israel’s Sanctuary: The Priestly «Picture of Dorian Gray»,” 391.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Joel Baden, “The Purpose of Purification in Leviticus 16: A Proposition Pertaining to Priestly Prepositions,” VT 71 (2020): 19–26.

<sup>246</sup> Baden, “The Purpose of Purification in Leviticus 16,” 392.

wipe away the wrong act's consequences. the sanctuary's contamination. Every sin was believed to contaminate the sanctuary (cf. Lev 15.31; Lev 20.3; Num 19.20, 13).<sup>247</sup>

Milgrom shows further that the defilement caused by sins threatens YHWH's presence among his people. The place of this presence is highlighted several times in P to be in the tent and especially over the ark-cover. From the minor sin to the most serious one, YHWH's stay in the sanctuary is closely connected to the sanctuary's purification from sins' contaminations. Inadvertent sins or severe physical impurity defile the courtyard altar (e.g., Lev 4.25, 30; 9.9). Unintentional sins of the high priest or all the people of Israel pollute the inner altar's shrine before the veil (e.g., Lev 4.5–7, 16–18). Finally, the unrepented sin contaminates the sanctuary where the throne of Yahweh exists above the ark-cover (Cf. Num 15.27–31; Isa 37.16). Sins committed by non-priests, for instance, contaminate the shrine where only priests are allowed to enter. Even the inner room itself, where only the high priest can enter once a year, could be polluted by anybody's wanton sins.

Feder has recently challenged this meaning of *kipper* and has argued that the social context of appeasing a rival is more fundamental to the meaning of *kipper*. For instance, when YHWH becomes infuriated with the complaints of Israel and sends a plague to obliterate them, we read in P (according to Feder's translation): “Moses spoke to Aaron: take the fire pan and place on it coals from upon the altar and add incense. Go quickly to the congregation and make appeasement for them (וּכְפַר עֲלֵיהֶם) because wrath has come forth from YHWH and the plague has begun! Aaron took it as Moses had commanded and he ran into the midst of the congregation, and, behold, the plague had begun among the people. He put on the incense and made appeasement for the people (וַיִּכְפֹּר עַל הָעָם). He stood

---

<sup>247</sup> Michael B. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*, FAT II/50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 135–172; idem, “Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal,” *JBL* 132 (2013): 749–67.

between the dead and the living, and the plague ceased” (Num 17.11–13).<sup>248</sup> That is, *kipper* refers to the appeasement against YHWH’s wrath, embodied in the plague. Feder associates the blood ritual with unjustified blood guilt, resulting from criminal homicide: “Blood shed by a premeditated and unjustifiable murder will remain in a state of seething hostility with a single-minded demand for vengeance.”<sup>249</sup> Feder traces semantic developments in *כִּפֶּר* where it evolves from mere reference to blood, to blood compensation in the cases of unjustified homicide, to the domain of repayment/value.<sup>250</sup> Feder argues that the purification offering rite adapted the same terminology for homicide compensation, using the blood language, and transformed it into a cultic means of making restitution for guilt, conceptualized as a debt to YHWH.<sup>251</sup> Feder establishes his case for the social meaning of *kipper* based on different passages from Hebrew Jewish scriptures, not particularly P. Moreover, his treatment lacks discussion of key passages where *kipper* is used and ideas of sin, repayment, and compensation to YHWH are lacking. For instance, Leviticus 14 uses *kipper* in the purification process of the patient with scale disease. After the patient is cured of their skin scale disease, the priest should examine them to complete the purification process, then they can enter the camp. However, the patient should stay outside their tent for seven days. On the eighth day, the patient should come to the Dwelling Place opening with their purification offerings so that the priest can perform the purification rituals. The priest makes *kipper* on behalf of the patient (14.18–20), using a

---

<sup>248</sup> Yitzhaq Feder, *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual: Origins, Context, and Meaning*, WAWSS 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 173. Feder explains his adopted meaning of *kipper*: “The semantic category of “appeasement” should be viewed as historically primary. this could be expressed alternatively as the priority of “propitiation” to “expiation.” In propitiation the action is directed towards God or some other offended person. The underlying purpose is to change God’s attitude from one of wrath to one of good-will and favour. In the case of expiation, on the other hand, the action is directed towards that which has caused the breakdown in the relationship. it is sometimes held that, while God is not personally angry with the sinner, the act of sin has initiated a train of events which can only be broken by some compensatory rite or act of reparation for the offence. In short, propitiation is directed towards the offended person, whereas expiation is concerned with nullifying the offensive act” (173). Cf. Yitzhaq Feder, “On *kuppuru*, *kippèr* and Etymological Sins that Cannot be Wiped,” *VT* 60 (2010) 535–45.

<sup>249</sup> Feder, *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual*, 174.

<sup>250</sup> Feder, *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual*, 189.

<sup>251</sup> Feder, *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual*, 193–94.

purification offering and an ascension offering: “The priest shall offer the purification offering (חטאת), to make *kipper* for the one to be cleansed from his uncleanness. Afterward, he shall slaughter the burnt offering; and the priest shall offer the burnt offering and the grain offering on the altar. Thus, the priest shall make *kipper* on his behalf (וכפר עליו) and he shall be clean.” (Lev 14.19–20). It is not clear how the blood guilt or debt to the deity plays a role in the *kipper* process here.<sup>252</sup> However, as Milgrom shows, the patient’s case with skin scale disease shows that חטאת sacrifices were also not offered for the purification from sin, nor forgiveness, but simply for removing the impurities from the sanctuary, including the ark-cover.

Roy Gane criticizes Milgrom’s work, arguing that P maintains the purification of the worshipper by means of sacrifice.<sup>253</sup> Milgrom’s position is that if the worshipper suffers from any impurity he could be purified by ablution, if the impurity is physical, or internal purification (i.e., repentance). Gane, however, argues that the blood manipulation ritual purifies the worshipper, not just the sancta, even though the blood is not applied to the worshipper directly. Gane focuses on the privative use of the preposition לֹא which, according to his interpretation, usually highlights the purification of the person. For example, the parturient woman stays impure during postpartum for forty days, if she gives birth to a boy, and eighty days if she gives birth to a girl (Lev 12.1–5). In both cases, she needs to bring a lamb for an ascension offering and a pigeon or a turtledove for a purification offering. Gane notes the following construction in P: “He shall offer it before YHWH to atone for her so she will be purified

---

<sup>252</sup> In his most recent book, Feder comments: “Scholars have struggled to find an adequate modern rendering for this verb. Though the Hebrew root k-p-r suggests the “paying-off” (expiation) of guilt, the usage of this verb in the biblical formulas apply to purification (e.g., Lev 12.7) alongside removing culpability (e.g., Lev 4.20), suggesting a more generic translation such as ‘clearing.’” Feder’s translation “clearing” would be in line with the regular concept of removal discussed above, though this definition would be a new development in his thoughts. See: Yitzhaq Feder, *Purity and Pollution in the Hebrew Bible: From Embodied Experience to Moral Metaphor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 95–96

<sup>253</sup> Roy E. Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005). Cf. Joshua M. Vis, “The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering,” in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*, ed. Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart, RBS (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 33–58.

from her blood flow” (Lev 12.7; והקריבו לפני יהוה וכפר עליה וטהרה ממקד דמיה). The effect of *kipper* is the purification of the mother “from” the blood flow. Gane argues that the reference here is not to the physical purification, as the parturient woman can only offer these sacrifices after the completion of her physical purification time. ובמלאת ימי טהרה לבן או לבת (Lev 12.6). Gane sees the causal construction. וכפר עליה הכהן וטהרה (Lev 12.8), where *kipper* causes purification. If the blood flow has already stopped, what does P mean by the purification of the parturient *from* her blood flow? Gane concludes: “The sacrificial process removes residual ritual impurity from her.”<sup>254</sup> Gane notices the same construction in the purification process of the patient with scale disease. ועשה הכהן את־החטאת וכפר על־המטהר מטמאתו (Lev 14.19). Again, the priest will offer the purification offering on behalf of the one who is being purified. The hithpaal participle conveys the idea that the person is in the process of purification “from” his impurity. Once the priest slaughters and offers the sacrifice on the altar, the person is purified. והעלה הכהן את־העלה ואת־המנחה המזבחה וכפר עליו הכהן וטהר (Lev 14.20). *Kipper* causes purification of the person again.<sup>255</sup> A third example that Gane uses is the impurity resulting from male and female discharges, including menstruation (Lev 15). Following these examples, Gane concludes that there are two purification phases. First, the purification of the worshipper from evil, which happens throughout the year by means of the purification offering, which removes the evils of the people from them and piles the impurities on the sancta (e.g., 4.26; 5.6, 10). This happens through the leaning of the hand(s) of the worshipper on the animal, which transfers the evil of the worshipper to the animal, which is then slaughtered on the altar. Hence, the blood of the animal carries the evil. The second phase involves the purification of the sancta from the piled evils, which happens once a year in Yom Kippur (Lev 16).<sup>256</sup>

<sup>254</sup> Gane, *Cult and Character*, 113. Gane affirms that: “There is nothing here about purgation of the altar on behalf of the woman. The purification offering, quantitatively supplemented by the burnt offering, has the goal of purging residual physical ritual impurity from the parturient herself” (114).

<sup>255</sup> Gane, *Cult and Character*, 119–20.

<sup>256</sup> Gane, *Cult and Character*, 123–43.



Gane's view has been criticized from different perspectives. Christophe Nihan, for instance, notices that there is a purification of people from the evil that happens in the scapegoat rite on Yom Kippur (Lev 16.20–22), while the purification of the sancta happens by means of the purification offering (Lev 16.14–19).<sup>257</sup> The distinction that Gane suggests thus seems superficial. Moreover, Nihan argues that Gane's claim that the sacrificial blood functions as a courier of evil are not warranted in P. According to P, the flesh and the blood of the purification offering sanctifies whatever it touches (Lev 6.27). I will show below that the hands-leaning gesture has a different function than what Gane suggests.

Andrew Rillera criticizes Gane's approach between for failing to distinguish the *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* residual impurity with the impure person, like the scale-disease patient, the impure parturient, and the discharging male.<sup>258</sup> According to Rillera, there is an impurity related to the person in each of the three cases that Gane presents, but the impurity is a contamination on the altar (extrinsic impurity), rather than internally residual within the person (intrinsic). Whenever the altar is purified from the contamination, the person becomes pure. Not because *kipper* removes the impurity from the person directly, but because *kipper* removes the impure contamination from the altar, which results in the purification of the person indirectly. After all, *kipper* happens on behalf of the worshipper, and the worshipper is the beneficiary of the results of *kipper*.

In this sense, as I noted above, the purification of the person might be equivalent to the acceptance of the worshipper, which is one of the results of the ascension offering. Gane does not indicate that in each case, there is an ascension offering that accompanies the purification offering (Lev 12.6; 14.19; 15.15, 30). I suggest that the purification of the persons in these three situations refers to their acceptance before YHWH as a result of the ascension offering (Lev 1.4; see above). In each case,

---

<sup>257</sup> Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 190–191.

<sup>258</sup> Rillera, *Lamb of the Free*, 98–109.

the ascension offering follows the purification offering, suggesting that the purification of the worshipper happens as the ascension offering is being made after the purification of the altar has been completed using the purification offering.

Another problem with Gane's approach is his interpretation of מן in a privative sense, denoting separating, hence "from," when it could be also interpreted in a causal sense, denoting the reason. Lev 12.7 is the main case on which Gane builds his argument that מן has to denote the separative meaning "from," hence the woman has been purified from her blood flow. However, Dorothea Erbele-Küster, interprets מן in Lev 12.7 in a causal sense. Her argument is rooted in the meaning of מקור. While Gane contends that the clause ממקרה דמיה means "the flow of her blood," Erbele-Küster rightly argues that מקור, which literally means "wellspring," is a figurative name for the genitalia of the woman. Gane also argues that "there is no other viable option" to translate מן in ממקרה other than "from." However, Erbele-Küster interprets מן in a causal sense, where מן refers to "from out of" denoting the source, or, more effectively, the cause. The clause then means that "the woman is not purified 'of her blood flow', but rather by means of or as a result of it."<sup>259</sup> That is, the woman became pure *because* (מן) her blood wellspring (i.e., genitalia) stopped bleeding. Erbele-Küster concludes: "After the specified time has passed, the woman is pure thanks to her 'spring', from deep within, or in medical terms, as a result of the residual bleeding of her womb."<sup>260</sup>

Space limitation does not allow me to fully respond to Gane, but the example from Lev 12.7 is sufficient to show that the privative sense of מן is not the only option as Gane argues, and definitely not the only correct option in every case. Hence, Milgrom's model is still valid. the purification offering's main role and function is to decontaminate the sancta for the benefit of the worshipper.

---

<sup>259</sup> Dorothea Erbele-Küster, *Body, Gender and Purity in Leviticus 12 and 15*, LHB/OTS 539 (London: T&T Clark, 2017), 49. Cf. Elizabeth W. Goldstein, *Gender and Impurity in the Hebrew Bible* (Lanham: Lexington, 2015).

<sup>260</sup> Erbele-Küster, *Body, Gender and Purity*, 49.

## Reparation Offering (Lev 5.14–6.7)

The final offering in the Jewish sacrificial system is the reparation offering, also known as the guilt offering. The worshipper has to offer this sacrifice if they commit a trespass or sin unintentionally. The worshipper must bring a ram without a blemish, which they will offer as a sacrifice. Additionally, the worshipper must make restitution for the holy things they trespassed and add one-fifth to it then give it to the priest (Lev 5.14–16). The sacrifice regulations highlight the fact that the reparation offering is important when “any of you sin without knowing it” (Lev 5.16). In this case, the priest “shall make *kipper*” on behalf of the worshipper, and they will “be forgiven” (5.16).<sup>261</sup> These are clear interpretive comments that explain how the sacrifice works. the worshipper committed the sin without knowing it, so they repair the pollution that they caused to the tent with their reparation offering, then forgiveness happens.

However, if the worshipper committed an intentional sin, and knowingly commits the sin, then there is a slightly different sequence. According to Num 5.6–8, “If a man or woman commits any wrong against man, whereby he trespasses against the Lord when that person feels guilty, he shall confess the wrong he has done, make reparation in its entirety and add one-fifth to it.”<sup>262</sup> Several extra elements appear in this case. First, the person must feel guilty. Second, they must confess their wrongdoing. Third, they must offer the sacrifice and add one-fifth to it. The association between feeling guilty and uttering a confession is significant. The sinner who feels guilty should *confess* their sins. Milgrom concludes that the verbalized confession is obligatory for the forgiveness of deliberate sins. Feeling guilty and remorse was sufficient for involuntary sins, “But for deliberate sins, there is the

---

<sup>261</sup> Cf. Christophe Lemardelé, “Une solution pour le ’āšām du lépreux,” *VT* 54 (2004): 208–215.

<sup>262</sup> I follow Milgrom’s translation here. Milgrom argues that נשא “when it is followed by the preposition and a personal object it means to ‘incur liability to’ someone for reparation; without an object, it refers to the inner experience of this liability, i.e., ‘to feel guilt.’” In the current case, the verb occurs without an object. See the full presentation of philological evidence in: Jacob Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*, SJLA 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 3–12.

added requirement that remorse be verbalized.”<sup>263</sup> Lev 5.20–26 and Num 5.6–8 thus reveal that repentant deliberate sinners condemned of theft *can* be forgiven if they feel guilty, confess their sins, return what has been stolen, and offer their sacrifice. In the only three expiable deliberate sins recorded in P (Lev 5.20–26; Lev 5.1; Lev 16.21), confession is an explicit precondition for forgiveness.

Forgiveness happens after *kipper* happens. If the sin is involuntary, the sinner should offer the purification offering to purify the sanctuary from the impact of their sin. If sin is intentional, the sinner must feel guilty and then utter their confession of their sin, so they can offer the reparation offering which atones for the sin’s contamination of the sanctuary. Ablution purifies the body; remorse and confession of sin purify the heart; and sacrifices, whether purification offering or guilt offering, purify the tent and the sanctuary.

Overall, the Jewish sacrificial system is meant to maintain the relationship between the worshipper, the community of Israel, and YHWH. The Israelites had to offer sacrifices to keep YHWH in the temple. If impurities, whether ritual impurities or ones caused by moral sins, piled up on the sanctuary, YHWH would abandon the sanctuary.<sup>264</sup> Thus, P’s sacrificial system is the solution to the problem of ritual impurity which results from transgressing YHWH’s commandments, whether they are ritual commandments or moral commandments. As we have seen, almost all the sacrifices are connected to *kipper* in some way or another, and they are all meant to attract YHWH to the worshipper. Acceptance is maintained as the worshipper continues to offer sacrifices, and YHWH smells the pleasing odor which affects acceptance of the worshipper.

---

<sup>263</sup> Jacob Milgrom, “The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance,” *RB* 82 (1975): 186–205 (195).

<sup>264</sup> Ezekiel pictures YHWH departing the temple because of the impurities that have piled up on the sanctuary (10:18, 11:22–23; cf. 1:28; 3:12; 8:4).

### **The Substitutionary Misconceptualization of Sacrifices**

This overview of P's sacrificial system leads to an important conclusion: animals did not die in place of the worshipper. The understanding of sacrifices as substitutionary is a ubiquitous misconception, especially among Christians. The substitutionary interpretation of sacrifices wrongly assumes that (a) the worshipper should die for something wrong that they committed, (b) that the animal is substituted for the wrongdoer, and (c) that the animal bears the wrongdoer's punishment by dying. This interpretation of the Levitical sacrificial system is incorrect. In many cases, as shown above, the animals die as sacrifices for nothing morally wrong that the worshipper committed. Even when the worshipper commits a deliberate sin, there is an opportunity for self-reflection, remorse, and verbal confession of the wrongdoing, which, along with the sacrifice, were capable of restoring the relationship between YHWH and the worshipper. Sacrifices were offered to cleanse YHWH's residence, the tent of meeting, and later the temple, from Israel's ritual and moral impurities.

Num 35.30–34 establishes a legal principle in Israel's life that further enforces that sacrifices do not function to substitute the animal's death for the death of a wrongdoer. This passage treats the case of a person who murders another, whether deliberately or unintentionally. According to this legislation, if a person deliberately kills another, they must die. As the legislative text emphasizes: "You shall accept no ransom for the life of a murderer who is subject to the death penalty; a murderer must be put to death" (v. 31). This legal rule requires that if one is subject to the death penalty, nothing can save their life. They must die. A similar principle applies to one who unintentionally murders another person. In this case, the murderer can flee to a refuge city where the avenger of blood cannot kill them. Even still, the legislation emphasizes: "Nor shall you accept a ransom for one who has fled to a city of refuge, enabling the fugitive to return to live in the land before the death of the high priest" (v. 32). Again, nothing can compensate for the punishment of a murderer, whether the punishment was the death penalty or isolated exile to a refuge city. Why is this the case? Why can nothing compensate for

the act of murder? The text explains: “You shall not pollute the land in which you live, for blood pollutes the land, and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it. You shall not defile the land in which you live, in which I also dwell, for I the Lord dwell among the Israelites” (vv. 33–34). Blood pollutes the land, and nothing apart from the blood of the blood-shedder can purify the land from pollution. Sacrificial blood cannot purify it. Only the blood of the killer can purify the land from the pollution caused by the blood of the killed. This passage shows that if a human has to bear the death penalty, there is nothing that can stand in their place. If the substitutionary interpretation of the sacrificial system is true, one would logically expect the possibility of offering a sacrifice to save the murderer’s life in this situation. Yet the lack of the substitutionary interpretation of sacrifices in this context shows that it is not the right interpretation.

What then could have led to the substitutionary interpretation of sacrifices? Two reasons in my estimation. First, the gesture of laying hands on the animal sacrifices as the worshipper brings the animal to the tent or the temple. Second, the scapegoat rite, which is also connected to the gesture of laying hands. Hubert and Mauss popularized the gesture of laying hands within their anthropological interpretive framework of sacrifices as an identification of the animal and the worshipper.<sup>265</sup> They argued that, during the process of offering a sacrifice, the worshipper and the animal are both transformed from this profane world to the sacred realm.<sup>266</sup> The transformation of the animal happens in the act of slaughter, which in a sense liberates the soul of the animal from the profane world to the sacred realm. Yet the transformation of the worshipper happens through identifying with the sacrificed animal. This identification happens through two practices. first, the gesture of laying hands, and second, eating the animal’s flesh. Thus, the laying of hands is a gesture that enables the identification of

---

<sup>265</sup> Ivan Strenski states that Hubert and Mauss’s essay is “the most frequently cited theoretical work on sacrifice ever written.” See: Ivan Strenski, “The Social and Intellectual Origins of Hubert and Mauss’s Theory of Ritual Sacrifice,” in *India and Beyond: Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought*, ed. D. van der Meij (London: Keagan Paul International), (511-37): 511.

<sup>266</sup> Hubert and Mauss, “Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice,” 36–37.

the worshipper with the animal, so whatever action happens to the animal happens to the worshipper. In Hubert and Mauss's interpretation, this action is consecration.<sup>267</sup> Hubert and Mauss's interpretation has been developed further in Biblical scholarship. Philip Jenson points out that: "The laying on of hands (Lev. 1.4) identifies the substitute, whose death (v.5) takes place instead of the sinner and results in acceptance (vv. 3–4), represented by the pleasing odor (v. 9)."<sup>268</sup> That is, if as Hubert and Mauss claimed that the worshipper and the animal are identified in the sacrifice offering process, then, according to Jenson, the death that the worshipper deserves transfers to the animal. And just like Hubert and Mauss focus on the act of slaughter, Jenson seems to focus on the death of the animal too. Hartmut Gese even goes further to claim that atonement starts at the very act of laying hands.<sup>269</sup> Some forms of this interpretation suggest that the sin and/or guilt of the sinner *transfers* to the animal which dies in place of the worshipper when the worshipper lays their hand on the animal.<sup>270</sup> Others contend that the transference of sin/guilt will make the offering impure, which contradicts the Biblical text that requires the offering to be pure. For this reason, another modified version of the interpretation suggests that only the death penalty for the sinner is transferred to the animal when the worshipper lays their hand on the animal.<sup>271</sup> Others suggest that the impurity was eliminated when the animal touched the altar during the

---

<sup>267</sup> Hubert and Mauss, "Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice," 66–67, 71–75.

<sup>268</sup> Jenson, "The Levitical Sacrificial System," 28. Similarly, Arie Noordtjij comments: "The laying on of hands in a sense made the animal into the successor of the person who presented it. It came to stand in his place, so that when the life of 'soul' of the sacrificial animal was poured out with its flowing blood and sank into death, it was just as if the soul of the person who brought it departed from him and likewise died away... in the offering, soul was substituted for soul, or life for life" Arie Noordtjij, *The Book of Leviticus*, trans. Raymond Togtman (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 33–35. Cf. A. M. Rodriguez, "Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cultic- Related Texts," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1980), 193–99.

<sup>269</sup> Hartmut Gese, "The Atonement," in *Essays on Biblical Theology*, ed. Hartmut Gese, trans. K. Crim (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981) (93–116): 104.

<sup>270</sup> E.g., W. Adler, "imposición de Manos," in *Enciclopedia de La Biblia* (Barcelona: Ediciones Garriga, 1963) 4:131–34; Friedrich Blome, *Die Opfermaterie in Babylonien und Israel* (Rome: Pontificail Institutum Biblicum, 1934), 53–58; Klaus Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung umdie Wende von der exilischen zur nachexili-schen Zeit," *EvTh* 26 (1966): 217–39 (230); R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel*, WMANT 24 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967).

<sup>271</sup> See, for instance, A. Dillmann, *Die Bucher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1880), 416; J. C. Matthes, "Der Sühnegedanke bei den Sündorfen," in *ZATW* 23 (1903): 97–119.

slaughter process.<sup>272</sup> However, these different interpretations do not offer an argument that accounts for the distinction between sin and its punishment.

These efforts seek to see a substitution in the gesture of laying hands without arguing for it based on evidence. I suggest that the long-held Protestant tradition that Jesus died instead of humans popularized reading the sacrificial system and the gesture of laying hands as substitutionary.<sup>273</sup> This is another form of Christian Supersessionism in reading Jewish texts. For instance, Christians never interpret the laying of hands gesture in the New Testament to convey substitution.<sup>274</sup> It is only when it comes to the Jewish sacrifices that they are interpreted in a substitutionary fashion. In any case, there are several reasons to doubt the substitutionary interpretation of the gesture of laying hands.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>272</sup> Cf. Alexis Medebielle, *L'Expiation dans L'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament* (Rome: Institute Biblique Pontifical, 1923), 157–8.

<sup>273</sup> There are others who reached the substitutionary interpretation of sacrifices before Protestantism, notably Jewish Figures. Nachmanides comments on Lev 1:9, and after criticizing Maimonides (who minimized the meaning of sacrifices to temporary measures instituted to distance Israel from idolatry), says: “All these acts are performed in order that when they are done, a person should realize that he has sinned against God with his body and soul, and that ‘his’ blood should really be spilled and ‘his’ body burned, were it not for the lovingkindness of the Creator, Who took from him a substitute and a ransom, namely this offering, so that its blood should be in place of his blood, its life in place of his life.” Ibn Ezra, the Jewish medieval commentator, in his comments on Lev. 1:1, translates *kipper* as “serve as a ransom,” and argues that the blood is tossed on the altar during sacrificial services “to be a ransom payment for whatever punishment he (the offerer) deserves.” See Ramban (Nachmanides), *Commentary on the Torah: Leviticus*, trans. Charles B. Chavel (New York: Shilo Publishing House, 1974); Ibn Ezra, *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*, trans. H. Norman Strickman and Arthur M. Silver (New York: Menorah Publishing, 2004), 6.

<sup>274</sup> E.g., John Fleter Tipei, *The Laying On of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009); Daniel A. Machiela, “Luke 13:10–13: ‘Woman, You Have Been Set Free From Your Ailment’—Illness, Demon Possession, and Laying on Hands in Light of Second Temple Period Jewish Literature,” in *The Gospels in First-Century Judaea: Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of Nyack College's Graduate Program in Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins, August 29th, 2013*, ed. R. Steven Notley and Jeffrey P. García, JGPS 29 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 122–135.

<sup>275</sup> Based on linguistic reasons, a strand of scholarship distinguished between two gestures of laying hands: the laying of one hand gesture, and the laying of two hands gesture. The last occurs mainly on Yom Kippur in Lev. 16, while the former occurs in every other instance. While the issue is still debated, it will not affect my argument whether there were two gestures of just one. I will show that in both cases the gesture is not substitutionary. For the arguments supporting the distinction between two gestures, see: René Pétér, “L'imposition des mains dans l'ancien testament,” *VT* 27 (1977): 48–55; Bernd Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift*, 2nd ed., WMANT 55 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 199–221; David P. Wright, “The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature,” *JAOS* 106 (1986): 433–46; idem, “Hands, Laying On of: Old Testament,” *ABD* 3:47–48; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 151; Kiuchi, *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature*, 112–19. See also the well-nuanced argument for the existence of only one gesture of laying hands employing both hands in every situation in: David Calabro, “A Reexamination of the Ancient Israelite Gesture of Hand Placement,” in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart (Atlanta: SPL Press, 2017), 99–124.



The ritual gesture of laying hands on the animal (and sometimes on a person) occurs 23 times in Jewish scriptures.<sup>276</sup> To understand its meaning, David Wright examines the practice of laying hand(s) gesture in the Hittite texts and compares it to the gesture in the Jewish scriptures. Wright finds that the function of the gesture in the Hittite texts serves to attribute the offering material (i.e., the animal) and the ritual act (i.e., who is offering the sacrifice), to the person who performs the hand placement.<sup>277</sup> Wright argues that while the gesture might seem to mean the transference of sins to the scapegoat in Lev 16 (which I will discuss below), this is not the usual way to interpret the laying of hands gesture in other places. For instance, in Lev 24, one who commits blasphemy is driven outside the camp of Israel, and the witnesses lay their hands on his head. The natural interpretation of the gesture here is legal; it designates the sinner as the guilty one deserving the punishment.<sup>278</sup> Wright argues that “the witnesses symbolically confirm their testimony to the community and also acknowledge their responsibility in the death of the criminal.”<sup>279</sup> The witnesses against Susanna who accuse her of adultery use their hand gestures to confirm the credibility of their testimony, which further emphasizes that there was a connection between one’s credibility and the gesture (Dan 13.34). These examples encourage a re-examination of Moses laying his hands on Joshua in Num. 27.18–23 and Deut. 34.9. While Num. 27.20 appears to convey the idea of transferring power and authority from Moses to Joshua, Wright argues that it is more likely that the power and authority do not move from Moses’s body to Joshua through Moses’s arms.<sup>280</sup> While Joshua will receive power and authority, the ritual rite is meant to designate

---

<sup>276</sup> See: Exod 29:10, 15, 19; Lev 1:4; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; 8:14, 18, 22; 16:21; 24:14; Num 8:10, 12; 27:18, 23; Deut 34:9; 2 Chr 29:23.

<sup>277</sup> For a full list of the Hittite references, see Wright, “The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature,” 440–41.

<sup>278</sup> B. J. van der Merwe, “The Laying on of Hands in the Old Testament,” *Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika* 5 (1962): 34–43 (40); L. Moraldi, *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'Antico Testamento* (Rome: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1956), 256–7; Matthes, “Der Sühnegedanke bei den Sündopfern,” 105.

<sup>279</sup> Wright, “The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature,” 435.

<sup>280</sup> Wright, “The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature,” 436. Cf. Keith Edward Kriehoff Mattingly, “The Laying of Hands on Joshua: An Exegetical Study of Numbers 27:12–23 and Deuteronomy 34:9” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1997).

Joshua as the recipient of Moses's power and authority. Wright's interpretation seems more plausible when we observe that the mentioned rite happens in front of the Israelites. Moses is establishing Joshua's authority in front of the Israelites.

Another example that might lead to the substitutionary interpretation of the hands-laying gesture is the placement of Israel's sins on the scapegoat on Yom Kippur: "Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat and confess over it all the iniquities of the Israelites, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task" (Lev 16.21). Wright argues that the sins of Israel are placed on the head of the scapegoat, but the text does not say that those sins are transferred from Aaron's body to the scapegoat as if all Israel's sins exist in Aaron's body. While it is possible that Aaron, as a high priest, could have served as a representative of Israel, it seems that the placement of Israel's sins on the scapegoat's head happens because of the confession that Aaron makes. The ritual gesture of laying hands seems to designate the scapegoat as the recipient of the iniquities, transgressions, and sins of Israel. In Wright's wording, the confession "concretizes the sins" of Israel, which fall on the scapegoat's head. The scapegoat is the only animal in the whole Torah that is said to receive "all the iniquities of the Israelites, and all their transgressions, all their sins." Yet it is also significant to note that the scapegoat is not a sacrifice. It does not die at all, and not instead of the Israelites. Even if it were true that the hand-laying gesture was the medium of transferring the sins of Israel to the scapegoat, it does not lead to the execution of the death penalty that the Israelites deserved in the animal.<sup>281</sup>

Wright's designatory interpretation fits well in all three cases examined above. While it is possible that the gesture might have had multiple functions in different situations, there is no reason to

---

<sup>281</sup> See the detailed discussion in David P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBLDS 101 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 15–74.

make this assumption. In all other sacrifices, where the worshipper has to lay their hands on the animal, it serves to designate the animal as the worshipper's animal. As Roland de Vaux has long noted. "In placing his hand on the animal's head, the offerer attests that this victim is his indeed, that the sacrifice is about to be presented by the priest is offered in his name, and that the benefits accruing from it will return to him."<sup>282</sup> The Hittite texts that Wright examines demonstrate de Vaux's point to be true. In these texts, the worshipper who offers the sacrifices is, in most cases, not the functionary who performs the rites.<sup>283</sup> By the beginning of the ritual rites of the offering, the functionary who officiates the ritual rites invites the offerer to place their hands on the offerings, which shows that the laying-hands gesture is an attributive gesture that designates the beneficiary of the offering.

The designatory interpretation of the hand-laying gesture makes sense in light of the prophetic critique of the stolen sacrifices in later periods of Israel's history as well. In several places, Israel's prophets appear to be attacking the cultic sacrifices putting specific moral behaviors above the cult, which seems to suggest a dichotomy between the prophets and the priests, as if morals are not cultic, nor cult moralistic. This is, at least, how Max Weber understood the relationship between the priestly cultic sacrifices and the prophetic critique.<sup>284</sup> Jonathan Klawans finds several keys to explain the prophetic critique of sacrifices.<sup>285</sup> For instance, many of the prophets were themselves priests, like Jeremiah (cf. Jer 1.1) and Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 1.1). But Klawans finds Wright's designatory interpretation of sacrifices to be the key answer. Klawans explores sacrifices as involving the transfer of property from layperson to priest, and from the priest to God. Consequently, sacrifices should be properly owned first before they could be offered to YHWH. The worshipper must declare that the animal belongs to

---

<sup>282</sup> Roland de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964), 28–29.

<sup>283</sup> See the texts in Wright, "The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature," 443.

<sup>284</sup> Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion*, trans. Ephraim Fischhoff (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), 30–46.

<sup>285</sup> Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); idem, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 84–85.

him, not stolen from someone else. Klawans shows that in many cases where the prophets criticize the sacrificial offerings, the problem was not in the sacrificial system *per se*, but in how the Israelites wanted to offer inappropriate sacrifices. One of the main problems was offering stolen and inappropriately owned animals to offer them as sacrifices. Thus, Saul was condemned for offering sacrifices he did not own (cf. 1 Sam 15), while David did not offer sacrifices for the same reason (cf. 2 Sam 24.24). Stolen sacrifices are even called “abominations” in Proverbs 21.27.

If the gesture of hand-laying does not entail substitution, the scapegoat rite does entail a transfer of sins, transgressions, and wrongdoings that are committed by Israel to the goat. P narrates the Yom Kippur rite as follows: “Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat and confess over it all the iniquities of the Israelites, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task. The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region, and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness” (Lev 16.21–22). The origin of the scapegoat ritual, Azazel, has been a long-time debate among scholars. Usually, scholars try to approach the rite comparatively with cognate cultures. Ida Zatelli, for instance, examines an Eblaite purification rite, that probably dates back to the third millennium BCE, where a scapegoat is sent towards the steppe of Alini, outside the city of Ebla (Northern Syria), with a bracelet tied to its neck as an offering. Zatelli notes that there is no confession of transgressions rite over the animal.<sup>286</sup> Zatelli follows a long tradition of scholarship that sees the rite as a fossilized ritual practice that goes far in the history of ancient Israel, where Azazel probably represents a demonic being or some sort of deity.<sup>287</sup> The parallelism between YHWH and Azazel in the distribution of the two goats on Yom Kippur might have led to the view that Azazel was a rival deity or demonic being to YHWH (Lev 16.8). Milgrom summarizes the view: “In pre-Israelite practice he

---

<sup>286</sup> Ida Zatelli, “The Origin of The Biblical Scapegoat Ritual: The Evidence of Two Eblaite Texts,” *VT* 48 (1998): 254–63.

<sup>287</sup> See, for instance, Martin Noth, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1965), 119–124; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 44, 1021, 1071–79.

[Azazel] surely was a true demon, perhaps a satyr (cf. Ibn Ezra on Lev 16.8), who ruled in the wilderness—in the Priestly ritual he is no longer a personality but just a name, designating the place to which impurities and sins are banished.”<sup>288</sup> The wilderness is a regular place for the dwelling of demonic beings in Jewish scriptures (Isa 13.21; 34.14; *Bar* 4.35; *Tob* 8.3; Matt 12.34; Luke 11.24; Rev 18.2). Wright points out that the figure of Azazel, to whom Aaron sends the scapegoat in the desert, is a vague character that P does not develop further: “Azazel does not appear to be an angry deity who needs nor a desert demon who is the custodian of evil.”<sup>289</sup> Bernard Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm argue that similar elimination rites existed in South Anatolian and North Syrian cognate cultures, in which some other animals and birds function as substitutes for humans to appease an angry deity.<sup>290</sup> Hayim Tawil, however, argues that Azazel’s name consists of עזז and אל, meaning together “a fierce god.” Apparently, this makes up the name as עזזאל, not עזאזל as it occurs in the Masoretic text. Tawil argues that “the spelling of this word as employed in the MT seems to be a scribal metathesis deliberately altered to conceal the true demonic nature of this supernatural being.”<sup>291</sup> Aron Pinker argues that עזזאל is the original form of the name and that it is, in fact, another name for YHWH: “It seems reasonable to conclude that the ritual described in Lev 16.5–26 was to the same God, identified as יהוה and עזזאל, respectively.”<sup>292</sup>

<sup>288</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1021.

<sup>289</sup> Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity*, 72.

<sup>290</sup> Bernard Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, “Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt. Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10.21f,” In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament: Internationale Simposion, Hamburg 17–20 März 1990*, OBO 129, eds. Bernard Janowski, Klaus Klaus, and Gernot Wilhelm, (Freibur-Göttingen, 1993), 106–169. Janowski and Wilhelm also follow Tawil’s suggestion of the name change to עזזאל. Cf. Bernard Janowski, ‘Azazel’, in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karel van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. W. van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 128–31.

<sup>291</sup> Hayim Tawil, “Azazel the Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study,” *ZAW* 92 (1980): 43–59 (58). Most recently, Zatelli revived Tawil’s argument: “Perhaps the spelling עזזאל in Qumran texts is acceptable for עזאזל; it has been changed into the more neutral עזאזל in the textus receptus. Probably it was originally a kind of Canaanite demon—which developed in the Hebrew tradition—connected with the chthonian power expressed by goats. The wilderness is a symbol of the underworld.” See Zatelli, “The Origin of The Biblical Scapegoat Ritual,” 262–63.

<sup>292</sup> Aron Pinker, “A Goat to Go to Azazel,” *JHS* 7 (2007): 1–25 (16) <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2007.v7.a8>. Pinker does not explain why, if Azazel is the name of YHWH, did P continue to use that name? It is not clear why only here in the

In the Second Temple period, Azazel appears as one of the fallen watchers who are the source of evil in the world (1 *Enoch* 8.1–2; 9.6; 10.4–8; 13.1). Azazel is described as one of the watchers who lust after human women (cf. Gen 6.1–4) and taught humans to create weapons.<sup>293</sup> In the Apocalypse of Abraham, there is a celestial scapegoat named Asael/Azazel, who is cast out into the cosmic wilderness and becomes a “firebrand of the furnace of the earth,” and is expelled “into the untrodden parts of the earth” (*Apoc. Ab.* 14.5–6).<sup>294</sup> In the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>295</sup> Azazel is a fallen watcher who inherits “evil for all his age” (4Q180 1.10).<sup>296</sup>

Apparently, a wide range of proposals have been put forth regarding the nature of Azazel in P, yet the available evidence within P limits the capacity to ascertain that nature. Scholars place excessive emphasis on the character of Azazel, which may lead them to overlook the primary significance of the ritual. Irrespective of the nature of Azazel, it is feasible that the scapegoat ritual might have contributed to the development of the substitutionary comprehension of the sacrificial system.

Narrative studies of Leviticus serve as a reminder that we ought to concentrate on the facets of the ritual that could be gleaned from within the literary world of the text. As I have noted earlier, one of these facets is that the scapegoat is not slaughtered, which means it is not a sacrifice.<sup>297</sup> Instead, the

---

history of Jewish literature that we have the notion of Azazel as the name of YHWH and nowhere else. Also, we never hear about a different abode for YHWH in the desert as Pinker suggests.

<sup>293</sup> On the history of the interpretation of the scapegoat ritual in the second temple era, see: Lester L. Grabbe, “The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation,” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–167. On the punishment of the fallen watcher Azazel in the Book of Watchers, see: Hendryk Drawnel, “The Punishment of Asael (1 En. 10:4–8) and Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Literature,” *RQ* 99 (2012): 369–94.

<sup>294</sup> Alexander Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*, TCS 3 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 21. On the function of the scapegoat in the Apocalypse of Abraham, see: Andrei A. Orlov, *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham*, SJ 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

<sup>295</sup> All translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are from: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 2 Vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998).

<sup>296</sup> Annette Yoshiko Reed comments: “it is intriguing that the author distinguishes this Watcher from the rest, singling him out as the one who ‘inherits evil.’” Perhaps the reason behind this is the connection with the scapegoat in P who bears all transgressions of Israel. See: Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 98.

<sup>297</sup> Pace Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, “Living like the Azazel-Goat in Romans 12:1B,” *TynB* 57 (2006), who argues that: “The Azazel-goat is a sacrifice (Lev. 16:5) – a sin offering – but unlike all other sacrifices it is not killed.”

scapegoat is basically an elimination rite, wherein the goat carries away Israel's transgressions from their camp. The various rites performed during Yom Kippur are all oriented toward the removal of contamination that has accumulated as a result of Israel's impurities. The scapegoat rite, in particular, serves as a mechanism for removing the contamination caused by Israel's *intentional* sins from the tent. As previously noted, Aaron's confessions are aimed at transferring the sins to the scapegoat. An analogous elimination rite is also found in the purification process for the patient suffering from scale disease, wherein one of the two birds required for the purification procedures is sacrificed, while the other is released (Lev 14.6–7). Yet in my estimation, the key to comprehending the nature of the scapegoat ritual hinges on the destination of the scapegoat, which is a commonly overlooked element in the narrative. The desert (המדברה) as the destination of the scapegoat lies outside the scope of the land of Israel (Lev 16.21).<sup>298</sup> In Jewish scriptures, the desert, wilderness areas, and ruins, are commonly portrayed as places of chaos (Deut 32.10; Job 6.18, 12.24; Isa 24.10; 45.18).<sup>299</sup> In contrast, Israel is viewed as a perfectly ordered creation of YHWH (Isa 11.1–9). Additionally, the return of the Israelites from the Babylonian exile is depicted as a transformation of the chaotic lands they pass through into renewed lands (Isa 41.17–20; 43.19–21; 49.9–13; 51.3). The sea, and the monsters that inhabit it, represent other expressions of the chaos found outside Israel (Gen 1.2; Ps 46.3–4; 74.12–17; 89.10–15; 104.6–7; 5.22; Job 38.8–10). Moral wrongdoings are also attributed to the chaotic world (Isa 57.20).<sup>300</sup> Likewise, the darkness is another image that represents the chaotic world (Job 3.3–6; Prov. 2.13; Jer. 49.9).<sup>301</sup> The correlation between moral sins, the sea, and, the darkness as portrayed in these texts implies that human depravity can be interpreted as a manifestation of disorder. Consequently, beyond the territory of Israel lies the realm of chaos, an unstructured domain where transgressions are deemed

---

<sup>298</sup> Dominic Rudman, "A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual," ZAW 116 (2004): 396–401; idem, "Reflections on a Half-Created World: The Sea, Night and Death in the Bible," BBR 19 (2000): 33–42.

<sup>299</sup> Matt 12:43 associates the wilderness with demonic beings, which might shed more light on the reason early Jewish texts depict Azazel as a fallen angel.

<sup>300</sup> A similar view of wrongdoings as belonging to the chaotic world appears in Jude 13.

<sup>301</sup> Paul also connects wicked moral behavior to the "deeds of darkness" (Rom 13:12–13).

to belong. Thus, *the scapegoat ritual's paramount significance lies in its capacity to expunge the wrongdoings from the land of Israel and banish them to the realm of chaos*. According to P, the eradication of transgressions through the scapegoat ritual does not involve substitution. It is important to note that P does not assert the death of the scapegoat in the wilderness, as the fate of the scapegoat is not the fundamental objective of the ritual. The ritual is as simple as this. the scapegoat leaves the land of Israel. Nowhere does P say that the scapegoat is subjected to any form of punishment. Rather, the ritual functions as a mechanism of elimination, whereby the scapegoat carries away Israel's sins.<sup>302</sup>

## Conclusion

In this chapter, I have surveyed the Jewish sacrificial system, and its centrality in the wilderness tent first, then in the Jerusalem temple. The purification system exists to maintain the purity of the temple, which attracts YHWH to continue to live among the Israelites. I examined the different types of sacrifices, their roles in Israel's life, and how they maintained the relationship between YHWH and the Israelites. The interpretive comments in Lev 1–7 reveal the design and the goal of the Jewish sacrifices. We have also seen that the substitutionary understanding of sacrifices is only a misguided conceptualization of Jewish sacrifices and that there is no evidence to support the claim that the sacrificial animal dies instead of the worshipper.

Anticipating the arguments of the following chapters, since the Levitical sacrificial system is the most important activity that happens in the Jerusalem temple, and Luke's positive interest in the temple, which I discussed in the previous chapter, implies that Luke puts a significant weight on the sacrificial system. In the following chapters, I will show that Luke is interested in another Jewish model for the temple. the heavenly temple, where Jesus offers his blood as a sacrifice. But first, we

---

<sup>302</sup> It is plausible that the ritual, within the confines of its narrative world, is reflective of the consequences that Israel would face if they were to persist in their sinful conduct, namely their expulsion from the land into the tumultuous Babylonian realm. Even if this is true, it should be noted that the scapegoat is not intended as a replacement, but rather serves as an indicator of the forthcoming retribution that shall be borne by the Israelites themselves, and not the scapegoat.



need to understand the nature of the heavenly temple in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period.

### Chapter 3: The Heavenly Temple in Early Judaism

#### Introduction

I have shown that Jewish sacrifices were not substitutionary; that is, the sacrificial animals did not die in place of the worshippers. However, each sacrifice had a unique purpose, and the purpose of the purification offering's blood specifically was to purify the Dwelling Place or the temple from the contamination that resulted from ritual and moral impurities.

The issue at hand is how Jesus's death is sacrificial in Luke-Acts and what it means for Jesus to die as a sacrifice according to Luke-Acts. I suggest that Luke portrays Jesus offering himself as a sacrifice through his death, resurrection, and ascension to offer his blood as a kipper in the heavenly temple. In this chapter, I will investigate the nature and function of the heavenly temple in its Jewish milieu, while in the next chapter, I will demonstrate Luke's interest in the heavenly temple. Once we have a better understanding of the heavenly temple in the wider context of the Ancient Near East, Israel's scriptures, and Second Temple literature, we will be able to see how heavenly temple thinking can be found in Luke-Acts. The purpose of this chapter is *descriptive*, surveying evidence for the heavenly temple and assessing the history of research on it, to understand how ancient Jewish texts depict a heavenly temple, along with assessing the history of research. The focus is on identifying the texts and literary contexts in which traditions about the heavenly temple appear, the language used in these texts, and its implications. Additionally, it is important to explore how these texts relate to each other and what they reveal about the function of the heavenly temple. Moreover, many early Jewish texts attest to the belief in a celestial priesthood, which presumes the existence of the celestial temple in which celestial priests serve, or at least alludes to it. Some writings highlight the ministry of angels as priests in a heavenly temple, while others show prominent Jewish figures elevated to a status similar to

angels where they also serve as priests in the heavenly temple, and yet some texts include both kinds of heavenly priesthood. Some of these texts view God's abode in heaven as a temple, while others view the whole cosmos as a temple with heaven being the inner sanctuary.

The notion of the heavenly temple is popular in the Ancient Near East. Canaanites thought that the higher gods dwell in a temple or a Dwelling Place on the summit of a holy mountain, generally associated with heaven.<sup>303</sup> There is a close connection between the temple and the celestial world in that the temple was perceived as the central spot where heaven and earth are united, and the gods meet humans. Whoever crosses the gates of the temple has crossed into heaven. We find this pattern in

---

<sup>303</sup> The literature on the heavenly temple in the Ancient Near East is massive. For some key works see: Ronald E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965); Alfred Jeremias, *The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell* (London: D. Nutt, 1902), 139–40; Geo Widengren, "Temple Building: A Task for Gods and Kings," *Orientalia* 32 (1963): 56–8; Wayne Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*, Mesopotamian Civilizations 8 (Winona Lake, IL: Eisenbrauns, 1998), 223–362; Michael B. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013). Cf. Victor A. Hurwitz, "I have Built You an Exalted Temple": *Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*, JSOTSup 115 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Benedikt Otzen, "Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function," in *In The Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*, ed. W. B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer, JSOTSup 31 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 199–215; Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

Sumerian literature,<sup>304</sup> Akkadian mythological and legal texts,<sup>305</sup> Hittite hymns,<sup>306</sup> Ugaritic epics,<sup>307</sup> and Egyptian inscriptions.<sup>308</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> In the royal inscriptions from the Gudea Cylinders, King Gudea sees a heavenly pattern of a temple that he should build for the god Ningirsu: “a warrior who bent arm holding a lapis lazuli plate on which he was setting the ground plan of a house... Ningirsu had conceived it (the house) in his (heart) as a sanctuary from which the seed sprouted.” Jan Wilson interprets the function of this dream to establish the link between the earthly temple that Gudea built and Ningirsu’s dwelling in heaven. The text shows Gudea saying: “The heavens tremble before my house, the Eninnu, founded in heaven, whose powers are the greatest, surpassing all others, before the house whose owner looks out over a great distance, as before the roaring thunderbird” (AI 11). *Eršemma*, another Sumerian text, shows goddess Inanna laments the destruction of her temple in Uruk, saying: “My house stands from the very heavens upon the earth... I am the hierodule of heaven... my house! My shrine Eanna! I am the lady of the Eanna. My brickwork of Uruk and Kulaba... I am the hierodule of heaven. My great gate of the Enamtar! I am the lady of Eanna... My seat in heaven and my seat upon earth!” (10–22). On the Gudea Cylinders, see: Diane M. Sharon, “A Biblical Parallel to a Sumerian Temple Hymn: Ezekiel 40-48 and Gudea,” *JANESCU* 24 (1996): 99–109; Richard E. Averbeck, “Ritual Formula, Textual Frame, and Thematic Echoes in the Cylinders of Gudea,” in *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*, ed. Mark W. Chavalas, Gordon D. Young, and Richard Averbeck (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 1997), 39–93; E. Jan Wilson, *The Cylinders of Gudea: Transliteration, Translation, and Index*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 244 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), 28. See also: Dietz Otto Edzard, *Gudea and His Dynasty*, *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods* 3 no. 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 71–72; Adam Falkenstein and Wolfram Von Soden, *Sumerische und Akkadische Hymnen und Gebete* (Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1953), 142. Translation for *Eršemma* is from: Samuel Noah Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology: A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C.* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1944), 59. Cf. Mark E. Cohen, ed., *Sumerian Hymnology: The Eršemma*, *Hebrew Union College Annual Supplements* 2 (Cincinnati: Hebrew College Press, 1981).

<sup>305</sup> The Laws of Hammurabi describe the king, “who made famous the temple of Ebabbar which is akin to the abode of heaven” (*the Laws of Hammurabi* II.22–31). The Akkadian creation myth, *Enūma Eliš*, speaks of three temples, one in heaven, and the other two build after its model: “The Lord measured the construction of Apsu, He founded the Great Sanctuary, the likeness of Esharra. In the Great Sanctuary, Esharra, which He built, and in heaven, He made Ea, Enlil, and Anu dwell in their holy places.” (Tablet IV, lines 143–146). Marduk also establishes earthly counterparts to the heavenly entities: “He shall establish for his fathers’ great food offerings, he shall provide for them, he shall take care of their sanctuaries. He shall cause incense burners to be savored, he shall make their chambers rejoice. He shall make on earth the counterpart of what he brought to pass in heaven” (Tablet V, lines 109–113). Translation for Hammurabi from: Martha T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 77. Translation of *Enūma Eliš* is from: *The Context of Scriptures*, ed. William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, 3 Vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997–2003), 1:398–99.

<sup>306</sup> The Hittite song of Ullikummi describes the Kummiya, the temple of Tessub, the god of storm, located in northern Syria, as existing in heaven: “Temples and the kuntarra-shrines in heaven,” where Ullikummi, a rock transformed into a human, fights against the god Tessub who “has blocked heaven, the holy temples, and Hebat” and in the confrontation between both of them, Ullikumi says: “I will go up to heaven to kingship. I will take myself Kummiya, (the gods’) holy temples, and the kuntarra-shrines.” The text then goes on to describe Ullikumi as becoming so tall that he reaches to the sky to enter into the heavens and encounter the gods and the temples. Translation from: Harry A. Hoffner Jr., *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 59–65.

<sup>307</sup> The Ugaritic Epic of Aqhat pictures Danel, weeping over the death of his son Aqhat, the protagonist, for seven years, then “He presents a meal for the gods, into the heavens sends incense, to the stars the Harnemite’s incense” (KTU 1.19 IV 22–25). Cycles of Baal has several notions connected to the heavenly sanctuary. After Baal defeats Yam, El grants Athirat permission to build a house, a temple, for Baal. This temple is described in cosmic terms: “May Baal enrich with his rain, may he enrich with rich water in a downpour, and may he give his voice in the clouds, may he flash to the earth lightning” (KTU 1.4 V 6–9). See: Simon B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, trans. Mark S. Smith, Simon B. Parker, Edward L. Greenstein, Theodore J. Lewis, David Marcus, *Writings from the Ancient World Series*

These cognate cultures viewed temples as a microcosm, a miniature world of its own. Heavenly temples were perceived to be the eternal dwellings of the gods and goddesses, while earthly temples were structures built after the patterns of the heavenly structures and were meant to facilitate the dwelling of the gods among their peoples. As we turn to Jewish scriptures, we find similar, though more detailed, descriptions of the heavenly temple and its function, yet with more developments that highlight Israel's religious views about YHWH's election of Israel. Jewish texts depict God's abode in heaven as a temple and a royal court. I will start by surveying some key pieces of evidence from Jewish scriptures that support the existence of the heavenly temple, with a special emphasis on the relationship between the heavenly temple, the Dwelling Place, and the Jerusalem temple. I will also examine some key early Jewish works that portray a heavenly temple, tracing the development of the relationship between the heavenly temple and the Jerusalem temple. Both texts groups represent the background and the context in which Luke wrote the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles. In addition, I will examine the role of the heavenly temple in Hebrews and Revelation, as they both exhibit particular interest in the heavenly temple and atonement that takes place in it. I perceive these two texts to be Jewish texts that belong to the early Jesus movement. Finally, the Testament of Levi, while originating in Jewish settings, has developed within circles connected to the early Jesus movement. Hence, I discuss it with Hebrew and revelation.

### **The Heavenly Temple in Jewish Scriptures**

Authors of different Jewish scriptures have different views of heaven. Some view heaven as a temple, others as a royal divine court, others as a royal palace, and others still as mix of all three. For

---

(Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 67; 129; Marjo Christina Annette Korpel, *Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990), 375.

<sup>308</sup> For instance, the Egyptian Pyramids Texts depicts an ascension scene that reads as follows: "As for any god who will take me to the sky, may he live and endure; bulls shall be slaughtered for him, forelegs shall be cut off for him, and he shall ascend to the mansion of Horus which is in the sky; but as for any god who will not take me to the sky, he shall not have honor, he shall not possess a leopard skin, he shall not taste p3k-bread, and he shall not ascend to the mansion of Horus which is in the sky on that day when judgment is made" (Pyramids Texts, Utterance 485). See Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1993), 172.

instance, some authors depict God sitting on his throne in the heavenly divine council which is depicted as a courtroom where the council makes proper judgments (e.g. 1 Kgs 22.19–22; Isa 6.1; Psalm 82; Zech 3.1–10; Job 1.6–12).<sup>309</sup>

I start with examining the heavenly temple in the Song of Moses (Exod 15.1–18).<sup>310</sup> This song portrays YHWH living in the sanctuary located on the top of the cosmic mountain. The author writes: “In your steadfast love you led the people whom you redeemed; you guided them by your strength to your holy abode... You brought them in and planted them on the mountain of your own possession, the place, O Lord, that you made your abode, the sanctuary, O Lord, that your hands have established” (vv. 13–17). The song starts by comparing YHWH to other gods (v. 11), that YHWH lives in a sanctuary made by YHWH’s hands, yet this sanctuary made with YHWH’s hands is located on the top of a mountain.<sup>311</sup>

When YHWH cut the covenant with Israel, a delegation of Israel that consisted of seventy elders of Israel ascended Mount Sinai (Exod 24.9–11). The author writes: “Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel went up, and they saw the God of Israel. Under his feet, there was something like a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness. God did not lay his hand on the chief men of the Israelites; they beheld God, and they ate and drank.” Several

---

<sup>309</sup> On the divine council, see Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 186–190; E. Theodore Mullen, *The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* HSM 24 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 175–209; Robert P. Gordon, “Standing in the Council: When Prophets Encounter God,” in *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 190–204; Min Suc Kee, “A Study of the Heavenly Council in the Ancient Near Eastern Texts, and Its Employment as a Type-scene in the Hebrew Bible” (PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2003), 30–68, 262–63; Katri Antin, “Transmission of Divine Knowledge in the Sapiential Thanksgiving Psalms from Qumran” (PhD Dissertation, University of Helsinki, 2019), 50–80.

<sup>310</sup> David Freedman made the compelling argument that this passage from Exodus is about the heavenly temple. See: David N. Freedman, “Temple Without Hands,” in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977*, ed. A. Biran (Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981), 21–30.

<sup>311</sup> Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society of America, 1991), 80; Freedman, “Temple Without Hands”, 28. I will show that Luke uses Exod 15.1–8 in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 as a reference to the heavenly temple.

elements in this passage suggest that the author meant to show the delegation of Israel entering heaven. First, they saw YHWH on the top of a mountain. YHWH has been already described as living in a sanctuary on the top of a mountain. Second, under the feet of YHWH was a pavement of sapphire, which is used elsewhere to describe God's heavenly throne (Ezek. 1.26). The thought flow shows that the mountain gives the Israelites access to heaven as it is where the heaven and earth flow together. Thus the covenant with Israel was not only cut on earth but in heaven too. The meal in the presence of YHWH further indicates that the Israelite delegation was celebrating the ratification of the covenant. “They beheld God, and they ate and drank” is a statement rooted in covenantal language. Following this scene, YHWH instructs Moses to build the sanctuary (Exod 25.8). Up to this point, YHWH only lived on the mountain, but now YHWH is going to dwell in a sanctuary that the Israelites should build for him. However, as YHWH instructs Moses to build the Dwelling Place, YHWH gives Moses the specific pattern of the Dwelling Place: “In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the Dwelling Place (תבנית המשכן) and of all its furniture, so you shall make it” (Exod 25.9). The author creates an *inclusio* using the word “pattern” (תבנית) in this verse and at the end of the passage after the furniture of the Dwelling Place has been described: “And see that you make them according to the pattern for them, which is being shown you on the mountain (בתבניתם אשר־אתה מראה בהר)” (25.40). YHWH instructs Moses that the Dwelling Place should be a miniature structure of an original structure, the sanctuary made with YHWH’s hands on the top of Mount Sinai as I have shown in Exod 15. Moses already was on the top of Mount Sinai, in the middle of the clouds (Exod. 24.16–18), so it is possible that Moses saw the heavenly structure of YHWH’s eternal sanctuary. The furniture in the Dwelling Place also should follow the heavenly pattern. Yet the furniture of the Dwelling Place is the ark of the covenant, the lampstand, and the table of the bread, thus suggesting that the likes of these components exist also in the heavenly sanctuary.

The authors of the writings about the history of Israel usually depict YHWH answering prayers from his heavenly dwelling as if YHWH does not exist in the earthly temple (e.g., 1 Kgs 8.30, 39, 43, 49). Only the name of YHWH exists in the earthly temple (1 Kgs 9.3), which is probably more of a representation of YHWH, while YHWH exists in heaven.<sup>312</sup> Even though the Dwelling Place of meeting existed before building of the temple (Cf. Josh. 18.1; 19.51; 24.26), YHWH was testifying against Israel's sins from heaven, and heard Israel's loud cries from heaven, not the earthly temple (1 Sam 9.16; cf. Exod. 15.25; 22.23, 27; Num 20.16; Deut. 26.7). YHWH is also described as looking down from heaven before intervening in Israel's current situations (e.g., 1 Sam 9.16). Solomon realized the same fact that God's eternal dwelling is in heaven (1 Kgs 8.27), and again the earthly temple was for YHWH's name to *represent* YHWH's dwelling among his people (1 Kgs 8.16; cf. Neh 1.9).<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>312</sup> The Deuteronomist source depicts YHWH as more transcendent than the other Pentateuch sources. YHWH does not show himself to others, nor appear to anyone. The phenomena of anthropomorphic descriptions of YHWH do not appear in Deuteronomy. Even the tent is not the Dwelling Place of YHWH, but of the name of YHWH (12.11; 14.23; 16.2–11; 26.2). Yet other passages suggest that YHWH continued to be present among his people. For instance, Deut. 6.15 reads: "The Lord your God, who is present with you, is a jealous God," and Deut 7.21 reads: "The Lord your God, who is present with you, is a great and awesome God." Thus, the Deuteronomic tradition suggests that YHWH is still living among his people, but in a different sense. Deut. 26.15 shows that YHWH's eternal abode is in heaven: "Look down from your holy habitation, from heaven, and bless your people Israel and the ground that you have given us, as you swore to our ancestors, a land flowing with milk and honey." YHWH's holy habitation is in heaven. Thus, YHWH's visible nature that exists in other Pentateuchal sources does not exist in Deuteronomy; YHWH continues to exist among his people but in a hidden mode through his name. As Benjamin Sommer notes: "In the Deuteronomic tradition, God has a nonfragmentable self, and therefore God has only one body located exclusively in heaven." Sommer addresses the issue of the corporeality of YHWH within the diverse concepts of corporeality in Mesopotamia and Northwest semitic region. Sommer's main claim is that "a single deity could exist simultaneously in several bodies" (12). Through this concept of fluid divinity, Sommers shows how ancient people could perceive the deity embodied in several statues, even though the statues remain distinct from the deity in some ways. See: Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 67.

<sup>313</sup> Scholars have long recognized the connections between the description of Solomon's temple and the heavenly temple in Jewish scriptures. William Albright famously noted that Boaz and Jachin, the two enigmatic pillars standing free in the temple courtyard (1 Kgs 7.21), were common in other ancient Near Eastern temples. In some temples, these column pairs functioned as structural support to the portico's roof, but in other temples, they did not have any structural support function, thus "may have been regarded as the reflection of the columns between which the sun rose each morning." According to Albright, the molten sea that Solomon established in the temple (1 Kgs 7.23–36), "has been universally recognized as having cosmic significance of some kind." As Albright argues, the sea "cannot be separated from the Mesopotamian Apsu, employed both as the name of the subterranean fresh-water ocean from which all life and all fertility were derived and as the name of a basin of holy water erected in the temple." The Mesopotamian cosmic sources of water represent an essential part of the Mesopotamian mythological imagery for the creation of the cosmos. Albright notes another connection between the altar of the burnt offering and the Mesopotamian cosmological mythology, especially in Ezek. 43.13–17. The altar of the burnt offering is built in three



The authors of numerous psalms clearly view heaven as a temple where the throne of YHWH exists, which is the reason why the authors of the psalms note that YHWH can see all humanity and

---

square stages, each with a side two cubits shorter than the stage below it. Albright argues that the lowest stage, which functions as the foundation platform should be translated as “the bosom of the earth” חֵיק האֶרֶץ (Ezek 43.14) while the summit of the altar should be understood as “the mountain of the gods” האֶרְאִיל (Ezek. 43:16), a reference to “the cosmic mountain in which the gods were born and reared” according to Assyrian texts. Albright then shows that the altar of the temple as Ezekiel envisioned looks similar to the Mesopotamian temple tower, Ziggurat, which means “the mountain peak.” These Ziggurats are usually depicted in inscriptions decorated with four horns just like Ezekiel's altar (Ezek 43.15). Albright also notes that in the Chronicler's version of the dedication of Solomon's temple, Solomon steps on a raised bronze platform in front of the altar כִּיּוֹר נחֹשֶׁת and its dimensions are five cubits long, five cubits wide, and three cubits high (2 Chr. 6.12–13). This raised platform placed in front of the altar is attested elsewhere in ancient Near Eastern inscriptions. One limestone stela found at Ugarit, which Albright dates to 1400 BCE, pictures a king standing on a raised platform before Baal, and the king's hands are upraised in prayer posture, just like Solomon. Another stela kept in the Cairo Museum portrays a priest standing on a raised platform before a Syrian god and an incense altar to his side. What is common about these two archaeological scenes is that the platform has a lid that could be opened. Albright, connecting these two scenes to another inscription of Sargon II of Assyria which uses cognate terms Kiuri or ki-ur, both of which are linguistically connected to the Hebrew כִּיּוֹר that the chronicler uses, argues that the meaning of כִּיּוֹר is “the entrance to the underworld.” Hence, the platform's lid functions as an entrance point to the underworld. In Hebrew, the term nuances “the foundation of the earth” which again shows cosmological connections embedded in the temple structures. Based on these observations, Albright concludes that Solomon's temple “possessed a rich cosmic symbolism.” The function of these cosmic connections to the temple, as Albright interprets them, is to further emphasize the ideology of Yahwism through the universality of YHWH's dominion. In Albright's words: “In the temple, Yahweh was enthroned as the sole ruler of the entire cosmos; heaven, earth, and underworld were all subject to him.” Albright does not see these cosmic connections as an extension of the building of the Dwelling Place according to the heavenly pattern shown to Moses. Instead, they serve a religious ideology to further the rulership of YHWH over the whole cosmos, not just Israel. Jon Levenson takes a different approach, arguing that there is a correlation between the cosmos-building process to the temple-building process. Levenson finds several thematic and linguistic parallels between both processes. The language of God's command occurs in both processes (cf. Gen 1.3 and Exod 39.43), the idea that the work has been completed (Gen 2.1 and Exod 39.32) and that it has been finished (Gen 2.2 and Exod 40.33b–34) also occur in both processes. Additionally, the idea of consecration upon finishing the work appears in both processes (Gen 2.3 and Exod. 40.9–11). Levenson argues that “the function of these correspondences is to underscore the depiction of the sanctuary as a world, that is, an ordered, supportive, and obedient environment, and the depiction of the world as a sanctuary, that is, a place in which the reign of God is visible and unchallenged.” The priestly circle looked at the temple in terms of the cosmos and vice versa – the cosmos is a macro world, the palace of God. For these priestly circles, cosmogony could only be understood through the ritual act that took place in the temple, and the ritual act is in fact a cosmic action. Humans could participate in the divine realm through the ritual action performed in the temple as a cosmic sacred space. Thus, both processes, the cosmic-building and temple-building “implicate each other, and neither is complete alone.” The temple is the ideal cosmos, and the connections to the creation in the temple serve to summon up the ideal world that is fully different from the present mundane and profane reality. Albright and Levenson offer different ways of approaching the cosmic implications of the Dwelling Place, the temple structure, and the temple building process, though they intersect at some points. Albright understands the connections between the cosmos and the temple as a reference to the universality of YHWH's sovereignty, while Levenson focuses more on the nature of the temple as a microcosmos that shows how the world should look like if it remains under YHWH's control. Again, Levenson, like Albright, sees the connection between the temple and the cosmos as representing YHWH's sovereignty, though in a different way. Other pieces of evidence, especially from Psalms, further emphasize this conclusion. See: William F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel: The Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1942), 144–55; John Levenson, *Creation and The Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 86–99.

judge their actions (cf. Ps. 47.9; 102.19). Mitchel Dahood translates Psalm 78.69 as: “He built His sanctuary like the high heavens.” While the Hebrew text uses רמים and does not include “heavens,” Dahood argues: “*rāmīm* is an adjective with the force of a substantive... short for Ugaritic *šmm rmm* in one of Anath’s epithets, *b ‘lt šmm rmm*, “mistress of the high heavens,” Phoenician *šmm rmm*, and *samēroumos* in Sanchunyatōn,”<sup>314</sup> which means that the psalmist refers to the heavenly pattern of the temple (cf. Exod 25.9). The psalmist also recognizes the connection between the firmament and the heavenly temple: “Praise the Lord! Praise God in his sanctuary (בְּקִדְשׁוֹ); praise him in his mighty firmament! (בְּרָקִיעַ עֲזוֹ)” (Ps 150.1). The parallelism between the sanctuary and the firmament shows that the psalmist refers to the heavenly temple.<sup>315</sup>

The author(s) of the Chronicles’ version of David’s connection to the temple that his son Solomon built is also significant for our analysis of the heavenly temple in Jewish scriptures (1 Chr 28). According to the author(s) of the Chronicles, David gives instructions to Solomon on how to build the temple, where the author of the Chronicles is careful to show that David gave Solomon the pattern or the ground-plan of the temple, and all furnishings and vessels used in it (vv. 11, 18, 19). But the author of the Chronicles also states how David received this pattern of the temple. David showed Solomon “the plan (תְּבִנִית) of all that he had in his spirit (כָּל אֲשֶׁר הָיָה בְּרוּחַ) for the courts of the house of the Lord, all the surrounding chambers, the treasuries of the house of God, and the treasuries for dedicated gifts” (1 Chr 28.12). Two significant observations about this verse. First, the author of the Chronicles uses the same Hebrew word (תְּבִנִית) that P uses for the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place (Exod 25.9), which suggests that for the author of the Chronicles *not only the Dwelling Place is*

---

<sup>314</sup> Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II: 51–100: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 247.

<sup>315</sup> Dahood sees the parallelism between YHWH’s “mighty deeds” and “surpassing greatness” in v. 2, and notes that the rhythm of the whole psalm is structured in parallels. See: Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms III: 101–150: Introduction, Translation, and Notes With an Appendix: The Grammar of the Psalter* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 359. The association between the heavenly temple and the firmament will be useful in our analysis of Luke’s view of the heavenly temple (see chapter four below).

*built after the heavenly pattern, but Solomon's temple is also built after the heavenly pattern.* Second, NRSV mistranslates the Hebrew construction כל אשר היה ברוח, translated in the Old Greek translation as ὁ εἶχεν ἐν πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, both meaning “All which is in his spirit,” suggesting the means through which David received the pattern of the temple. Later on, David claims that YHWH explained all the pattern's details to him: “All, through writing from YHWH's hands on me, is made clear – all the works of the pattern” (הכל בכתב מיד יהוה עלי השכיל כל מלאכות התבנית).<sup>316</sup> The statement about YHWH's hands on someone refers to divine revelation elsewhere (e.g., Isa 61.1; Ezek. 3.14; 2 Sam 23.2). Thus, the author of Chronicles wants to picture David, like Moses in Exodus, receiving the pattern of the temple from heaven. The author of the Chronicles continues to maintain the notion of the heavenly abode of YHWH. During the times of Hezekiah's reforms after he renewed the sacrificial worship in the temple “the priests and the Levites stood up and blessed the people, and their voice was heard; their prayer came to his holy dwelling in heaven (למעון קדשו לשמים)” (2 Chr 30.27). מעון is used elsewhere in 2 Chronicles to denote the earthly temple (e.g., 2 Chr 36.15).

Within the text of the Book of Ezekiel, the prophet also sees a chariot that carries YHWH's glory in heaven have been a source of inspiration for Second Temple authors (especially Ezek 1, 8–11, 43).<sup>317</sup> In these visions, God's glory appears sitting on a moving throne with wheels, which as Ezekiel later recognizes, represents the winged cherubim that YHWH rides while abandoning the temple (Ezek 10.20). The cherubim stood on the ark-cover in the holy of the holies in Jerusalem's temple, and where sculpted in different places in the temple. As Martha Himmelfarb notes, Ezekiel is able to recognize the flying creatures as the cherubim because of his proximity to the sculpted ones in the temple.<sup>318</sup> On the top of the flying creatures of the divine throne, there is “something like a dome (רקיע), shining like

---

<sup>316</sup> This is my translation of the Hebrew text.

<sup>317</sup> I do not discuss Isaiah's vision as I am convinced that Isaiah did not see the heavenly temple, but had a vision of the unseen reality within the earthly Jerusalem temple. See: Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 54–55.

<sup>318</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 11.

crystal, spread out above their heads” (Ezek 1.22). The flying creatures carry a dome, or a firmament, on which the divine throne rests in the heavenly temple as Ezekiel saw it. The firmament is material structure usually associated with שמים (cf. Gen 1), where it divides the primordial water into upper water and lower water. Adela Yarbro Collins describes it as a “strip of beaten metal,” as the Hebrew word denotes an expanded or a stretched surface.<sup>319</sup> The author of *Tg. Ezek.* 1.22 writes that the firmament is made of גליד (ice, frost). The idea of the stretched sky recurs in the Jewish scriptures, described like a stretched piece of cloth or leather (Isa. 40.22; 42.5; 44.24; 45.12; 51.13; Jer 10.12; 51.15; Zech 12.1; Ps. 104.2; Job 9.8), probably of a tent. In *Enuma Elish*, when Marduk constructs the sky from the corpse of Tiamat, the text describes the process as if is stretching a tent.<sup>320</sup> The connection between the sky firmament and the tent invokes the heavenly pattern of the tent discussed earlier. In Ezekiel, the firmament serves double purposes. (a) it is the platform that holds the flying creatures who hold the divine throne, and (b) it is the sky.<sup>321</sup> Hence, the firmament is connected to the heavenly temple.

But for Ezekiel, this vision does not bring the good news, because the Jerusalem temple became so defiled that YHWH abandoned it. YHWH orders the angels to destroy Jerusalem, and even to begin with the sanctuary (Ezek 9.6). YHWH will only return to a temple in Jerusalem when it is pure, which will happen in the future as Ezekiel sees the eschatological temple (Ezek 40–48). Ezekiel sees YHWH’s glory return to the temple just as when he saw YHWH’s glory abandon it (Ezek 43.3). Meanwhile, Ezekiel sees YHWH’s present and eternally existing temple in heaven. YHWH shows Ezekiel the *pattern* of the temple in heaven, which Moses saw earlier: “As for you, mortal, describe the temple to

---

<sup>319</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*, JSJSup 50 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 36. Cf. C. Houtman, *Der Himmel im Alten Testament: Israels Weltbild und Weltanschauung, Oudtestamentische studiën* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 222–23.

<sup>320</sup> See the discussion in Kyle Greenwood, *Scripture and Cosmology: Reading the Bible Between the Ancient World and Modern Science* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2015), 57.

<sup>321</sup> William Hugh Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19*, WBC 28 (Waco: Word Books, 1986), 34.

the house of Israel, and let them measure the pattern תכנית (43.10). The term *tabnīt*, as used by the Prophet, refers to the divine plan, pattern, model, or blueprint concerning the instructions for the reconstruction of the temple, to which the glory of God will return (Ezek 40.1–43.12). This also includes the directives for the construction of the associated structures and activities within the temple complex (Ezek 43.13–48.35), as well as the guidelines for the settlement of the people surrounding the temple.

The notion of the heavenly temple appears for the first time in Jewish scriptures in connection with a negative view of the earthly Jerusalem temple. Ezekiel’s visions will influence other Second Temple authors who were not satisfied with the role of the Second Temple. Himmelfarb once again notes: “In the period of the Second Temple, under the influence of Ezekiel, those who are unhappy with the behavior of the people and especially its priests come to see the temple not as God’s proper dwelling, the place where heaven and earth meet, but rather a mere copy of the true temple located in heaven.”<sup>322</sup> Himmelfarb calls this process a “desacralization of the earthly temple.”<sup>323</sup> Whether this description is the best interpretation of the evidence or not, the essential point remains that Ezekiel brought the heavenly temple into the scene when there was dissatisfaction with the earthly Jerusalem temple.

There are various functions that authors of the Jewish scriptures attribute to the heavenly temple. The authors of the Torah, for instance, emphasize that the heavenly temple is the abode of YHWH, and the earthly Dwelling Place of meeting and the Jerusalem temple are designed according to the heavenly pattern of YHWH’s abode. Other authors, like the authors of Psalms emphasize the heavenly temple as the royal court for the divine council and YHWH’s palace, where YHWH’s judgment and salvation come from. Yet a prophetic text like Ezekiel turns to the heavenly temple when

---

<sup>322</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 13.

<sup>323</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 13.

the Jerusalem temple seems to be so defiled that YHWH cannot indwell it anymore. The variegated functions of the heavenly temple in Hebrew Jewish scriptures continued to inspire Jewish authors in the Second Temple period.

### **The Heavenly Temple in Early Judaism**

The Jewish imagination about a heavenly temple that exists in heaven undergoes diverse developments within the Second Temple period. Different conceptualizations about the heavenly temple, its structure, and its function emerged in literature from this period. Jewish authors of what later became parts of the Jewish scriptures depict God's heavenly abode as a temple, which suggests that the idea of the earthly temple being patterned after the heavenly temple may have followed from this understanding. Early Jewish texts take a similar direction. Those authors conceive the heavenly temple and its priesthood similar to the earthly temple and its priesthood. As I will show, the idea that the heavenly temple is the archetype of the earthly temple was popular in the Second Temple period.<sup>324</sup>

I will review ten works from the Second Temple period that contribute to our understanding of the role that the heavenly temple played in the development of Second Temple Judaism. Some of these texts are more explicit than others, so I will begin with the most explicit ones which will help illuminate the more implicit ones.

### **The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice**

The first work to discuss is the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a liturgical work among the Dead Sea Scrolls, as it expands the notion of the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place. The preserved Songs has thirteen songs, each one of them devoted to one of a series of thirteen Sabbaths. Carol Newsom argues that the function of the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice is to “invoke angelic praise, describe the angelic priesthood and the heavenly temple, and give an account of the worship performed

---

<sup>324</sup> Cf. V. Aptowitzer, “The Celestial Temple as Viewed in the Aggadah,” in *Binah: Studies in Jewish Thought*, ed. J. Dan, *Binah: Studies in Jewish History, Thought, and Culture* 2 (New York: Praeger, 1989), 1–29.

on the Sabbath in the heavenly sanctuary.”<sup>325</sup> Newsom believes that the thirteen songs are intended to be recited during the first thirteen Sabbaths of the calendar year and that there might have been originally 52 songs for each Sabbath.<sup>326</sup> Johann Maier, however, points out that the thirteen songs cover the first quarter of the calendrical year and are intended to be repeated throughout the rest of the year quarters.<sup>327</sup> Regardless, the Songs are clearly meant as a liturgical manual summoning and describing the worship of priestly angels in the heavenly temple.

The text of the Songs is preserved in eight fragmentary manuscripts (4Q400 – 4Q407). Two other texts were discovered, one in Cave Eleven and the other at Masada. Newsom dates the scrolls to the late Hasmonean period or early Herodian period based on paleographic evidence.<sup>328</sup> Regarding the structure of the Songs, Newsom suggests that the seventh song lies at the center of the literary composition of the Songs, not only because number seven lies at the center of number thirteen, but also because the sixth and eighth songs include several references to the number seven (e.g., seven priesthoods, seven councils, seven precincts, seven words, seven psalms, seven chief princes). Thus, Newsom finds three main divisions of the Songs. the first five songs, the middle sixth to the eighth songs, and the ninth to the thirteenth songs.

As James Davila notes: “The most detailed surviving account of the macrocosmic temple and celestial throne room from the Second Temple period is found in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.”<sup>329</sup> The first division highlights the purity and holiness of the angels who stand in God's presence

---

<sup>325</sup> Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, A Critical Edition*, HSS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 1. See the discussion of the heavenly temple's ministry in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in: Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*, JSPSup 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 235–45.

<sup>326</sup> Newsom, *Songs*, 5.

<sup>327</sup> J. Maier, “Shire Olat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations on Their Calendric Implications and on their Style,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 543–60 (544).

<sup>328</sup> Newsom, *Songs*, 86, 168, 363.

<sup>329</sup> James R. Davila, “The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 1–19 (2).

performing the work of the priests. The angels clearly “propitiate his goodwill for all who repent of transgression” (4Q400 1, I.16). Just as we noted in the Testament of Levi, angels perform the priestly service of atonement in the heavenly temple in the Songs too. Notably, the Songs invite even the building structure of the heavenly temple to participate in the heavenly worship of God. The text of the Songs is rich and vivid in its description of the heavenly temple and its worship. For instance, the author of the Songs writes:<sup>330</sup>

With them praise all the foundations of the holy of holies, the supporting columns of the most exalted dwelling, and all the corners of his building. Sing to God, awesome in power, [all you spirits of knowledge and of light], to exalt together the most pure vault of [his] holy sanctuary. [Praise him, divine spirits, praising for ever and ever the main vault of the heights, all [its] beams] and its walls, all its structure, the work of [its] construction. The spirits of the holy of holies, the living gods, [the spirits of everlasting holiness] above all the holy ones in the wonderful vaults, marvel of splendour and majesty, and wonderful is the glory in the most perfect light (4Q403 1, I. 41–46).

The author invites the spirits of knowledge and light, presumably the angels, to praise God within the heavenly temple. The angels should also praise the existence of the heavenly temple as an everlasting holy place. In another passage of the same text in the Songs, the authors invite the worshippers to praise the very structure of the heavenly temple:

[Praise with them all the foundations of the] holy of the holies, [the] supporting [columns of] the highest vault, and all the corner[s] 10 [of its building. Sing to God,] who is awesome [in power, all spirits of] knowledge and of light, to exalt together the most [pure vault] 11 [of his holy sanctuary. Praise him, divine spirits, praising] forever and ever the [main vault] of the

---

<sup>330</sup> All translations of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices are from Martínez & Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:804–39.



height[s, all] 12 [its beams and its walls, all its structure, the work of its construction.] The spirits of the hol[y of] holies, the /living/ gods, the spir[its of everlasting] ho[liness] 13 [above all the holy ones in the] wonderful [vault]s, marvel of splendour [and majesty] and wonderful is the glory in the 14 [most perfect] light, [knowledge ... in al]l wonderful sanctuaries. The spirits of God around the residence of 15 [the king of truth and justice; all its walls ...] in the holy of holies (4Q405 57–58. 9–15).

The description of the heavenly temple in the Songs looks similar to the Jerusalem temple. The temple includes the most inner sanctum just like the Jerusalem temple. The Holy of the Holies קודש[ח] קודשים receives special attention in the Songs:

He has established] the most holy ones among the eternal holy ones, so that for him they can be priests [of the inner sanctum in the temple of his kingship,] the servants of the Presence in his glorious sanctuary. In the assembly of all the divinities [of knowledge, and in the council of all the spirits] of God, he has engraved his ordinances for all spiritual creatures, and [his] [glorious] precepts [for those who establish] knowledge, the people of the intelligence of his divine glory, Blank for those who are close to knowledge. [...] eternal. And from the holy source of the [most] holy sanctuaries [...] prie[sts] of the inner sanctum, servants of the Presence of the [most] holy king [...] his glory. (4Q400 1 I.3–8).

Moreover, the author of the Songs notes that the decoration of the heavenly temple structure is similar to the Jerusalem temple. For example, the author of the Songs writes: “5 [The likene]ss of living gods is engraved in the vestibules (through which) the king enters, figures of radiant spirits [... ki]ng, figures of glorious li[ght,] [wonderful] spirits. 6 [In the] middle of the spirits of splendour (are) wonderful multicoloured (works), figures of living gods [... in the] glorious [in]ner shrines, the structure of 7 [the sanctuary of the ho]lly of holies, in the inner shrines of the king, figure[s of g]o[ds.

And from the] likeness [...] holy of holies 8 [...] ... [...] the in]ner shrine of the ki[ng]” (4Q405 14-15, I.5-8). Those gods engraved on the walls of the heavenly temple most probably represent the Cherubim engraved on the walls of the Jerusalem temple.

According to the Songs, God established the angelic priesthood, with a specific group of angels set to the ministry of the Holy of the Holies: “For he has established among the eternally holy ones the holiest of the holy ones, and they have become for him as priests” (4Q400 1, II. 3). Among the holy ones, there is the holiest of the holy ones, whom God made priests to serve in the Holy of the Holies.<sup>331</sup> God has amalgamated the Yahad members with the angels: “He has joined their assembly to the sons of heaven to be a council of the community, a foundation of the building of holiness, and eternal plantation throughout all ages to come” (4Q403 1, I.41).

Davila argues that the Songs are thoroughly indebted to the Torah’s notion of the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place (Exod. 25.9).<sup>332</sup> First, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice use the same Hebrew word “pattern” (תבנית) to describe various “structures” in the heavenly temple, including the architectural design of the “chief firmament on high” (4Q403 1 I.43-44); the “appearance of a glorious structure for the chiefs of the dominions” (4Q403 1 II. 3//4Q404 6.5); the “chiefs of the divine structure” (4Q403 1 II.16); “a structure of a throne chariot” (4Q405 20 II.21-22); and “every structure of spirits of wond[er]” (11Q 17 VIII.3). Second, the work incorporates details of the Dwelling Place into its description of the heavenly Temple. The “workmanship of colorful stuff” (4Q402 2 + 3 I.7) echoes a similar phrase in Exod 26.36. The celestial brickwork (11Q17.4 and 4Q405.19//11Q17.6) is inspired by Exod. 24.10. The curtain screening off the holy of holies (4Q405 15, II.16) is described in Exod 26.31-33; 36.35-36. The phrase “purely salted” is applied in Exod 30.35 to the incense used in

---

<sup>331</sup> Compare this language to 4QMMT’s description of the Israelite priests, where Israel is “holy, while the children of Aaron are holy of the holies” (4QMMT B 79). See Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 57.

<sup>332</sup> Davila, “The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” 3-4.

the Dwelling Place is applied to features of the heavenly Temple (4Q405 19.4//11Q17 6.4–5; 4Q405 20, II.21–22; 11Q17 9.7; 4Q405 23, II.10). The priestly garments of the angels in the Songs are modeled on the garments of the high priest in Exodus. These include the breast piece (11Q17 9.6) and the ephod (11Q17 9.8; 4Q405 23 II.5), described in detail in Exodus 28 and 39; the “cord” that connects them (cf. 11Q17 9.7 and Exod 28.28); and the “woven workmanship” of the garments (4Q405 23, II.7, 10; cf. Exod 28.32; 39.22, 27). In addition, a heavenly Dwelling Place is mentioned twice in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q403 1, II.10; 4Q405 20, II.21–22). Third, there are other Jewish authors from the Second Temple period who applied materials from the description of the Dwelling Place to their accounts of the heavenly Temple. Philo says that the universe is the true Temple, with the angels serving as priests (*Spec. Leg.* 1.66–67). The blueprint of the Dwelling Place was revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai in a form symbolic of this universe (*Mos.* 2.74–76, 88, 98, 101–5) and the vestments of the earthly high priest (including specifically the breast piece, ephod, and woven work) act as a perceivable representation of the universe (*Mos.* 2.109–33; *Spec. Leg.* 1.82–96). Thus the author of the Songs’ description of the heavenly temple is rooted in the Torah’s description of the Dwelling Place formed according to the heavenly pattern.

The author of the Songs also highlights the common feature of early Jewish works focusing on the heavenly temple, which is the bloodless and sacrificial aroma. The smell of the angelic sacrifices is described as “the aroma of their offerings” and “the aroma of their libations” in song thirteen (11Q17 8–7.2–3). Newsome finds this a “means of suggesting... the correspondence between the heavenly and earthly service.”<sup>333</sup> Newsom looks at the whole work as a ritualistic medium, in which the community members viewed themselves as joining the angels in heaven in worship in the heavenly temple. Participation in the worship and ministry of the heavenly temple compensates for the community’s

---

<sup>333</sup> Newsom, *Songs*, 372–73.

isolation from the Jerusalem temple. Barriers between angels and the worshippers are broken, in a sense, within the liturgical experience.<sup>334</sup> The celestial and the mundane meet together in the liturgical context.

## The Book of Watchers

The Book of Watchers is one of the early Jewish apocalyptic works and constitutes the first book in the collected work known as 1 Enoch.<sup>335</sup> The book discusses the rebellion of the angels (called “Watchers” in the book) and its consequences. But the most significant aspect of the work for my purposes is that it is the earliest work from the Second Temple period that envisions the existence of the heavenly temple,<sup>336</sup> especially in 1 Enoch 14 and its surrounding context:<sup>337</sup>

---

<sup>334</sup> The Hodayot has a similar expression: “And a perverted spirit you have purified from great sin that it might take its place with the host of the holy ones and enter into community with the congregation of the children of heaven. And you cast for man an eternal lot with the spirits of knowledge, that he might praise your name in a common rejoicing and recount your wonderful acts before all your works” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 11.22–24).

<sup>335</sup> For the text of 1 Enoch, see George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012). For the translation and extensive commentary, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); and George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37–82* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011). For a summary of the discussions of the respective parts of 1 Enoch, see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 44–46; 47–53; 83–86; 110–15; 248–56. For a handy and brief introduction to the compositions making up 1 Enoch, see Michael E. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period; Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 395–406. For more on the dating of the Book of Watchers, see James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 111–114. For the early reception history of the Book of the Watchers, see Anette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 80–83; George W. Nickelsburg, “The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum; Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113.

<sup>336</sup> Carol Newsom argues that 4Q201 corresponds to sections in 1 Enoch 6–11, 12–16. Yet the scroll, which is dated to the second century BCE, is itself a conflation of several original independent traditions, which means that the traditions in these sections from 1 Enoch are older. Loren Stuckenbruck also argues that “fragments of 4Q201 correspond to chs. 1–5 (in 4Q201 1i–ii), 6–11 (in 1 iii–vi, in which the Asael and Shemihazah traditions are combined), and ch. 12 (in 1 vi). Similarly the early Hasmonian ms. 4Q202 (= 4QEnoch<sup>b</sup>): from chs. 1–5 (1, II.1), chs. 6–11 (1, II–IV), and ch. 14 (1, VI).” See: Carol A. Newsom, “The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19. Cosmology and Judgment,” *CBQ* 42 (1980), 310–29; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 13–14.

<sup>337</sup> For a discussion of the heavenly temple in 1 Enoch 12–16, see: George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 580–2; idem and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 1*, 253–66; and Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 9–16.

And in (the) vision it was shown to me thus. Behold, clouds in the vision were summoning me, and mists were crying out to me; and shooting stars and lightning flashes were hastening me and speeding me along; and winds in my vision made me fly up and lifted me upward and brought me to heaven. And I went in until I drew near to a wall built of hailstones; and tongues of fire were encircling them all around; and they began to frighten me. And I went into the tongues of fire, and I drew near to a great house built of hail stones; and the walls of this house were like stone slabs; and they were all of snow, and the floor was of snow; And the ceiling was like shooting stars and lightning flashes; and among them were fiery cherubim, and their heaven was water; and a flaming fire encircled all their walls, and the doors blazed with fire. And I went into that house—hot as fire and cold as snow; and no delight of life was in it. Fear enveloped me, and trembling seized me; and I was quaking and trembling, and I fell upon my face. And I saw in my vision, And behold, another open door before me. and a house greater than the former one; and it was all built of tongues of fire. And all of it so excelled in glory and splendor and majesty that I am unable to describe for you its glory and majesty. Its floor was of fire; and its upper part was flashes of lightning and shooting stars; and its ceiling was a flaming fire. And I was looking, and I saw a lofty throne; and its appearance was like ice; and its wheels were like the shining sun; and its guardians were cherubim; and from beneath the throne issued streams of flaming fire. And I was unable to see. And the Great Glory sat upon it; his raiment was like the appearance of the sun and whiter than much snow. And no angel could enter into this house and behold his face because of the splendor and glory; and no flesh could behold him. Flaming fire encircled him, and a great fire stood by him; and none of those about him

approached him. Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; but he needed no counselor; his every word was deed” (1 *En.* 14.8–22).<sup>338</sup>

The visions begin when Enoch sees the gates of heaven, or what the Aramaic fragments of the work found at Qumran call “the gates of the temple of heaven” (4Q204 1, VI.4). We have here an explicit reference to the heavenly temple, and the Aramaic version states that Enoch will be taken to the temple of heaven. 1 Enoch 14 describes Enoch’s ascension to heaven in clouds (v. 8). Ascent to heaven represents an early type of apocalyptic revelation that will become increasingly popular during the Second Temple period as we will see. Similar to Ezekiel, Enoch encounters the heavenly temple in a structure similar to the Jerusalem temple, consisting of the outer court אולם (1Kgs 6.3; cf. Ezek 40.48), the Holy היכל (1Kgs 6.17; cf. Ezek 41.1), and the Holy of the Holies קדש הקדשים (1Kgs 6.5, 16; cf. Ezek 41.4). Enoch sees the structural wall of the heavenly temple in a vision, most probably referring to the outer chamber, the vestibule.<sup>339</sup> The outer wall of the heavenly temple is built of hailstone and surrounded by “tongues of fire” (v. 10). As Enoch goes through the fire tongues, he enters the house, which resembles the Holy place in Jerusalem’s temple, and sees the cherubim, the celestial watchers, within the structure (v. 11). Enoch describes how “a flaming fire was around all its walls, and its doors were ablaze with fire” (v. 12). Then Enoch encounters another house, referring to the Holy of the Holies, which is “constructed of tongues of fire” (v. 15). There is an emphasis on the presence of tongues of fires within the structure of the temple and around it. The text even describes the floor of the building as made of fire, while the chambers are made of lightning and fire-balls, and the roof made of

---

<sup>338</sup> The translation is from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 257. Nickelsburg bases his translation on an eclectic reconstruction of the original text of 1 Enoch based on all available witnesses, as he notes in the introduction: “My translation and commentary presume my own eclectic text, which represents my best judgment about the value of the resources available in the Aramaic fragments, the Greek and Ethiopic versions, and the fragments of versions preserved in Latin, Coptic, and Syriac.” See, Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 3.

<sup>339</sup> Martha Himmelfarb defends the idea that Enoch goes through three houses, where the outer wall represents the third, outer chamber, the vestibule, the existed in the first temple (1 Kgs 6.3) and the second temple (for instance, as described by Josephus, *JW* 5:207–19). While the Ethiopic text mentions a mere “wall,” Himmelfarb notes that the Greek version refers to a building. See Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 14.

blazing fire (v. 17).<sup>340</sup> In this heavenly Holy of the Holies, Enoch encounters the divine throne, from which streams of blazing fire come forth (v. 19). This throne had wheels, and Enoch found cherubim at the throne. The Book of Watchers relies on Ezekiel in this divine throne picture; a moving throne with wheels and cherubim connected to it. Then Enoch saw God, the Great One, sitting on the throne, and again fire encircled the throne, with thousands of angels around him, constituting the divine council. But even angels could not approach the throne. Those angels likely served as priests in the heavenly setting as they approached God everyday: “And the watchers of the holy ones who draw near to him did not turn away from him, by night, nor do they depart from him” (1 *En.* 14.23).<sup>341</sup>

There are various similarities between the heavenly temple and the Jerusalem temple. As we have seen, both consist of three structures. an outer chamber, the Holy place, and the Holy of the Holies, with the third one containing the divine throne. The heavenly temple is built from fire, lightning, and hailstone as described above. But Josephus also maintains a similar glamorous description of the Second Temple: “Being covered on all sides with massive plates of gold, the sun was no sooner up than it radiated so fiery a flash that persons straining to look at it were compelled to avert their eyes, as from the solar rays” (*J.W.* 5.222). Himmelfarb argues that “we cannot fail to be reminded of the heavenly temple of 1 Enoch 14.”<sup>342</sup>

The Book of Watchers intentionally shows the heavenly temple as the archetype of Jerusalem’s temple. Yet at the same time, the Jerusalem temple, whether the first temple or the second, never appears in the work. Several factors have led scholars to conclude that the heavenly temple in the Book of Watchers functions as the pure temple instead of the defiled Jerusalem temple. David Suter

---

<sup>340</sup> Zech 2.5 states that God will become a wall of fire surrounding the eschatological Jerusalem since it will not have any walls. These notions of fire tongues and fire walls will prove to be significant in the next chapter as we discuss the heavenly temple in Luke’s writings.

<sup>341</sup> See the discussion in Eibert Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*, Oudtestamentische Studiën 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 195–203.

<sup>342</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15.

and George Nickelsburg both convincingly argue that the fallen watchers represent a specific line of priesthood that defiled itself with unlawful marriages and/or sexual relationships with women during their menstruation periods.<sup>343</sup> With their defiled ministries in the Jerusalem temple, this line of priesthood defiled the temple altogether so that it could no longer function as the dwelling place of Israel's God.<sup>344</sup> When priests are defiled, they not only defile the temple, but they offer defiled sacrifices, which nullifies the purpose of the sacrifice.<sup>345</sup> Defiled sacrifices cannot purify.<sup>346</sup> For the apocalyptic author, there exists the memory of the great first temple and the hope for the future eschatological temple. For the time being, God's abode should be sought in heaven only, and only the righteous, like Enoch, will be able to access it.

---

<sup>343</sup> See: David. W. Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–35; idem, "Fallen Angels Revisited," *Henoch* 24 (2002): 137–42; Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Mapping the First Book of Enoch: Geographical Issues in George Nickelsburg's Commentary," in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An On-Going Dialogue of Learning*, 2 vols., ed. Jacob Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck, JSJSup 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2.387–94; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Temple According to 1 Enoch," *BYU Studies Quarterly* 53 (2014): 7–24. The theory that the fallen angels in the Book of Watchers represent Jerusalem priests has not gone without criticism. Loren Stuckenbruck, for instance, argues that the logic of evil in the Book of Watchers necessitates demonic beings behind the human moral failure, hence, the fallen watchers cannot be reduced to defiled priests. While Stuckenbruck's point about the author's perception of the reality of the demonic beings is valid within the narrative world of the text, it does not devalue Suter and Nickelsburg's theory which aims to define the *Sitz im Leben* of the text. See: Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 226.

<sup>344</sup> Similar accusations of priesthood exist elsewhere. The Damascus Document says: "And they also defiled the temple for they did not keep apart in accordance with the law, but instead lay with her who sees the blood of her menstrual flow" (CD 5.6–7). Psalms of Solomon also accuses priests: "They plundered the sanctuary of God, as if there were no heir to redeem (it). They trod upon the altar of the Lord, (coming) from all uncleanness; and with menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices as (if these were) polluted flesh" (*Psalms of Solomon* 8.11–12).

<sup>345</sup> These ramifications in early Jewish texts are rooted in the Holiness Code where sexual defilement has an ethical element (Lev. 18:24–25). See: Martha Himmelfarb, "A Kingdom of Priests': The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism," *JTP* 6 (1997): 89–104.

<sup>346</sup> The author of Jubilees highlights the rejection of the sacrifices if offered by defiled priest: "If one does this or shuts his eyes to those who do impure things and who defile the Lord's sanctuary and to those who profane his holy name, then the entire nation will be condemned together because of all this impurity and this contamination. There will be no favoritism nor partiality; there will be no receiving from him of fruit, sacrifices, offerings, fat, or the aroma of a pleasing fragrance so that he should accept it. (So) is any man or woman in Israel to be who defiles his sanctuary" (30.15–16).



## Jubilees

Jubilees is another work from the Second Temple period that was composed sometime during the second century BCE, re-narrating materials from Genesis and the first half of Exodus.<sup>347</sup> Moses goes to the top of Mount Sinai, and there he receives revelation mediated through the “angel of presence” (1.27). The author implies the existence of the heavenly temple in different ways. For instance, while Noah was dividing the land between his children, where he recalls the blessing of the dwelling land of Shem (8.18), the angel explains to Moses that Noah was aware that “the Garden of Eden was the holy of the holies and the dwelling of the Lord” (8.19). I will discuss the nature of Eden as a heavenly temple in connection to Luke’s Gospel in the next chapter, but a brief description of Eden in Jubilees here will help us get an idea about the author’s conception of the heavenly temple.

The author of Jubilees considers Eden to be the dwelling place of YHWH which is why it is called the Holy of the Holies, the term used for the most holy place in the temple. The author also gives us hints about the Holy place and the outer chamber. In Jubilees, Eden is associated with Mount Sinai, located in the middle of the desert, and Mount Zion, located in the middle of the navel of the earth. These two mountains may be viewed here as cosmic mountains, representing the whole temple complex of YHWH, with Eden as the most inner chamber of YHWH’s abode. The author provides a spatial description of the three entities together: “These three were created as holy places facing each other” (8.19). In fact, both mountains have been associated with different sacred spaces in the Torah. Mount Sinai is where Moses saw the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place, and Mount Zion is where Solomon built the temple.

---

<sup>347</sup> See the discussion of date and provenance in: James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 17–19; idem, *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees Chapters 1-21*, ed. Sidnie White Crawford, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018), 25–40.

The author of Jubilees treats Adam and Eve as impure upon their creation as the author associates Eden with the sanctuary. The author states:

In the first week Adam and his wife—the rib—were created, and in the second week he showed her to him. Therefore, a commandment was given to keep (women) in their defilement seven days for a male (child) and for a female two (units) of seven days. 9/ After 40 days had come to an end for Adam in the land where he had been created, we brought him into the Garden of Eden to work and keep it. His wife was brought (there) on the eightieth day. After this she entered the Garden of Eden. For this reason a commandment was written in the heavenly tablets for the one who gives birth to a child. If she gives birth to a male, she is to remain in her impurity for seven days like the first seven days; then for 33 days she is to remain in the blood of (her) purification. She is not to touch any sacred thing nor enter the sanctuary until she completes these days for a male. As for a female she is to remain in her impurity for two weeks of days like the first two weeks and 66 days in the blood of (her) purification. Their total is 80 days. After she had completed these 80 days, we brought her into the Garden of Eden because it is the holiest in the entire earth, and every tree that is planted in it is holy. For this reason the law of these days has been ordained for the one who gives birth to a male or a female. She is not to touch any sacred thing nor enter the sanctuary until the time when those days for a male or a female are completed (3.8–13).<sup>348</sup>

According to this passage, Adam was created outside Eden, and only brought into Eden after forty days. Eve also was brought into Eden eighty days after her creation. The author creates an

---

<sup>348</sup> Translation from VanderKam, *Jubilees 1*, 206. The passage quoted here exists only in the Ge'ez version and the Greek version preserved in Syncellus's *Chronographia*, both are later than the Hebrew scrolls from the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, it should be noted that the Hebrew version is fragmentary, just like many other scrolls, and the lacuna does not mean that the quoted passage did not exist in the earlier version at some point. VanderKam's translation is based on an eclectic reconstruction of the work. See: James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, CSCO 510: Scriptores Aethiopici 87 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), IX–XVI.

analogy between the recently created Adam and Eve and the newborns. According to the parturient impurity legislation in Lev 12, the mother stays impure for forty days when she gives birth to a boy, and eighty days when the newborn is a girl. During this time, the mother cannot enter the sanctuary, and, apparently, the child, assuming the child is with the mother wherever she is. The legislation specially prohibits the woman from entering the sanctuary till she fulfills the duration of her purification: “She shall not touch any holy thing or come into the sanctuary until the days of her purification are completed” (Lev 12.4). The author of Jubilees calls Eden “the holiest in the entire earth” (3.12).<sup>349</sup> Treating Eden as a sanctuary, the author of Jubilees does not allow Adam and Eve to enter the garden except after their purification time have been fulfilled.<sup>350</sup>

Since Adam and Eve were expelled from the garden it became unreachable to humans (3.32). However, for Jubilees, the garden is still on earth (4.26), though in a place that is not accessible to humans. Based on the association between Eden and the cosmic mountains, Eden could be located on the top of one of these mountains. That the flood covered everything on Earth but not Eden affirms that it is placed on an elevated summit (4.24). 1 En 32.6 also locates heaven on earth, though in an ambiguous location in the far lands of the east, also inaccessible to humans. Christopher Rowland suggests that the transfer of Eden from an ambiguous earthly location to a heavenly sphere is a later apocalyptic development (cf. 2 Bar 4.3; 2 En. 8.1; 3 En. 5.5. Both 2 Cor 12.4 and Rev 2.7 place paradise, presumably Eden, in heaven).<sup>351</sup> The placement of Eden on an elevated summit as the holy of the holies draws richly on the picture of the cosmic mountain as YHWH’s abode in the Torah as we discussed above.

---

<sup>349</sup> Cf. 4Q265, 7:14, where the author says: “The Garden of Eden is holy and all its young shoots are holy.”

<sup>350</sup> Cf. Matthew Thiessen, *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels’ Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First Century Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 34–35.

<sup>351</sup> Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982) 124. On Eden/paradise as a heavenly location see chapter four below.

Additionally, Adam offers a sacrifice as he and Eve are leaving Eden, suggesting again that Eden is a sanctuary in Jubilees, and that Adam is the first priest in what will be a long line of priesthood (3.27). The only human who could enter Eden after Adam and Eve is Enoch (4.23). When he enters Eden, Enoch does not just function as a scribe learning the law, but as a priest who offers incense. Enoch's priestly ministry in Eden shows that the author intends to depict Enoch participating in a heavenly cultic service. Jubilees also seems to assume that angels serve as priests in heaven (30.18; 31.14) when Levi was chosen to serve as a priest. The angels of the presence instruct Moses: “And the seed of Levi was chosen for the priesthood and Levitical orders to minister before the Lord always just as we do” (30.18). This passage clearly shows that the author of Jubilees thought the earthly temple ministry is a reflection of the angelic ministry in the heavenly cultic sphere. Not that the angelic ministry in the heavenly temple echoes the priestly temple ministry in Jerusalem, but that the earthly temple ministry is an extension of the angelic ministry in the heavenly temple. Thus, the heavenly temple is the archetype of the earthly temple in Jubilees.

In chapter 31, the author also speaks of Jacob visiting his father, Isaac, who blesses Levi saying: “May he draw you and your seed near to him from all flesh to serve in his sanctuary as the angels of the presence and the holy ones” (31.14). Again, the superiority of the heavenly temple is assumed compared to the earthly temple, which serves as an extension of the heavenly temple. The author of Jubilees never explains the nature of the angelic ministry in heaven. However, the author highlights that the Feast of Weeks was fully celebrated in heaven from the creation to the days of Noah (6.18). According to Lev 23, Israelite males were to offer several offerings during the celebration of the feast. The author of Jubilees may assume such offerings in the heavenly temple though the author remains silent on this issue.

A significant aspect of Jubilees is that the author emphasizes the significance of the aroma of the sacrifice as the heavenly offering in the heavenly temple. When describing regular sacrifices, the

author of Jubilees highlights the significance of the aroma (see the repeated notions of the aroma in *Jub.* 21.7–9). When Noah offers his sacrifices, he accompanies it with an incense offering, and the author of Jubilees highlights the aroma (*Jub.* 6.3) which “caused a sweet savor to ascend acceptable before the Lord his God” (7.5). The Torah does not mention Noah adding incense to the offering, though YHWH’s smelling the pleasant odor might have inspired the author to add this detail (cf. Gen 8.20–21). However, the author presents both Abraham (15.2) and Jacob (32.4–6) offering incense along with their sacrifices (15.2). These details are not mentioned in the Torah. Among the offerings mentioned in Leviticus, only the grain offering (מנחה) is to be accompanied by the incense offering (Lev 2.1). In fact, the very first offering that occurs in Jubilees is an incense offering that Adam offers as he leaves Eden: “On that day on which Adam went forth from the Garden, he offered as a sweet savor an offering, frankincense, galbanum, and stacte, and spices in the morning with the rising of the sun” (3.27). Even more, God says that keeping his commandments about the Sabbath will “rise as a fine fragrance which is acceptable in his presence for all times” (2.22). The reason for Jubilees’ emphasis on the sacrificial aroma is not explicitly stated. One possible explanation is its connection to heavenly temple worship. The author, unable to conceive of a temple without sacrificial rituals, yet equally unable to envision bloody sacrifices in heaven, emphasizes the aroma as the central element of sacrificial worship. This focus on the aroma, an ethereal component, eliminates the necessity for the presence of physical blood in the heavenly realm.<sup>352</sup>

One of the main goals of Jubilees is to portray the Levitical system of worship as an eternal system since the creation of the world. Israel’s law has been there since the creation, not just when Moses came. Within this context, the author maintains that the sacred space where that worship

---

<sup>352</sup> As the sacrificial blood is normally used as a detergent to decontaminate the sanctum from impurity, hence, offering bloody sacrifice in heaven would imply that the heavenly temple could be contaminated. Perhaps the author of Jubilees does not want to say that. As we will see, however, the author of Hebrews views the heavenly sanctum to be potentially impure and in need of decontamination via Jesus’s blood (Heb 9.23).

happens, the temple, has been existent since the creation, rooted in the heavenly archetype of the garden of Eden. Levitical priests are to serve just like angels in heaven, their temple is modeled around the eternal one in heaven, and their sacrifices are also connected to heaven through the aroma.

### **The Animal Apocalypse**

Another work that has been preserved as part of 1 Enoch is the *Animal Apocalypse*, which constitutes the second part of the Book of Dreams (1 *En.* 83-90). Collins dates the *Animal Apocalypse* to the Maccabean period, especially the wartime, which seems to be the last historical period reflected in the apocalypse (1 *En.* 90.6–39).<sup>353</sup> While the apocalypse does not reflect major heavenly ascents (hence Collins classifies it as a historical apocalyptic text), it briefly mentions the ascents of Enoch (87.3) and Elijah (1 *En.* 89.52). The ascent of Enoch is described as follows:

And I lifted my eyes again to heaven, and I saw in the vision, and behold, there came forth from heaven (beings) with the appearance of white men; four came forth from that place and three with them. And those three who came after took hold of me by my hand and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me onto a lofty place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were smaller. And they said to me, ‘Stay here until you see all that happens to those elephants and camels and asses and to the stars and to the cattle and all of them’. (1 *En.* 87.1–4)<sup>354</sup>

Patrick Tiller traces the transition of Enoch to paradise in Enochic literature.<sup>355</sup> For instance, 1 Enoch 18.6–8 mentions the existence of seven mountains, with the one in the middle “reach[ing] to heaven like the throne of God.” A closely related passage, 1 Enoch 24–25, places the throne of God and the tree of life on the same mountain, where the tree of life “shall be transplanted to the holy place, to

---

<sup>353</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 67.

<sup>354</sup> Translation from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 364.

<sup>355</sup> Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*, EJL 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 249.

the temple of the Lord, the Eternal King” (1 *En.* 25.5). Tiller notes that these two traditions locate the mountain to the northwest. A third tradition places the “Garden of righteousness,” which contains the tree of wisdom and from which Adam and Eve were expelled, in the northeast close to the seven mountains (1 *En.* 32). Whether these are two different paradises, or one is not clear. Another tradition perceives Enoch’s dwelling, about which Noah says: “The garden where the elect and righteous dwell, where my grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam” (1 *En.* 61.12; cf. 60.8). Enoch is then said to have been translated to the garden of righteousness in the northwest (1 *En.* 70.2–4). We have already seen that Jubilees also places Enoch in paradise (4.23–26), where he spends the same amount of time that is mentioned in the *Animal Apocalypse* in the lofty place (90.31).

Based on these traditions about Enoch’s abode in the paradise, Tiller concludes: “The lofty place of 87.3 is paradise (the garden of righteousness/life/Eden), and it is situated upon the mountain of God.”<sup>356</sup> Daniel Olson sees this conclusion as consistent with the rest of the Enochic traditions: “These traditions are logically consistent with the traditions about Enoch’s ultimate destination throughout the Enochic corpus.”<sup>357</sup>

When Enoch ascends to heaven, he sees a high tower above the earth. The description of the tower suggests that it is a temple located in heaven.<sup>358</sup> The apocalypse is rich with symbolism that goes beyond the scope of this work, but it is significant to note that Solomon’s temple is described as a “great tower” (89.50), while the Second Temple is described as a “high tower” (89.73). The author considers the Second Temple polluted, signified by the polluted bread (89.73). Thus, there is a

---

<sup>356</sup> Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 250. The identification of the high place as the paradise in the *Animal Apocalypse* was first suggested by Charles. See: R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 188.

<sup>357</sup> Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch, “All Nations Shall be Blessed”: With a New Translation and Commentary*, SVTP 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 155; so Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 374.

<sup>358</sup> Matthew Black comments: “Since ‘tower’ is used later to symbolize the Temple, we may also think here of a heavenly sanctuary to which Enoch is led.” See Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 261.

consistent pattern of describing Jewish temples in the *Animal Apocalypse* as towers. Consequently, when angels lead Enoch up to heaven, and he sees a high tower above the earth (87.3), it is natural to understand this structure as a temple, a heavenly temple. The angels who ascend with Enoch to heaven could be heavenly priests. Their appearance as white as snow highlights their purity as the holy ones (cf. Dan 7.9). Nickelsburg observes that the angels' white garments associate them with the priestly ministry since the white garments were usually the priestly garments for the ministry in the Dwelling Place and the temple.<sup>359</sup>

Elijah is also taken up to the high tower, where he is to stay with Enoch. The ascent of Elijah is described in vivid figurative language:

And again I saw that those sheep strayed and went off in many paths and abandoned that house of theirs. And the Lord of the sheep summoned some from among the sheep and sent them to the sheep, and the sheep began to kill them, but one of them escaped safely and was not killed. It sprang away and cried out over the sheep, and they wished to kill it; but the Lord of the sheep saved it from the hands of the sheep and brought it up to me and made it dwell (there). And many other sheep he sent to those sheep to testify and lament over them. (1 *En.* 89.51–53)<sup>360</sup>

The sheep are the people of Israel, and the summoned sheep who are sent to the rest are the prophets of Israel. The text refers to Elijah as the one from the sent sheep who escaped safely and was not killed, in a reference to Elijah's escape from Queen Jezebel who killed seven hundreds of Israel's prophets (1 Kgs 19). Elijah is taken to heaven later (2 Kgs 2.11), which corresponds to bringing him up to the heavenly temple in the *Animal Apocalypse*.

---

<sup>359</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 374

<sup>360</sup> Translation from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 367.



Both Enoch and Elijah are taken up to the heavenly temple, since both are taken up alive in scriptural narratives. The author of the *Animal Apocalypse* does not explain the reason for Enoch's ascension into the heavenly temple. However, the context surrounding Enoch's ascension account might provide a hint. The watchers' offspring were going around swallowing the cattle (86.5–6; 87.1), and during this time, Enoch sees the tower, which represents the heavenly temple, and the angel places him in the tower. As the narrative progresses, the bad sheep, that represents wicked Israelites, attempts at persecuting Elijah. Possibly, God wanted to protect both Enoch and Elijah by hiding him in the heavenly temple. This conclusion is further emphasized as the apocalyptic author notes that Elijah ascends to heaven just when the sheep try to kill him (89.52). That is, there were life threatening conditions in the context of both ascension scenes of Enoch and Elijah. In the case of Elijah, according to 2 Kings, the conflict with Baal prophets was surrounding the sacrificial offerings. Even though Elijah was in the northern kingdom, the text keeps Elijah connected to the Jerusalem temple: "At the time for the evening sacrifice, the prophet Elijah went near the altar" (1 Kgs 18.36). The mentioned altar might be the altar that Elijah built to offer his sacrifices, but the text notes that Elijah prayed to God to vindicate him at the time for the evening sacrifice, which is offered in the Jerusalem temple. In the same scene, Elijah escapes the threats. The author of the *Animal Apocalypse* highlights the threats directed at Elijah, though he connects him to the heavenly temple, not the Jerusalem temple. Both Enoch and Elijah were able to survive the persecution when they took refuge in the heavenly tower, the temple. Implicitly, the earthly temple could not provide this protection. Later on, the author indicates that God "abandoned that house of theirs and their tower" (89.56). Hence, Elijah's ascension to the heavenly temple appears in a context where God abandons the Jerusalem temple. While the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* mentions the heavenly temple briefly, it does so following the Book of Watchers' pattern of dissatisfaction with the earthly temple.

Two other Jewish apocalyptic works contemporary to Luke are noteworthy: 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. Both works are written after the destruction of the temple, and will give us insight into Luke's views of the heavenly temple and its relationship to the Jerusalem temple. The authors of both works offer a theological response to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by the Roman forces around 70 C.E. Both works refer to the heavenly temple as the indestructible temple which could not be lost.

#### 4 Ezra

4 Ezra is originally a Jewish text that survives as part of a later expanded Christian work, 2 Esdras (chapters 3–14).<sup>361</sup> The work is preserved in several versions in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Arabic. Scholars today are convinced that the work might have been originally composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek at an early stage.<sup>362</sup> The narrative context of the work is set within the Babylonian exile in the sixth century B.C.E as the author writes: “In the thirtieth year after the destruction of our city” (3.1),<sup>363</sup> and Shealtiel is the seer, who is later identified as Ezra the scribe.<sup>364</sup>

The text constitutes a compilation of visions that Ezra receives as a divine response to his inquiries. Ezra's contemplation of the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem leads him to question

---

<sup>361</sup> Theodore A. Bergren, “Christian Influence on the Transmission History of 4, 5, and 6 Ezra,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler, CRINT 3/4 (Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 102–27.

<sup>362</sup> On the textual and translation history of 4 Ezra see: Bruce M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *OTP* 1:518–19; Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 42 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 113–19, 129–31; Michael E. Stone, *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* (Missoula, MN: Scholars Press, 1979).

<sup>363</sup> See other historical references in 3.28; 4.28–29; 10.20–23.

<sup>364</sup> Shealtiel is Zerubbabel's uncle in Hebrew Jewish scriptures (1 Chr 3.19; Matt 1.12 agrees), though he is Zerubbabel's father in the Old Greek translation. John Collins suggests that the author of the text did not want to represent Ezra, the great Israelite scribe, as a doubting figure, so he resorted to Shealtiel, who will be later transformed into Ezra, to point out that this is another Ezra, not the historical figure. However, the author might have known that Ezra lived long after the destruction of the temple, so the author might have identified Ezra with Shealtiel to reconcile his own account of Ezra with 1 Chronicles. This move allows him to use Ezra as a figure immediately after the destruction of the temple. See: John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., BCS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmann, 1998), 197.

how the God of Israel could permit such an event to occur.<sup>365</sup> He goes so far as to ascribe injustice to God (3.4–36).<sup>366</sup> However, Ezra undergoes a transformation through the visionary experience, gaining insight into God's just ways. Ezra turns from a skeptical figure to one who has hopes for apocalyptic eschatological restoration of Israel, and proceeds to offer his readers, perplexed Jews, a consoling explanation to consider.

Ezra sees seven visions, the most relevant one for our discussion of the heavenly temple is the fourth vision. After recounting the stressful reality of the destroyed city, including the temple and its profaned vessels (10.19–23), Ezra receives a number of visions, and in the fourth vision he sees the eschatological Jerusalem city. Ezra does not see a heavenly temple in his vision, but a heavenly Jerusalem, similar to the author of Revelation.

In the first summary of the world's history, the author of 4 Ezra describes the creation of Adam as follows: “You brought him to that paradise which your right hand planted before the earth came about” (3.6).<sup>367</sup> The author echoes the creation of Adam in Genesis (cf. Gen 2.8), but adds that God

---

<sup>365</sup> The scholarly consensus is that 4 Ezra is a theodicy, in which the author attempts to reconcile the sovereignty of God with the existence of evil. In 4 Ezra's case, the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple represents the evil that the author struggles to understand, especially in light of Israel's relationship to God. Lydia Gore-Jones highlights the fact that scholars tended to treat 4 Ezra as a theological treatise on theodicy. However, she argues that the core emphasis in 4 Ezra is on the relationship between Israel and God. The work is not an abstract theological treatise about philosophical theodicy. Gore-Jones explains: “the purpose of the book is not to contemplate philosophical ideas about theodicy or to debate fine theological categories, but above all to deal with a crisis in the understanding of Israel's covenant with her God after Jerusalem was destroyed by Rome.” This crisis is embodied in questions the text raises, such as: Did Israel cease to be God's elected people? What happened to the covenant between Israel and God? Did Rome destroy the covenant? 4 Ezra answers the question about God's relationship with Israel, that the covenant hinges upon Israel's faithfulness to the Torah. The question of evil is not a theoretical or an abstract question in the context of 4 Ezra. See: Lydia Gore-Jones, *When Judaism Lost the Temple: Crisis and Response in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch*, SAA 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2020), 40–41. Cf. Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*, JSJSup 130 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–40; Tom W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, JSPSup 4 (London: T&T Clark, 1989), 65–72.

<sup>366</sup> Bruce Longenecker calls Ezra's first speech “one of the most daring criticisms of God in any religious text.” See: Bruce W. Longenecker, *2 Esdras*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 36.

<sup>367</sup> I follow Michael Stone's translation in: Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990). Stone notes the following about the translation: “The translation follows the RSV except in instances in which the editor's judgment is that another reading is preferable. Such judgments are made on textual grounds alone, not on those of style, prosody, word choice, or the like. The editor has not been

planted the paradise, Eden, with God's right hand. The author also adds that God planted the paradise *before* the creation of earth. That is, the paradise is not part of the created earth, and is made with God's hands.<sup>368</sup> I have shown that several literary works from the Second Temple period view paradise as the Holy of the Holies. The reference to paradise as made with God's hands echoes the description of the heavenly sanctuary in Exod. 15.6: "You will bring them and plant them in your own mountain, the place you made to dwell in, O Lord, the sanctuary, O Lord, which your hands established." Similarly, the author of Second Isaiah (40–54) has YHWH declares: "My right hand spread out the skies" (Isa 48.13).<sup>369</sup> Jewish scriptures, thus, maintains that what YHWH creates with his hands are of heavenly nature, especially the heavenly sanctuary. 4 Ezra attributes the creation of paradise to YHWH's hands. The author of 4 Ezra provides further indications that paradise is connected to the heavenly temple. The angel tells Ezra to prepare himself for an eschatological revelation that will take place in a "field":

---

conservative in departing from the RSV and, particularly, has given greater weight to the readings of Ethiopic and Georgian than did the translators of the RSV." Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 8.

<sup>368</sup> The term "eternal plantation" is a common name for the Yahad in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 8.4–6; 11.7–9; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14.15; 16.6; cf. CD 1.7–8). George Brooke notes that the plantation theme is connected to Eden twice in 1 QH<sup>a</sup> 16.4–37, and that Eden is closely connected to the sanctuary and its cult in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Q500 1; 4Q265 7.2.11–17; 4Q421 11–12; though 4 Q265 and 4Q421 do not seem to say what Brooke thinks). Brooke observes that the themes of plantation, Eden, and the sanctuary are so interwoven to the extent that the scrolls might refer to Eden and the sanctuary subsumed under the plantation theme, a phenomena he specially observes in *Florilegium*. Brooke summarizes his findings: "The cultic connection is part of the very woof and warp of the tapestry of images which are held together around the metaphor of planting." On the eschatological function of the theme of "plantation" and its relationship to God's creation of the paradise in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see: George Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultes im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, eds. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999), 285–301; idem, "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 417–34; Patrick A. Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997):326–35. On the connections between 4 Ezra and the scrolls, see: Daniel J. Harrington, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 343–55.

<sup>369</sup> I adopt the modern scholarly consensus on the different textual layers in what we now know as the Book of Isaiah. The main sections are: First Isaiah (chapters 1–39), Second Isaiah (or Deutero-Isaiah; chapters 40–54), and Third Isaiah (or Trito-Isaiah; chapters 56–66). For a survey of the reasons scholar adopt this division of Isaiah, see: David L. Petersen, *The Prophetic Literature: An Introduction* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 47–48; Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Latter Prophets," in *The Hebrew Bible Today: An Introduction to Critical Issues*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Matt Patrick Graham (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 69–94 (78); Ulrich F. Berges, *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*, trans. Millard C. Lind (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 300–303; Katie M. Heffelfinger, "Isaiah 40–55," in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 111–27; Andreas Schüle, "Isaiah 56–66," in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*, 128–41.

There I told you to remain in the field where no house had been built, for I knew that the Most High would reveal these things to you. Therefore I told you to go into the field where there was no foundation of any building, for no work of man's building could endure in a place where the city of the Most High was to be revealed (10.51–54).

Ezra sees a woman who mourns her son,<sup>370</sup> then the woman is transformed into the eschatological Jerusalem coming down from heaven<sup>371</sup> in that field suddenly:

And it came to pass, while I was talking to her, behold her face suddenly shone exceedingly, and her countenance flashed like lightening, so that I was too frightened to approach her, and my heart was terrified. While I was wondering what this meant, behold, she suddenly uttered a loud and fearful cry, so that the earth shook at her voice. And I looked, and behold, the woman was no longer visible to me, but there was an established city, and a place of huge foundations showed itself. Then I was afraid, and cried with a loud voice and said. Where is the angel Uriel who came to me at first? (10.25–28)

The angel then explained to Ezra:

The woman who appeared to you a little while ago, whom you saw mourning and began to console, but you do not now see the form of a woman, but an established city, has appeared to you, and as for her telling you about the misfortune of her son, this is the interpretation. This woman whom you saw, whom you now behold as an established city, is Zion. (10.41–44)

---

<sup>370</sup> See the discussion of the recurrent theme of feminine characters representing cities (e.g., Jerusalem and Babylon) in apocalyptic literature in: Edith McEwan Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse, and The Shepherd of Hermas*, JSPSup 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 66–69. On the function of the fourth vision as the transformative point in 4 Ezra, see: Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Ezra's Vision of the Lady: Form and Function of a Turning Point," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, eds., Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski, JSJSup 164 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 137–150.

<sup>371</sup> The idea that a new Jerusalem will be lowered from heaven in the end of times is ubiquitous in early Jewish literature (1 En. 90.28–29; 4QFlorilegium 1.1–3; Tob. 13.17–18; Bar. 4.30–5.9; Sib. Or. 5.397–405; Jub. 1.27–29).

Thus, Ezra sees the heavenly city of Jerusalem, lowered down from heaven, in a field which is connected to the paradise,<sup>372</sup> though not explicitly. The author further connects the heavenly Jerusalem to the paradise by showing that the heavenly Jerusalem is made by God's hands only: "And Zion will come and will be revealed to all when it is prepared and built just as you saw the mountain that was hewn without hands" (13.36). While the focus in the vision is on the renewed heavenly city of Jerusalem, the implication is that it includes a heavenly temple.<sup>373</sup> The angels instruct Ezra: "And behold, you saw her likeness (Syr. *dmwt'*; Lat. *similitudo*)" (10.48). The use of this term to refer to a feminine figure who is transformed into the temple-city recalls the tradition of the heavenly pattern (Vul. *similitudinem*) of the Dwelling Place. That is, Ezra has been shown the heavenly Zion, the original Zion, whose earthly copy is destroyed.<sup>374</sup>

The idea of a new Jerusalem descending from heaven appears in the *Animal Apocalypse*:

And I stood up to see till they folded up that old house; and carried off all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of the house were at the same time folded up with it, and they carried it off and laid it in a place in the south of the land. And I saw till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than that first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up. All its pillars were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which He had taken away, and all the sheep were within it. (1 *En.* 90.28–29)

---

<sup>372</sup> Scholarship on 4 Ezra tended to interpret the location of Ezra's vision as happening in heaven, not on earth. However, it is clear from the context that Ezra sees the heavenly city coming down to earth at the uninhabited field. 4 Ezra's language is similar to Rev 21.10–22. See: G. H. Box, *The Ezra-Apocalypse*, (London: Pitman and Sons, 1912); R. Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprechts Verlag, 1889).

<sup>373</sup> The Aramaic scrolls labelled together "New Jerusalem" (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18) focus on the building of the eschatological temple. Eibert Tigchelaar comments: "Even though the composition has been labeled New Jerusalem, the real focus on the text is on the new temple, which should be identified with the new temple of the new creation referred to in Jub. 1.27–29 and 11QTaXXIX 8–10." See: Eibert Tigchelaar, "The Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic New Jerusalem," in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. T. Nicklas, J. Verheyden, and E. Eynikel, JSJSup 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 117–132.

<sup>374</sup> Jonathan A. Moo, *Creation, Nature, and Hope in 4 Ezra*, FRLANT 237 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 143.

The eschatological city of Jerusalem appears as a new city that will replace the contemporary Jerusalem. While the text does not say that the new city is a heavenly one, it is described in a way similar to 4 Ezra. The author mentions that God “brought” a new house. The use of the verb “brought” means that the city existed previously, probably in heaven, and God placed it on earth. The description of the new Jerusalem in this passage as “loftier” than the older house connects it to the heavenly tower which is based on a “lofty” place as we discussed above (1 *En.* 87.1–4; 89.50).<sup>375</sup> The new Jerusalem possible included the heavenly temple too.<sup>376</sup> Thus, it is highly probable that the new Jerusalem in 4 Ezra might also have included the heavenly temple. Hindy Najman argues: “Instead of foreseeing a human reconstruction of the temple, 4 Ezra prophesies the revelation on earth of a heavenly temple that can occur only in a place where there is no human artifice whatsoever.”<sup>377</sup> Najman classifies the notions of the heavenly temple in Second Temple literature, and sees that in 4 Ezra, “There is a heavenly temple, prepared before creation in Eden, which will ultimately be revealed on earth. This can be described as an Edenic paradigm of the ultimate heavenly temple.”<sup>378</sup> Najman situates the Edenic heavenly temple within the eschatological hopes of Israel’s restoration. Adam has been expelled from Eden, and has been since in exile, in which he lost access to the Edenic heavenly temple. Similarly,

---

<sup>375</sup> Tiller argues: “The height of the house may mean that the New Jerusalem stands on the mountain of God (Zech 8.3) or that the temple mount itself is increased in height (Ezek 40.2; Isa 2.1, Mic 4.1). The main point is that the New Jerusalem reaches toward heaven and, in fact, becomes heaven in the sense that it becomes the abode of God.” That is, the New Jerusalem, according to Tiller, becomes heavenly, after God places it on the lofty mountain. Tiller does not comment on the significance of God’s bringing the city, nor explains its origin. Interestingly, Tiller adopts the translation “brought” while in his commentary says: “The new house is built on the same spot as the old one.” The problem with the use of “built” is that it means that the new house did not exist before that point. Olson too uses “brought” in his translation. Nickelsburg further understands the city descending from heaven: “The New Jerusalem is brought by the Lord of the sheep, presumably from heaven.” Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 376; Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse*, 225; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 404.

<sup>376</sup> So Black and VanderKam: “No explicit mention is made here of the temple (the ‘tower’ of 89.50) but it is no doubt included.” Black and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 278.

<sup>377</sup> Hindy Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 109.

<sup>378</sup> Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future*, 118. Paul similarly seems to believe in an earthly “present Jerusalem” (τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ) and “a Jerusalem from above” (ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ) in Gal 4.25–26. Paul’s use of the adjectives τῇ νῦν and ἄνω suggests that he compares the present Jerusalem belongs to this age, with the Jerusalem from above as the eschatological city that will be revealed in the age to come.

Israel lost access to its temple upon its destruction by Rome. Ezra, just like Adam, is in exile, and recalls the wilderness experience of Israel as an exilic experience. The author of 4 Ezra seems to understand the lesson: earthly temples could be destroyed, not just once, but twice, hence the author places his hopes in the heavenly Edenic temple. In the field, Ezra could see the heavenly temple (and in a later passage, receives the Torah in the field, see 14.37). The destruction of the Jerusalem temple is not a sign of God's abandonment of Israel, but of Israel's failure to be obedient. The temple that humans built, which should have brought Jewish worshippers from the earth to heaven, was destroyed. Yet 4 Ezra envisions the Edenic heavenly temple, made by God's hands, descending to earth. This is the indestructible temple.

## 2 Baruch

2 Baruch is a Jewish work,<sup>379</sup> closely connected to 4 Ezra, that similarly represents an early apocalyptic response to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Baruch ben Neriah appears as Jeremiah's scribe (Jer 32.16; 36.4–32; 45.1). Though he was a minor figure in Jewish scriptures, he

---

<sup>379</sup> The dominant scholarly view is that 2 Baruch is a Jewish work. Remarkably, the only modern commentary on 2 Baruch to date [Pierre Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriac et Commentaire*, 2 Vol., Sources Chrétiennes 145 (Les Éditions du Cerf: Paris, 1960, 1969)], appears in the Christian patristic series Sources Chrétiennes. More recently, Rivka Nir has challenged the scholarly consensus arguing that 2 Baruch is an entirely Christian composition. Nir's evidence entails analysis of several major sections of the work where she traces evidence of Christian perspectives. An example of Nir's methodology is the predictive perspective she finds in the work, which betrays overt or hidden Christian threads, expecting the coming Messiah. Robert Kraft has pointed that "Some Christians seem to have felt it important to have 'predictive' texts (especially apocalyptic) in which aspects of the career and function of their messiah were somehow noted, even if only cryptically or in passing." Nir takes Kraft's observation and applies it extensively to 2 Baruch, especially in light of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the three apocalyptic visions that Baruch receives pertaining to eschatological redemption. Nir's work has been extensively critiqued, and the suggested later "Christian" perspectives have been shown to be possibly Jewish. Moreover, 2 Baruch's over occupation with the eschatological restoration of Israel and its temple following the war with Rome shows that the author is a Jew. Matthias Henze convincingly argues that 2 Baruch is a Jewish voice in an in-house debate among various Jewish voices on how to live Judaism after the destruction of the temple. Henze finds that 2 Baruch centers the Jewish life around the Torah, a practice that rabbinic sages later develop further. See: Rivka Nir, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, EIJL 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2003). For evaluations of Nir's work, see: James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* JSJSup 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 130–31; Liv Ingeborg Lied, "Recent Scholarship on 2 Baruch 2000–2009," *CBR* 9 (2011): 238–76 (261–63). Cf. Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*, TSAJ 142 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), especially here 32–34.



assumed a significant role in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period.<sup>380</sup> The text exists in full in one Syriac manuscript only, that dates to the sixth or seventh century CE, and was probably translated from a Greek vorlage as the heading of the manuscript indicates.<sup>381</sup> The author depicts Baruch lamenting the destruction of Jerusalem, and questioning God's justice and the place of Israel's covenantal relationship with God following Rome's destruction of the city and its temple. The narrative is situated during the twenty-fifth year of King Jeconiah (1.1; cf. 2 Kgs 24–25), when the exile happens, linking the author to Ezekiel's vision of the land of Israel during the exile "in the twenty-fifth year" (Ezek 40.1).

In the narrative world of the text, God informs Baruch about the coming destruction of the city of Jerusalem and all its inhabitants as a divine judgment against their evil deeds (1.1–2.2).<sup>382</sup> Baruch then protests against God's judgment, based on the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (3.4–9). Baruch argues that if Jerusalem is destroyed along with its temple there would be no place to speak of God's glorious deeds, nor a place where the Torah is explained. Baruch also reminds God of his promises to Moses regarding Israel. God then answers Baruch as follows:

The city will be delivered up for a time, and the people will be chastened for a time, and the world will not be forgotten. Or do you think that this is the city of which I said. 'On the palms

---

<sup>380</sup> In addition to 2 Baruch, there is 1 Baruch, 3 Baruch, Paraleipomena of Jeremiah (or 4 Baruch), and the Epistle of Baruch (which constitutes chapters 78–87 of 2 Baruch, though it is clearly a later addition). See: J. Edward Wright, *Baruch ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).

<sup>381</sup> The manuscript, Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, was the only known full text of 2 Baruch (other than the fragments of chapters 12–14 preserved in Greek as part of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri), until the discovery of an Arabic manuscript (Sinai No. 589), which might be a later free Christian translation of the work, though most probably translated from a Syriac text. See: A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction," in *OTP* 1:615–16; Fred Leemhuis, A.F.J. Klijn, G.J.H. van Gelder, *The Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch: Edited and Translated with a Parallel Translation of the Syriac Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); Fred Leemhuis, "The Arabic Version of the Apocalypse of Baruch: a Christian Text?" *JSP* 4 (1989): 19–26; Liv Ingeborg Lied, *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*, STAC 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021).

<sup>382</sup> Noteworthy is that Baruch does not involve any heavenly ascensions or cosmic journey like other apocalyptic texts. However, God interacts directly with Baruch. Mediating angels are not prominent in 2 Baruch, with the exception of Ramiel's interpretation of the vision of the waters (55.3). See Susan Docherty, *The Jewish Pseudepigrapha: An Introduction to the Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 149.

of my hands I have carved you’? It is not this building that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment that I decided to create Paradise. And I showed it to Adam before he sinned. But when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him – as also Paradise. After these things I showed it to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims. And again I showed it also to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels. Behold, now it is preserved with me – as also Paradise. (4.1–7)<sup>383</sup>

This divine speech cites Isa 49.16 and asserts that the city of Jerusalem is not the one about which the prophecy applies. Jerusalem will be destroyed by the Babylonians. The “building that is in your midst now” is a reference to the Jerusalem temple,<sup>384</sup> which is not the one that God promised to keep according to 2 Baruch. In the Isaian setting, the exiled Israelites thought that YHWH forgot them. YHWH responds that he engraved Jerusalem on his hands, assuring them that he will always remember Jerusalem and will not forsake it. Jerusalem will be rebuilt.<sup>385</sup> God tells Baruch he did not say that about Jerusalem, which is a mundane counterpart of the heavenly city.<sup>386</sup> God created the heavenly city with its heavenly temple before creation, along with the paradise. Adam had access to this heavenly Jerusalem when he had access to the paradise, but lost access to both when God expelled him from the paradise. Abraham also saw the heavenly city. But Moses is probably the most important one for my purposes here, since the author of 2 Baruch states that the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place,

---

<sup>383</sup> All translations of 2 Baruch are from: Daniel M. Gurtner, *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text, With Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances*, JCTS (London: T&T Clark, 2009).

<sup>384</sup> Henze notes that in 2 Baruch Jerusalem and the temple are one entity, not clearly differentiated, and at several points, both are used interchangeably. See Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel*, 78. Cf. Carla Sulzbach, “The Fate of Jerusalem in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra: From Earth to Heaven and Back?” in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*, LSTS 87 (London: T&T Clark, 2014), 138–52.

<sup>385</sup> Gwendolyn B. Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*, SBLDS 72 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), 44; Fredrick James Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*, SBLDS 78 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 86–87.

<sup>386</sup> Along those lines of the author of 2 Baruch’s view of the temple, the author shares the prophetic view that the second temple was not as glorious as the first temple (2 Bar 68.6–7).

which Moses had seen (Exod 25.9), is the heavenly temple. In contrast to 4 Ezra, the heavenly Jerusalem with its temple do not descend to earth. The consolation of Baruch is the very notion that a heavenly Jerusalem exists, and this city has been the object of divine promises from the beginning.

Paradise is also mentioned three times in this short passage, closely associating the heavenly city with the paradise, although the author does not quite identify them as one place.<sup>387</sup> The paradise is preserved with God, along with the heavenly Jerusalem, awaiting the eschatological redemption to be revealed. Later in the text, the author describes the paradise as the location of God's royal throne with the living creatures (see above) engraved on the throne, and all the hosts of angels minister in the paradise (2 Bar. 51.11). Liv Ingeborg Lied highlights that Adam had once access to both the heavenly city and paradise,<sup>388</sup> but when he lost access to the paradise in which he lived, he also lost access to the heavenly city. Lied then concludes: "This interpretation would place Paradise in the same category as the city/sanctuary as essentially heavenly entities, made visible or manifest to a select group of individuals at crucial points in the history of Israel."<sup>389</sup>

---

<sup>387</sup> Several later rabbinic sources note that God created, or intended to create, the paradise and the temple before creation. *Gen. Rab.* 1.4: "Six things preceded creation: there were those that were created and those that were intended to be created. The Torah and the throne of glory were created... the patriarchs and Israel and the temple and the name of the Messiah were intended to be created." Cf. Nir, *Destruction of Jerusalem*, 22.

<sup>388</sup> Liv Ingeborg Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*, JSJSup 129 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 255 Lied explains: "The most interesting issue at this point is the description of the loss of Paradise in 4:3, since it gives crucial information about 2 Baruch's notion of Paradise and its relation to the heavenly city/sanctuary: "And I showed it to Adam before he had transgressed, but when he transgressed the commandments he was deprived of it, as also Paradise." This sentence states that God showed Adam the city/sanctuary and that it was taken away from him when he transgressed. Then it adds: "as also Paradise." It is not explicit here whether Paradise was just something that Adam lost, or whether it was also part of what God showed him. Grammatically the sentence is not complete, but the most likely suggestion is that God made Paradise manifest to Adam before he transgressed. But, as a consequence of his transgression, Adam was deprived of the city/sanctuary as well as of Paradise. This means that in pre-transgression times God made both Paradise and the city/sanctuary manifest for Adam only to remove both of them when he transgressed."

<sup>389</sup> Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 255. A later Christian text makes a similar association between the paradise and the heavenly city of Jerusalem in the Testament of Dan. The author of *T. Dan* 5.12 says: "And the saints will rest in Eden, and the righteous will rejoice in the New Jerusalem." In this passage, the first clause, which refers to Eden, parallels the second clause, which refers to the heavenly new Jerusalem.

Another significant passage in *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, a first-century work,<sup>390</sup> pictures God showing Adam and Moses the heavenly temple, and sheds more light on the paradise in 2 Baruch. The following passage shows Adam's access to the heavenly temple:

And he said, "This is the place concerning which I taught the first-fashioned one, saying 'If you do not transgress what I have commanded you, all things will be subject to you.' But that one transgressed my ways and was persuaded by his wife; she was deceived by the serpent. Then death was ordained for the generations of men." The Lord proceeded to show him the ways of paradise and said to him, "These are the ways that men have lost by not walking in them, because they have sinned against me." (L.A.B. 13.8–9)<sup>391</sup>

This passage occurs in the context of God's communication of Moses about the Dwelling Place and the feasts to be observed. The passage states that God walked Adam through the paradise,<sup>392</sup> though Adam lost access to it because of his transgressions. The passage then shows that God also walked Moses through the ways of the paradise. Later, and closer to his death, Moses receives a similar vision:

Then the Lord showed him the land and all that is in it and said, 'This is the land that I will give to my people.' He showed him the place from which the clouds draw up water to water the whole earth, and the place from which the river takes its water... and the place in the firmament

---

<sup>390</sup> As Daniel Harrington argues, LAB was probably composed in Hebrew before 100 C.E., and was later translated into Greek and Latin, though only the Latin translation survives. The *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, a Hebrew manuscript from the fourteenth century, preserves some parts of LAB that correspond to the Latin text. Based on internal reasons, like the absence of any explicit reference to the Second Temple, the deliberate avoidance of any priestly laws, scholars place the authorship of the work within the first century CE., shortly after the destruction of the temple. See: Daniel J. Harrington, *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, TTPS 3 (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974), 1; Guido Kish, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Publications in Mediaeval Studies 10 (Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1949), 16–17. Cf. Mary Therese DesCamp, *Metaphor and Ideology Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods through a Cognitive Lens*, Bib. Int. 87 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3–4.

<sup>391</sup> Translation from: Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 113–14.

<sup>392</sup> Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 522–23.

from which only the holy land drinks. He showed him the place from which he rained down the manna upon the people, all the way to the paths of paradise. He showed him the measurements of the sanctuary and the number of sacrifices and the sign by which men shall interpret heaven. And he said, ‘These are what have been denied to the human race because they have sinned against me.’ (L.A.B. 19.10)<sup>393</sup>

The passage repeats that God has shown Moses the paths of paradise,<sup>394</sup> in connection with the heavenly pattern of the sanctuary. The phrase “paths/ways of paradise” (Latin. *semitas paradysi*) implies that the paradise includes streets; a heavenly city. While the text does not say explicitly that Moses saw the heavenly sanctuary *in* the paradise, it is probably the case since both places are stated consecutively. The author later calls the paradise “the place of sanctification” (L.A.B. 19.13), suggesting further connection with the sanctuary.<sup>395</sup> The notion of the firmament is also significant, since, as I have shown earlier, it is usually associated with the heavenly temple, though here it functions mainly as the source of rain. Similarly, 2 Enoch shows God saying: “And I created a garden in Eden, in the east, so that he (Adam) might keep the agreement and preserve the commandment. And I created for him an open heaven, so that he might look upon the angels, singing the triumphal song. And the light which is never darkened was perpetually in paradise” (2 En 31.1–2). The passage seems to follow 2 Baruch, where the open heaven is differentiated from the Garden of Eden.

Thus, 2 Baruch, L.A.B. and 2 Enoch, all associate Eden with some heavenly city, which Adam and Moses had access to at some point. Simultaneously, Moses saw the heavenly structure of the

---

<sup>393</sup> Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 122.

<sup>394</sup> The replication points to the centrality of the paradise in connection to the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place (narrated in detail in L.A.B. 11.15) to the establishment and the life of Israel and the cosmic significance of its foundation at Sinai. See: Fredrick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 93.

<sup>395</sup> Cf. Michael E. Stone, “Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, eds. Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 417–18.

temple on the same cosmic journey when he saw the paradise. This is further developed in 2 *Bar.* 59.4, where the angel Remiel explains to Baruch everything that God has shown to Moses on the top of Mount Sinai: “And also the likeness of Zion and its measures that is to be built, and the likeness of the sanctuary that is now.”

The author of 2 Baruch has a unique view of Jerusalem’s destruction. God’s promises were not about the earthly city and its temple, for these are just shadows of the heavenly city and its temple, associated with the eternal paradise. The temporal and transitory nature of the mundane Jerusalem is what makes it destructible, and Baruch is about to see that destruction. The first-century author learned about the first destruction of the temple, and perhaps witnessed the destruction of the Second Temple, which means that any hopes of a rebuilt third temple is meaningless, since it might also be destroyed. The only indestructible temple is the heavenly temple, the one made by God’s hands, because it is the one inscribed on God’s palms.<sup>396</sup> Thus, Israel’s covenantal relationship with God is not affected by the destruction of the earthly temple, because the heavenly temple, which is the truest temple, is preserved in heaven.

### **Philo of Alexandria’s Writings**

Philo was a Jewish philosopher who lived in Alexandria, Egypt, during the first century CE.<sup>397</sup> Philo has a distinctive view of the heavenly temple. Every other work I discuss in this chapter perceives the existence of a temple structure in heaven (which I will call here temple analogy). Philo, however, seems to understand the whole universe as a temple (which I will call here cosmic symbolism). The two understandings of the heavenly temple are not necessarily contradictory, though they deserve to be nuanced. Philo writes:

---

<sup>396</sup> Paul similarly speaks of “The present Jerusalem” and “The Jerusalem from above” (Gal. 4.25–26).

<sup>397</sup> Mirelle Hadas-Lebel, *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*, trans. Robyn Fréchet, SPA 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

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, (namely) heaven; for its offerings, the stars; for its priests, the angels who administer His powers as unbodied souls, not compounds of rational and irrational nature, as ours are, but with the irrational eliminated, all mind through and through, pure intelligences, in the likeness of the One. There is also the temple made by hands; for it was 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 blessings that befall them or ask pardon and forgiveness for sins. (*Spec. Leg.* 1.66–67)

Philo here states that heaven is the Holy of the Holies, and the angels minister in the heavenly sanctuary as priests. He then contrasts the earthly temple “made by hands,” with the heavenly temple, supposedly, not made with hands. But Philo adds ideas. the whole cosmos is the “truest” temple of God. Jonathan Klawans describes Philo’s view of the temple in this passage as a cosmic symbolism, where the whole universe is a temple.<sup>398</sup> Comparing Philo’s perception of the cosmic temple to the Book of Watchers’ image of a heavenly temple show us the difference. On the one hand, as we saw in the Book of Watchers, Enoch encounters the whole temple complex (three courts) in heaven (1 *En* 14). Philo, however, designates heaven as the location of the inner sanctuary only.

Philo adds a cosmic significance to the bread loaves of the Dwelling Place (*Spec. Leg.* 1.172), and interprets the priestly vestments as symbolizing the universe (*Spec. Laws.* 1.82-97; *Moses* 2.109–135; *QA Exod.* 2.107–124). Meanwhile, in his *Who is the Heir*, Philo maintains that incense offering consists of the four elements of natural existence (*Who is the Heir*, 196-197) and ascribes cosmic significances to the animal sacrifices offered in the temple (*QA Gen.* 3.3; *Spec. Leg.* 1.161–165). He also interprets the altar as a reference to the earth and water, and the menorah as a reference to the

---

<sup>398</sup> Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 118.

seven luminaries (*Moses* 2.101-103; *QA Exod* 2.73–81). Philo also believes that the veil of the temple separates the mundane and the heavenly spheres: “By the veil the inside (of the Dwelling Place) is set off and separated from the things outside, for the inside is holy and truly divine, while the outside, though it is also holy, does not attain the same nature or a similar one. Moreover, it indicates the changeable parts of the world which are sublunary and undergo changes of direction, and the heavenly (region) which is without transient events and is unchanging. And (it shows) how they are set off and separated from one another, for the ethereal and airy substance is, as it were, a covering” (*QA Exod* 2.91).

Philo also provides a vivid description of Moses’s vision of the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place:

It was determined, therefore, to fashion a Dwelling Place, a work of the highest sanctity, the construction of which was set forth to Moses on the mount by divine pronouncements. He saw with the soul’s eye the immaterial forms of the material objects about to be made, and these forms had to be reproduced in copies perceived by the senses, taken from the original draught, so to speak, and from patterns conceived in the mind. For it was fitting that the construction of the sanctuary should be committed to him who was truly high priest, in order that his performance of the rites belonging to his sacred office might be in more than full accordance and harmony with the fabric. So the shape of the model was stamped upon the mind of the prophet, a secretly painted or molded prototype, produced by immaterial and invisible forms; and then the resulting work was built in accordance with that shape by the artist impressing the stampings upon the material substances required in each case. (*Moses* 2.74–76).



Philo is most likely influenced by Plato's views of the world when he mentions the immaterial forms of the material objects.<sup>399</sup> Philo does not emphasize Moses's ascension into heaven, nor describe a journey or a vision in which Moses saw the structural pattern of the temple. Instead, he focuses on the model being "Stamped upon the mind of the prophet." Hence, Philo understands the revelation of the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place as an intellectual apprehension of the model through some idea that has been implanted in Moses's mind. Thus, when Philo says that the cosmos is the "truest" temple, he does not compare two structures, one in heaven and the other on earth. For Philo, the true temple is the intellectual pattern of the temple. The Jerusalem temple is an image of the idea of the cosmos as a temple, and the Jerusalem temple is given to Israel because they needed a temple that they could see.

In his work *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*, Philo writes:

Using as his (God's) model that form of intelligible light, which was discussed in connection with the incorporeal cosmos, he proceeded to create the sense-perceptible heavenly bodies, divine images of exceeding beauty. These he established in heaven, as in a temple made of the purest part of bodily substance. (*On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*, 55).

Philo connects creation to the image of a temple.<sup>400</sup> He does not explain what is "the purest part of bodily substance."<sup>401</sup> However, the emphasis in this passage is on the purity of the heavenly bodies, which resemble the cosmic temple. Philo also comments on the high priests:

---

<sup>399</sup> On Plato's influence on Philo, see: Charles A. Anderson, *Philo of Alexandria's Views of the Physical World*, WUNT II/309 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 188–189; John Dillon, "Philo and Hellenistic Platonism," in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*, ed. Francesca Alesse, SPA 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 223–232.

<sup>400</sup> Seneca, who was a contemporary of Philo, writes: "Such are wisdom's rites of initiation, by means of which is unlocked, not a village shrine, but the vast temple of all the gods — the universe itself, whose true images and true aspects she (wisdom) offers to the gaze of our minds, for the vision of our eyes is too dull for sights so great" (*Ep.* 90.28). Plato (*Tim.* 37c7), Aristotle (*De phil.* frg. 14 & 18), Plutarch (*On tranquility* 477c), and Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 12.33–34) make similar statements about the cosmos as the universal temple.

<sup>401</sup> Philo also writes: "The mind proceeds to investigate ... whether the four elements make up all things, or whether heaven and the beings in it have been allotted a special nature and have received a substance that is more divine" (*Apr.* 162). He never answers the question. See: David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On the Creation of the Cosmos*

Endowed with a nature higher than the merely human and to approximate the Divine, on the borderline, we may truly say, between the two, that people may have a mediator through whom they may propitiate God and God a subordinate to employ in extending the abundance of his boons to men. (*Spec. Leg.* 1.116).

Philo understands the priests to be similar to angels in their heavenly priestly ministry. The priests are not mediators because of their roles only, but according to Philo, because of their high nature too. Daniel Schwartz observes that when Philo addresses the temple in a non-legal context, he does not focus on the Jerusalem temple.<sup>402</sup> For instance, in his comments on notion of the city of God in Ps 46.5, Philo writes that there are two temples, none of them is made with human hands in any earthly place in the world. The first temple is the cosmos, and the second is the soul of the sage (*Somn.* 2.248). In this context, Philo writes:

Therefore do not seek for the city of the Existent among the regions of the earth, since it is not wrought of wood or stone, but in a soul, in which there is no warring, whose sight is keen. . . . For what grander or holier house could we find for God in the whole range of existence than the vision-seeking mind, the mind which is eager to see all things and never even in its dreams has wish for faction or turmoil? (*Somn.* 2.250–251).<sup>403</sup>

---

according to Moses: *Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 204.

<sup>402</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz, “Philo, His Family, and His Times,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 9–31 (27).

<sup>403</sup> Based on this comments, Samuel Sandmel concludes: “It cannot be over-emphasized that Philo has little or no concern for Palestine.” That is not accurate. Jerusalem for Philo is a unique city, and remains the religious center for all Jews, physically and geographically. Hence Philo says: “He does not consent to those who wish to perform the rites in their houses, but bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple. In this way he also applies the severest test to their dispositions. For one who is not going to sacrifice in a religious spirit would never bring himself to leave his country and friends and family and spend time in a strange land, but clearly it must be the stronger attraction of piety which leads him to endure separation from his most familiar and dearest friends ... And we have the surest proof of this in what actually happens. Countless multitudes from countless cities come, some over land, others over sea, from east and west and north and south at every feast. They take the Temple for their port as a general haven and safe refuge from the bustles and great turmoil of life, and there they seek to find calm weather” (*Spec. Leg.* 1.68–69). See: Samuel Sandmel, *Philo’s Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham* 155

To what extent are those two temples different? The cosmos as a temple, after all, is the purest form of the idea of the temple, in Philo's thoughts, while the soul represents the inner intellect too. John Barclay observes: "Philo's thought is structured by Platonic dualism, in which the visible and sensible world changing matter is taken to be a copy of an invisible, immaterial universe of 'ideas.' It is axiomatic for him that the conceptual world of eternal truths is the only proper object of study for our equal immaterial souls, which have the misfortune to make our burdensome bodies their temporary home."<sup>404</sup> Philo was a Jewish thinker who lived in a context that appreciated advanced intellect. His thoughts about the temple grew in that Hellenistic context. He believed that the whole cosmos is a temple, with the sanctuary in heaven, though his ideas are deeply shaped by classical Platonism.

In addition to the texts I discussed above, I will discuss the heavenly temple in Hebrews, Revelation, and the Testament of Levi, three texts that are connected to the Jesus movement. Among New Testament writings, Hebrews and Revelation show a particular interest in the heavenly temple. The Testament of Levi has been developed further in circles connected to the Jesus movement, but still preserves its Jewish roots, and envision sacrifices offered in the heavenly temple. Hebrews and Revelation speak of sacrifices in the heavenly altar, a high priest after Melchizedek, and incense offerings before the divine throne in heaven. Against the anachronistic view of these texts as Christian texts,<sup>405</sup> I view them as early Jewish literary products of the early Jesus movement, hence, I include them in my treatment of the heavenly temple in early Judaism.<sup>406</sup>

---

*in Jewish Literature* (New York: Hebrew Union College Press, 1971), 116; David T. Runia, "The Idea and the Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo of Alexandria" in *Philo of Alexandria: Collected Studies 1997–2021*, ed. David T. Runia, TSAJ 187 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023), 217–18.

<sup>404</sup> John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 164.

<sup>405</sup> Even in 2007, Kenneth L. Schenck could still speak of Hebrews as having "a basic Christian perspective" (4) where "The law made nothing perfect (7:19) nor did Levitical sacrifices perfect those who approached God by that method (10:1). For the fulfillment of these goals, we must look to Christ" (75). See: Kenneth L. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*, SNTSMS 143 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

<sup>406</sup> On the Jewishness of Revelation, see the collection of articles in Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston, eds., *Reading Revelation in Context: John's Apocalypse and Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids:

## The Epistle to the Hebrews

The author of Hebrews views Jesus as a high priest in heaven, who offer himself as a sacrifice in the heavenly temple.<sup>407</sup> Hebrews 4.14–16 and 10.19–25 form an *inclusio*, wherein the central section the author exhort the readers to join Jesus and participate in the ministry of the heavenly temple, proleptically conceived (6.18–20).<sup>408</sup> While Jesus ascended to heaven, the readers are nowhere envisioned to take a similar journey. Instead, the readers, just like in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, view themselves participating in the heavenly temple worship. The two passages forming the *inclusio* includes the subjunctive προσέρχουμαι as part of the author exhortation of the readers to approach the heavenly temple. Both sections encourage the readers to have confidence (παρρησία) in Jesus's ministry in heaven. Starting from 4.14–16, the author explains the nature of Jesus's ministry in the heavenly temple, which represents the basis for the readers' participation. The author exhorts his readers to 'see' (βλέπω) the exalted Jesus (2.9; 3.1; 9.24–8; 12.2) and themselves involved in the enthronement ceremony of Jesus (2.13; 10.24–5).<sup>409</sup> The author argues that Moses “persevered by seeing him who is invisible” (11.27), thus the community's perseverance will be strengthened when they realize their identity as the family of God who are able to see the currently invisible Jesus in the heavenly temple.<sup>410</sup> The author writes:

Therefore, since we have a great high priest who has ascended into heaven, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firmly to the faith we profess. For we do not have a high priest who is unable to

---

Zondervan, 2019), especially the introduction (19–34); John W. Marshall, *Parables of War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001); Ralph J. Korner, *Reading Revelation After Supersessionism: An Apocalyptic Journey of Socially Identifying John's Multi-ethnic Ekklesiāi with the Ekklesiā of Israel* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2020); John Sweet, “Revelation,” in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*, eds. John M. G. Barclay and John Sweet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 160–73 (161).

<sup>407</sup> Albert Vanhoye, *A Perfect Priest: Studies in the Letter to the Hebrews*, trans. Nicholas J. Moore and Richard J. Ounsworth, WUNT II/477 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 115–146.

<sup>408</sup> On the role of the author's hortatory effort in Hebrews, see: John Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*, SNTSMS 75 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 46; Scott D. MacKie, *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT II/223 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 9–26.

<sup>409</sup> Scott D. MacKie, “Heavenly Sanctuary Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *JTS* 62 (2011): 77–117 (79).

<sup>410</sup> On the theme of the family of God in Hebrews, see Amy L. B. Peeler, *Your Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, LNTS 486 (London: T&T Clarke, 2014).

empathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who has been tempted in every way, just as we are—yet he did not sin. Let us then approach God’s throne of grace with confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need (Heb 4.14–16).<sup>411</sup>

The author identifies Jesus as a great high priest (ἀρχιερέα μέγαν). Philip Church argues that the adjective μέγαν distinguishes Jesus as a high priest whose ministry in the heavenly temple is still ongoing, compared to the Jerusalem priesthood that stopped following the destruction of the temple.<sup>412</sup> Mark Kinzer, however, argues Jesus’s high priesthood is not a replacement to the Levitical priesthood. As long as the eschaton is not consumed, the author of Hebrews views the heavenly temple ministry not as a replacement to the earthly temple ministry, but as a greater parallel to the earthly temple, where the later surpasses the former, but does not supersede it. Hence, according to Kinzer, the earthly ministry priesthood did not stop within the narrative world of Hebrews.<sup>413</sup> Another significant aspect of Jesus’s high priesthood in Hebrews is Jesus’s relationship to Melchizedek. The author writes:

Every high priest is selected from among the people and is appointed to represent the people in matters related to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He is able to deal gently with those who are ignorant and are going astray, since he himself is subject to weakness. This is why he has to offer sacrifices for his own sins, as well as for the sins of the people. And no one takes this honor on himself, but he receives it when called by God, just as Aaron was. In the same way, Christ did not take on himself the glory of becoming a high priest. But God said to him,

---

<sup>411</sup> This passage comes directly after the author has addressed the Sabbath as the sacred time. As Jared Calaway argues, the author of Hebrews is concerned with a combination of sacred space (the Dwelling Place) and sacred time (the Sabbath) into “a singular heavenly reality denoting proximity to God’s presence” (2). Calaway notes further: “The tabernacle became where God rested and the Sabbath when God rested from the work of creation” (37). Hebrews, then, follows H which exhorts the readers: “You shall keep my Sabbaths and venerate my sanctuary” (Lev 26:2). See: Jared Calaway, *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and Its Priestly Context*, WUNT II/349 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

<sup>412</sup> Philip Church, *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*, NovTSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 370–71.

<sup>413</sup> Mark S. Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People, and the Identity of the Church* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015), especially 62–65.

“You are my Son; today I have become your Father.” And he says in another place, “You are a priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek.” During the days of Jesus’ life on earth, he offered up prayers and petitions with fervent cries and tears to the one who could save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. Son though he was, he learned obedience from what he suffered and, once made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him<sup>10</sup> and was designated by God to be high priest in the order of Melchizedek.

(Heb 5.1–7)

The author emphasizes that Jesus is a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek twice. Melchizedek plays a significant role in few texts from Second Temple Judaism. The Visions of Amram (4Q543–549) describes two angelic powers who govern over humans, the Prince of Light and the Prince of Darkness.<sup>414</sup> The Prince of Darkness is identified by the name *Melchi-resh’a* which translates to “My King is evil.” However, the name of his counterpart has not been preserved in the seven fragmentary copies of this work. Nevertheless, he was probably *Melchi-zedeq*, meaning “My King is righteous.”<sup>415</sup> The Prince of Light, who rules over the Sons of Light, uses his healing powers and his ability to save humans from the clutches of death. Furthermore, the Prince of Light is the leader of God’s heavenly army, a role that is typically attributed to the archangel Michael in other texts.<sup>416</sup>

---

<sup>414</sup> The initial publication of the Visions of Amram appears in: Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*, DJD 31 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 283–405. Puech has previously discussed the seven manuscripts that preserve the Visions of Amram, 4Q543–549, in, idem, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie future* (Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 531–40. The most recent translation of the work appears in: Robert R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)*, StBibLit 135 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010). See also: Henryk Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative of The ‘Visions Of Amram’ and Its Literary Characteristics,” *RQ* 96 (2010): 517–54; Blake Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547),” *JSP* 24 (2014): 3–42; Robert Jones, “Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of Its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem,” *DSD* 27 (2020): 1–30.

<sup>415</sup> Józef Milik first introduced this suggestion, and it is widely accepted today. See: Józef Milik, “4Q Visions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97, especially here 85–86. On the character of Melchizedek in the Visions of Amram, see: Michael E. Stone, “Amram,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 Vols, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:23–24; Anders Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 773–88.

<sup>416</sup> On this dualism, see: Liora Goldman, “Dualism in the Visions of Amram,” *RQ* 95 (2010): 421–32.

Melchizedek also appears in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice as one of the angels referred to as “priest in the assembly of God” (4Q401 11.3).<sup>417</sup> The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice thus presents Melchizedek as an angel with a priestly role in the heavenly sanctuary, potentially serving as a parallel to the earthly temple priests. In another scroll, 11QMelchizedek (11Q13) which focuses on the year of Jubilee, Melchizedek appears as an angel who wages war against the evil powers. The author writes: “He shall atone for all the Sons of [Light] ... and release th[em from the debt of a]ll their sins ... he will deliver all the captives from the power of B]elial.”<sup>418</sup> Thus, Melchizedek is an angelic priest who performs *kipper* on an eschatological Yom Kippur in heaven, presumably, in a heavenly sanctuary.<sup>419</sup> The portrayal of Melchizedek in Hebrews is one that emphasizes his exceptional nature. He is depicted as being “without father or mother,” and lacking a discernible “beginning of days and end of life.” Furthermore, he is likened to Jesus as the Son of God, in that he remains a priest for all eternity. In contradistinction to mortal priests, who are subject to death, Melchizedek is declared to be “living.” The basis of Jesus’s priestly role being likened to that of Melchizedek is not his lineage, as he was not of the tribe of Levi, but rather, it is grounded in the power of an indestructible life. (cf. Hebrews 7.3, 7.8, 7.15–16).<sup>420</sup>

The author describes Jesus’s ministry in the heavenly temple as follows:

Now the main point of what we are saying is this. We do have such a high priest, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, and who serves in the sanctuary, the true Dwelling Place set up by the Lord, not by a mere human being... there are already priests who offer the gifts prescribed by the law. They serve at a sanctuary that is a copy and shadow of

---

<sup>417</sup> See Newsom’s construction: Newsom, *The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 205.

<sup>418</sup> I will discuss this scroll below in the fifth chapter in connection with Luke-Acts.

<sup>419</sup> Other early Jewish texts that refer to Melchizedek are: Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen<sup>ar</sup> 22.12–17), some writings of Philo of Alexandria (*Abr.* 235; *Congr.* 99; *Spec. Leg.* 3.79–82), and in Josephus’s works (*J.W.* 6.438; *Ant.* 1.179–181).

<sup>420</sup> On Jesus priesthood and its relationship to Melchizedek in the second temple context, see further: Eric F. Mason, *‘You Are a Priest Forever’: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, STDJ 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

what is in heaven. This is why Moses was warned when he was about to build the Dwelling Place. “See to it that you make everything according to the pattern shown you on the mountain.” But in fact, the ministry Jesus has received is as superior to theirs... when Christ came as high priest of the good things that are now already here, he went through the greater and more perfect Dwelling Place that is not made with human hands, that is to say, is not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption. (Heb 8.1–9.12).<sup>421</sup>

The author affirms that the heavenly Dwelling Place is the “true” (τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς) one which exists in heaven,<sup>422</sup> and is the heavenly sanctuary where Jesus continues to minister as a high priest. The truity of the heavenly Dwelling Place lies in the concept that the earthly Dwelling Place is a copy and a shadow of the greater and more perfect heavenly one. David Moffitt demonstrates that Jesus’s activity in the heavenly temple coheres with Yom Kippur’s *kipper* rituals, which culminates in the manipulation of blood as the source of life.<sup>423</sup> Jesus entrance into the most holy place, i.e. the Holy

---

<sup>421</sup> Space limitation does not allow to examine Heb 10.1–18, on which see: Madison N. Pierce, *Divine Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Recontextualization of Spoken Quotations of Scripture*, SNTSMS 178 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 113–34.

<sup>422</sup> According to Benjamin Ribbens, Hebrews exhibits a noteworthy connection with the mystical apocalyptic tradition, where the cult is situated in heaven, but is distinct from and not synonymous with the cosmos or heaven itself. The sanctuary is equivalent to the throne court of God, and is already operational, as opposed to being in a state of readiness for the eschaton. See: Benjamin J. Ribbens, *Levitical Sacrifice and Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*, BZNW 222 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 89–98.

<sup>423</sup> While seeing Yom Kippur’s rituals in Hebrews is not Moffitt’s invention, he does show that most of previous scholarship operated within two levels sequence: the sacrifice offering in the humiliating death of Jesus, and the blood presentation in the exalting ascension of Jesus into the heavenly temple. Hence, Jesus’s death is the act of sacrifice. Moffitt does not see this interpretation as an accurate representation neither of the Levitical sacrifices, nor of Jesus’s death in Hebrews. Moffitt’s analysis illustrates that the conceptualizations of Jesus’s death in Hebrews are not aligned with sacrificial language. Rather, they align with the broader portrayal of Jesus as humanity’s assiduous representative, who perseveres through affliction to achieve perfection, culminating in resurrection and manifestation in the divine presence. Jesus’s death is an event which is set in a motion of sequence that leads to *kipper* in the heavenly sanctuary. See: David M. Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, NovTSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), especially here 285–94; idem, “Serving in the Tabernacle in Heaven: Sacred Space, Jesus’s High-Priestly Sacrifice, and Hebrews’ Analogical Theology,” in *Hebrews in Contexts*, ed. Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge, AJEC 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2016) 259–81; idem, “‘If Another Priest Arises’: Jesus’s Resurrection and the High Priestly Christology,” in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrew in Its*



of the Holies, shows that the author had Yom Kippur rituals in mind, as this is the only time in the year when the high priest can enter the Holy of the Holies. Moreover, Jesus is clearly called “high priest,” not just a priest. Moffitt also argues that “because he bears the blood that will be offered he can move through the first part of the tabernacle in heaven, and presumably through the veil that divides that initial sanctum from the holy of holies.”<sup>424</sup> Just like the earthly structure of the Dwelling Place has a holy place, a dividing veil, and a most holy place (i.e., Holy of the Holies), the heavenly structure also has similar sections. The high priest used to enter the most holy place every year with the blood of the sacrifice to apply it to the sanctuary, thus achieving *kipper*. Similarly, Jesus passed through the first section of the heavenly structure and the dividing veil to enter the most holy place (cf. 6.19; 10.20), and offered his blood to effect *kipper*. The heavenly sanctuary that Jesus entered in Hebrews is, as Moffitt argues, “the very one that Moses saw when he ascended from Sinai into heaven to receive the Law.”<sup>425</sup>

The author of Hebrews is also clear that heavenly sanctuary is in need of purification. In what ways is the heavenly sanctuary impure? Moffitt suggests two possible situations.<sup>426</sup> First, he notes that the earthly Dwelling Place required sacrifices, anointing, and ablutions for purification as part of its inauguration (Exod 24.6–8; 40.9–15, 26–34). Similarly, the consecration of priests and their vestments were purified (Exod 29.19–21; Lev 8.1–9.24, 10–30). Moffitt notes that these two phenomena are parts

---

*Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart, and Nathan MacDonald, LSNT 387 (London: T&T Clark, 2008) 68–79; idem, “Wilderness Identity and Pentateuchal Narrative: Distinguishing between Jesus’ Inauguration and Maintenance of the New Covenant in Hebrews,” in *Muted Voices of the New Testament: Readings in the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*, ed. Katherine M. Hockey, Madison N. Pierce, and Francis Watson, LNTS 565 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 153–71. For the criticism of Moffitt, see: Michael Kibbe, “Is It Finished? When Did It Start? Hebrews, Priesthood, and Atonement in Biblical, Systematic, and Historical Perspective,” *JTS* 65 (2014): 25–61; Jean-René Moret, “Le rôle du concept de purification dans l’Épître aux Hébreux: une réaction à quelques propositions de David M. Moffitt,” *NTS* 62 (2016): 289–307; Joshua D. A. Bloor, *Purifying the Consciousness in Hebrews: Cult, Defilement and the Perpetual Heavenly Blood of Jesus*, LNTS 675 (London: T&T Clark, 2023), 64–66.

<sup>424</sup> Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection*, 224.

<sup>425</sup> Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection*, 225, though it is not clear to me where does Moffitt see Moses’ ascension into heaven. His main point remains valid that in the author of Hebrews’ view, Jesus entered the very heavenly structure pattern that Moses saw.

<sup>426</sup> Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection*, 225–26, n. 20.

of inauguration celebrations, a concept that appears in the immediate context in Hebrews (9.23). The other possibility is that some contamination does exist in the heavenly sanctuary. The idea of the existence of contamination in heaven is not unprecedented in the early Jewish literature. The Book of Watchers, as I have shown above, have the watchers (heavenly beings) defile themselves by marrying human women. Those watchers have been banned from entering the heavenly sanctuary (1 *En.* 12.4; 14.5; 15.3), either not to defile the sanctuary,<sup>427</sup> or because they already have. Employing the same interpretation I have shown earlier that the fallen watchers are defiled priests, Klawans supports Moffitt's conclusion: "While it would appear logical to assume that an earthly temple would be more prone to pollution than a heavenly one, that logical *assumption* is undercut, not supported, by 1 Enoch. According to this text, the heavenly temple, no different from the earthly one, is prone to pollution by a fornicating priesthood."<sup>428</sup> Following Jesus's offering of his blood, effecting kipper in the heavenly sanctuary, God calls Jesus to sit to his right hand (Heb 1.3). According to Hebrews, Jesus remains at the right hand of God, till the full subjugation of his enemies. Finally, the author of the epistle writes: "Now the main point of what we are saying is this. We do have such a high priest, who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, and who serves in the sanctuary, the true Dwelling Place set up by the Lord, not by a mere human being" (Heb 8.1–2). This passage shows the author's confidence that the readers are well aware of the existence of the sanctuary in heaven and are at least partly cognizant of its significance.

---

<sup>427</sup> So Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 22.

<sup>428</sup> Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple*, 131 (emphasis original). Others argue that the heavenly temple has been contaminated by the act of sin, e.g., William L. Lane, *Hebrews 9–13*, WBC 47B (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991), 246–47. According to Attridge, the concept of the heavenly temple is used metaphorically to highlight the idea of purifying the conscience of individuals within the believing community on an existential or interior level. See: Harold W. Attridge, *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 262.

## Revelation

Revelation is also a Jewish text produced by the Jesus movement that attests to the idea of the heavenly temple in first-century Judaism.<sup>429</sup> In the introductory greeting of Revelation, the author asserts that Jesus has made the readers a kingdom of priests for God the Father through his blood (1.6). The concept of priesthood of the readers is reiterated later in the text where Jesus has made them a kingdom of priests to God (5.10). For the author of Revelation, the community of believers are part of Israel, who were first described as a kingdom of priests (Rev 1.6; 5.10; cf. Exod 19.6; Isa 61.6).<sup>430</sup> Additionally, Jesus promises that the priestly believers will rule on the earth, a pledge that will come to fruition during the millennium. As the author notes, these faithful individuals will serve as priests with Jesus and reign with him for a period of one thousand years (20.6). A vision of this community of priests vividly describes them ministering in the heavenly temple:

After this I looked, and there was a great multitude that no one could count, from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, robed in white, with palm branches in their hands. They cried out in a loud voice, saying, “Salvation belongs to our God who is seated on the throne and to the Lamb!” And all the angels stood around the throne and around the elders and the four living creatures, and they fell on

---

<sup>429</sup> The temple is a central theme in Revelation, and several temple characteristics and motifs appear in Revelation, including the heavenly temple. See: Robert A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*, SBL 10 (New York: Peter Lang, 199), especially here 96–103; Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*, BZNW 107 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001). On the influence of Jewish scriptures on shaping the thoughts of Revelation author, see: Frances Young, “Typology and Eschatology: The Scriptural Shaping of Imagery in the Book of Revelation,” in *The Scriptures in the Book of Revelation and Apocalyptic Literature: Essays in Honour of Steve Moyise*, eds. Susan E. Docherty and Steve Smith, LNTS 634 (London: T&T Clark, 2023), 11–24.

<sup>430</sup> Ralph Korner notes that the word *ekklēsia* occurs around 20 times in Revelation, and it is the preferred way of the author of Revelation to refer to his community of Jesus followers. Korner surveys the use of *ekklēsia* in Jewish literature and finds three main uses of the term: (1) the Hebrew *ekklēsia* of Israel in the desert, (2) the Jewish semi-public *ekklēsia* associations of Philo in Alexandria (first century CE; Virt. 108), (3) the Jewish public *ekklēsiai* of Judea and Galilee (2nd century BCE to 1st century CE). Korner, hence, concludes that the term is closely tied to the Jewish synagogue, and the author envisions a future heavenly Jerusalem that embodies the *ekklēsia*. John envisions the *ekklēsia* not as a replacement or supersession of Israel, but as a community integrated within God’s eternal covenant, positioned in anticipation of the imminent fulfillment of the divine plan. See: Korner, *Reading Revelation After Supersessionism*, 20.

their faces before the throne and worshiped God, singing, “Amen! Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honor and power and might be to our God forever and ever! Amen.” Then one of the elders addressed me, saying, “Who are these, robed in white, and where have they come from?” I said to him, “Sir, you are the one who knows.” Then he said to me, “These are they who have come out of the great ordeal; they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. For this reason they are before the throne of God and worship him day and night within his temple (ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ), and the one who is seated on the throne will shelter them. (Rev 7.9–15)

The author mentions the royal room of God with the throne several times before this passage, but this is the first time where the author identifies the place as a temple in heaven. The community of believers, who endured the great ordeal, worship God day and night in the heavenly temple. We have seen that the Levitical sacrificial system includes the offering of the ascension sacrifice everyday twice, day and night. On the throne, a Lamb, representing Jesus as a sacrifice, is offered in the heavenly temple. In an earlier scene, the author of Revelation sees the “door of heaven” opens,<sup>431</sup> then depicts four living creatures surrounding the divine throne in the heavenly temple, in a similar fashion to Ezekiel’s vision of the heavenly throne of God (Ezek 1.5–11):

And in front of the throne there is something like a sea of glass, like crystal. Around the throne, and on each side of the throne, are four living creatures, full of eyes in front and behind. <sup>7</sup> the first living creature like a lion, the second living creature like an ox, the third living creature with a face like a human face, and the fourth living creature like a flying eagle. And the four living creatures, each of them with six wings, are full of eyes all around and inside. Day and

---

<sup>431</sup> I have already explored several texts that envision a gate or door to the heavenly temple (1 *En.* 14.15–25; 4Q213A 1, ll.15–18; see also 3 *Macc* 6.18 and the discussion of *T. Levi* 5.1 below).

night without ceasing they sing, ‘Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God the Almighty, who was and is and is to come’ (Rev 4.6–8)

The passage draws upon a rich heritage of imagery about the temple, especially in apocalyptic literature. The heavenly sea is a recurring motif in Jewish apocalyptic narratives (e.g., 1 *En.* 14.10). The crystalline sea of glass (θάλασσα ὑαλίνη ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ) reminds the reader with the firmament that Ezekiel saw while looking into the heavenly temple in his vision (Ezek 1.22; the Old Greek translator uses κρυστάλλου to translate הקֶרֶת).<sup>432</sup> Hence, the firmament appears again as part of the heavenly temple. Additionally, we have seen God’s throne is situated in heaven (Ps 11.4; 103.9), where God is encircled by a celestial council (1 Kgs 22.19). According to Isaiah, the throne is elevated and exalted, and it is flanked by seraphs with six wings who praise God (Isa 6.1–3). In Ezekiel’s account, the throne takes the form of a sapphire chariot and is drawn by creatures with four faces each, representing a lion, an ox, an eagle, and a human being (Ezek 1.4–28). God’s apparition is resplendent in fiery glory, and a rainbow encircles God while a crystalline sea lies underneath Him. The fiery chariot is also equipped with wheels (Dan 7.9–10), and God is depicted as having white hair and raiment. A heavenly court is situated around God’s throne, and beyond them lie innumerable other celestial beings (e.g., 4 Q530 2.17).<sup>433</sup> The role of the four living creatures in the heavenly temple is to exemplify true worship,<sup>434</sup>

---

<sup>432</sup> Joel M. Rothman, *The Cosmic Journey in the Book of Revelation: Apocalyptic Cosmology and the Experience of Story-Space*, LNTS 683 (London: T&T Clark, 2023), 62–63. See also the relevant discussion of the sea imagery in Rev 21.1 in Jonathan Moo, “The Sea That Is No More: Rev 21:1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John,” *NovT*, 51 (2009): 148–67.

<sup>433</sup> The *Animal Apocalypse* (18:3–14) combines several elements, including a wheeled and fiery throne that is attended by four creatures. These creatures possess numerous eyes, four heads, and sixteen faces that bear resemblance to those described in Ezekiel. Additionally, they are depicted as having six wings, similar to the seraphs mentioned in Isaiah. We have seen earlier that *The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* makes reference to a celestial throne in the heavenly temple that possesses several noteworthy characteristics. It is described as being both wheeled and glorious, as well as fiery in nature. Surrounding this throne is a rainbow-like splendor, and around it are other heavenly beings who worship (4Q405 20–22 8–11)

<sup>434</sup> The four living creatures are probably part of the divine throne, not separated from it. See Georg Glonner, *Zur Bildersprache des Johannes von Patmos: Untersuchung der Johannes-apokalypse anhand einer um Elemente der Bildinterpretation erweiterten historisch-kritischen Methode*, NTA 34 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1999), 175–76; Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 42.

and call upon the twenty-four elders to join in worship (5.8–10). Noteworthy of their worship is that the song they sing in the heavenly temple recalls the song of the angelic beings in Isaiah’s vision in the Jerusalem temple (Isa 6.3).<sup>435</sup> For the author of Revelation, the worship in the Jerusalem temple is the same worship of the heavenly temple. Later, the author depicts Jesus as a sacrificed lamb in the heavenly temple:

Then I saw between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders a Lamb standing as if it had been slaughtered, with seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth. He went and took the scroll from the right hand of the one who was seated on the throne. When he had taken the scroll, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders fell before the Lamb, each holding a harp and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. (Rev 5.6–8)

Jesus, referred to as the slaughtered lamb in this context,<sup>436</sup> stands in the heavenly temple in front of God, who is seated on the throne. The author depicts Jesus as an animal sacrifice, while the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders offer incense offerings. The four living creatures and the twenty-four elders sing to Jesus: “You were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation; you have made them a kingdom and priests serving our God, and they will reign on earth” (Rev 5.9b–10). The notion of Jesus standing (ἑστηκός) close to God’s throne is reminiscent of the posture of the high priest in the temple, especially during Yom Kippur when the high priest comes closer to the ark (Lev 16.2, 12–13. Cf. Deut 10.8; 17.12; 18.5–

---

<sup>435</sup> On the role of hymns in the formation and development of Revelation’s theological ideas, see Justin P. Jeffcoat Schedtler, “The Hymns in Revelation,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Book of Revelation*, ed. Craig R. Koester, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 115–130; Steven Grabiner, *Revelation’s Hymns: Commentary on the Cosmic Conflict*, LNTS 511 (London: T&T Clark, 2015).

<sup>436</sup> On the identification of Jesus as a slain lamb in Revelation, see: Paul Middleton, *The Violence of the Lamb: Martyrs as Agents of Divine Judgement in the Book of Revelation*, LNTS 586 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 68–94; Craig R. Koester, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 38A (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 386–87; Loren L. Johns, *The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force*, WUNT II/167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

7).<sup>437</sup> Angels, who, as we have seen, function as priests in the heavenly temple, are regularly depicted as standing (Dan 7.9–10.13; 1 *En.* 71.8; 2 *Bar.* 21.6; 48.10 and 4 *Ezra* 8.21).<sup>438</sup> Through Jesus's sacrifice, the community of believers became a kingdom of priests who are serving in the heavenly temple. The whole context in this scene is cultic. The angels also join in the heavenly temple worship (5.11).

The heavenly temple plays a role also in inaugurating God and Jesus's victory over the unrighteous:

Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Messiah, and he will reign forever and ever." Then the twenty-four elders who sit on their thrones before God fell on their faces and worshiped God, 17 singing, "We give you thanks, Lord God Almighty, who are and who were, for you have taken your great power and begun to reign. The nations raged, but your wrath has come, and the time for judging the dead, for rewarding your servants, the prophets and saints and all who fear your name, both small and great, and for destroying those who destroy the earth." Then God's temple in heaven was opened, and the ark of his covenant was seen within his temple, and there were flashes of lightning, rumblings, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail. (Rev 11.15)

The angels celebrate the victory of God and his Christ on the nations,<sup>439</sup> and declare the eternal kingdom of God forever. The author sees God's kingdom as the just reaction against the nations who

---

<sup>437</sup> Some commentators view Jesus's posture as a reference to his resurrection. However, the fact that Jesus is not the only one who is depicted as standing in the heavenly temple diminishes this interpretation. See: David E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52A (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 2017), 352–53; Simon J. Kistemaker, *Revelation*, NTC (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 206.

<sup>438</sup> Matthias Reinhard Hoffmann, *The Destroyer and the Lamb: The Relationship between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*, WUNT II/203 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 141.

<sup>439</sup> Simon P. Woodman, "Fire from Heaven: Divine Judgment in the Book of revelation," in *The Book of Revelation*, eds. Garrick V. Allen, Ian Paul, and Simon P. Woodman, WUNT II/411 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 175–192.

oppressed the community of believers. In this context, the “temple of God in heaven” (ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) opens in theophanic language (also in 15.5), announcing God's victory. The author also depicts the ark of the covenant in the heavenly temple. The ark has been absent in the earthly temple. The ark represents YHWH's presence with his people, where YHWH used to talk to Moses from above the ark cover (Exod 25.22). That the author of Revelation sees the heavenly ark at this moment of inaugurating God's reign serves as a reminder to the community of believers that God is present in their lives.<sup>440</sup> Thus, Jesus's message to the community of believers since the beginning of the book is: “If you conquer, I will make you a pillar in the temple of my God” (Rev 3.12).

### **The Testament of Levi**

The last text I will examine here is The Testament of Levi (and the related work Aramaic Levi Document). The Testament of Levi is part of the larger work, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, a mid-second century CE work that has been developed within the Jesus movement circles. There is evidence that the Testament of Levi has Jewish roots, particularly when considered alongside the related work, the Aramaic Levi Document. However, scholars now widely agree that the text was further developed in circles associated with the early Jesus movement around the mid-second century CE. For this reason, I include it alongside Hebrews and Revelation as three works that developed among followers of the Jesus movement.<sup>441</sup> As Himmelfarb shows, the Testament of Levi is deeply indebted to the Aramaic Levi Document, a Jewish work contemporary with the Book of Watchers.<sup>442</sup>

---

<sup>440</sup> Just like in Judaism, in the Greco-Roman context where the author of Revelation writes, temples represented the active presence of the gods, and were places for protection. See the discussion in Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 42–44, 121–128.

<sup>441</sup> For the Aramaic Levi Document, see: Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 19 (Leiden: Brill, 2004). On the relationship between Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Levi, see: M. de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 71–89; Robert Kugler, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 47–56.

<sup>442</sup> Martha Himmelfarb, “What Goes On in the Heavenly Temple?” in *Atonement: Jewish and Christian Origins*, ed. Max Botner, Justin Harrison Duff, and Simon Dürr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 189–90.



Within the narrative world of the Aramaic Levi Document, the author is concerned with the priesthood and the associated sacrificial system. The Aramaic Levi Document includes references to Levi's ascent into heaven,<sup>443</sup> though the ascent narrative itself is not preserved in the text. The Testament of Levi, however, includes an ascent account. One of the main differences between both works is their imagination of heaven. While the author of the Aramaic Levi Document speaks of four heavens, the Testament of Levi construes seven heavens. Himmelfarb, thus, concludes: "The relationship between the Testament of Levi and the better-preserved portions of Aramaic Levi makes it likely that the Testament took the earlier ascent as a point of departure for its own, transforming Aramaic Levi's single heaven into seven heavens just as 2 Enoch did for the Book of the Watchers."<sup>444</sup> Whether the ascent account that we have now in the Testament of Levi was based on the ascent account in the Aramaic Levi Document or not, we cannot know. However, within the Testament of Levi, the sacrificial system is still valid and operative, though in the heavenly temple, and through bloodless sacrifices as I will show below. Because we are not certain about the origin of the ascent account, I treat the text as belonging to the Jesus movement in the second century CE.<sup>445</sup>

The author of T. Levi highlights the significance of the heavenly temple and the sacrificial aroma.<sup>446</sup> The work represents the last words of Levi, his testament to his sons, and his dissatisfaction with his priestly descendants' line. The book is part of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which modeled Jacob's last words to his children, depicting Jacob's children as giving similar words to their children. Before Levi enters heaven (*T. Levi* 5.1; Cf. *ALD* 4.6) he learns that the Great Glory dwells in heaven:

---

<sup>443</sup> I will show the references below in parallelism to the ascent account in the Testament of Levi.

<sup>444</sup> Himmelfarb, "What Goes On in the Heavenly Temple?" 189.

<sup>445</sup> As I mentioned when I discussed Hebrews and Revelation, a text originated within the Jesus movement does not mean that it is not a Jewish text. The parting of the ways, as discussed above, did not happen in the second century CE. However, to avoid confusing the text with earlier Jewish texts, I place it with Hebrews and Revelation.

<sup>446</sup> Every time there are parallels to the Testament of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, I will note it and cite the parallels.

In the uppermost heaven of all dwells the Great Glory in the Holy of Holies, superior to all holiness. There with him are the archangels, who serve and offer propitiatory sacrifices to the Lord in behalf of all the sins of ignorance of the righteous ones. They present to the Lord a pleasing odor, a rational and bloodless oblation. In the heaven below them are the messengers who carry the responses to the angels of the Lord's presence. So when the Lord looks upon us we all tremble. Even the heavens and earth and the abysses tremble before the presence of his majesty. (3.4–9. Cf. *ALD* 4.4–6)<sup>447</sup>

The author of *T. Levi* portrays a temple in heaven where God dwells in the heavenly Holy of Holies. Angels also function as priests there. They serve the heavenly altar and offer sacrifices on behalf of the righteous. Levi then enters heaven: “The angel opened for me the gates of heaven and I saw the Holy Most High sitting on the throne” (5.1; cf. Ps 24.7–10). Seven angels consecrate Levi as a priest, who is clad in “white raiment,” which is reminiscent of the seven angels in Ezekiel who wear linen garments (cf. Ezek 9.2–3; 10.2). Those white garments, in both Ezekiel and *T. Levi*, recall the high priest’s white garment on Yom Kippur’s service, when the high priest used to enter the holy of the holies once a year (cf. Lev 16.4).

The angel of the presence who guides Levi tells him about the various priestly ministries of the angels in the heavenly sanctuary. The author describes the ministry of the angels of the presence in the seventh heaven where God’s throne exists: “There with him are the archangels, who serve and offer propitiatory sacrifices to the Lord on behalf of all the sins of ignorance of the righteous ones” (*T. Levi* 3.5; cf. *ALD* 4.4–6). Angels perform *kipper* in the heavenly temple complex. They also perform an

---

<sup>447</sup> Translation from Howard C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *OTP* 1:789. For a more recent translation, see: H. W. Hollander and M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP (Leiden: Brill, 1985), here 136. Kee’s translation remains clearer and smoother. On the parallelism with *ALD*, see: Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 69.

intercessory role on behalf of humanity in the fifth heaven (3.7), which coheres with their role as priests.

The angel goes on to explain the nature of the heavenly offerings: “They present to the Lord a pleasing odor, a rational and bloodless oblation” (*T. Lev.* 3.6).<sup>448</sup> Just like how the author of Jubilees emphasizes the sacrificial aroma, the Testament of Levi also highlights the bloodless offering through the ethereal component, the sacrificial aroma, which takes place in heaven.<sup>449</sup> When Levi enters heaven (5.1), unlike Enoch in the Book of Watchers (1 *En.* 14.13), Levi does not show any fear or anxiety about being in the heavenly temple. This is because, as Himmelfarb argues, Levi, as the father of the Israelite priesthood, feels at home in the heavenly temple.<sup>450</sup> The main goal of the book is to reinforce Levi’s worthiness of the priesthood, thus it is confirmed in the heavenly temple. Even Jacob seems to accept the priesthood of his son Levi and pays tithes to him.

The Testament of Levi gives us a more detailed account of the heavenly temple. Heaven is viewed as a temple, and God sits in the most holy place. Angels minister and offer bloodless offerings, which focus on the sacrificial aroma. But the heavenly temple is also a perfect place, unprofanable, while Levi’s priestly descendants might profane the earthly temple (see especially *T. Levi* 14–17). Levi

---

<sup>448</sup> For the argument that the clause “reasonable and bloodless offering” is an early Christian polemical addition to the text, see: M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin*, Van Gorcum’s Theologische Bibliotheek 25 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), 48–49. For a criticism of de Jonge’s argument, see Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, AGJU 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 267–268, which de Jonge later accepts (“Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII,” in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*, ed. M. de Jonge, SVTP 3 [Leiden: Brill, 1975], 259). Martha Himmelfarb also notes that as other Jewish texts from the same second temple era highlight the ethereal offerings, the clause in *T. Levi* does not necessarily mean it is a Christian addition. Already in the first century, before the parting of the ways, which happened centuries later, Paul uses a similar clause (cf. Rom 12:1). See: Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 33–36.

<sup>449</sup> Another text that refers to the sacrificial aroma is *Serekh HaYahad* from Qumran. According to the text, “the council of the community shall be established in truth. It shall be an everlasting plantation, a house of holiness of Israel and a most holy congregation of Aaron, chosen by pleasure to atone for the earth and to repay the wicked their reward... It shall be a most holy dwelling for Aaron, with all-encompassing knowledge of the covenant of justice, and shall offer up a pleasant odor” (1 QS 8.4–9). The community atones for the whole earth through the offering of a pleasant ascending odor.

<sup>450</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 32.

seems at home in the heavenly temple, invested by the angels who legitimize his priestly office at the heart of the heavenly temple. He will then receive his priesthood as if it is an angelic status: “For you will stand near the Lord and will be his minister and will declare his mysteries to men” (*T. Levi* 2.10).

Perhaps the most significant aspect about the heavenly temple in the Testament of Levi is the author’s apocalyptic prediction that the properly instituted priesthood will end Adam’s exile from Eden:

The heavens will be opened, and from the temple of glory sanctification will come upon, with a fatherly voice, as from Abraham to Isaac... And he shall open the gates of paradise, and he shall remove the sword that has threatened since Adam. And he will grant to the saints to eat from the tree of life, and the spirit of holiness shall be on them (18.6–11).

The association between the heavenly temple, Adam, and the location of the paradise, though not clear enough in the passage, shows that there was an expectation of an eschatological Eden, somehow connected to the heavenly temple, where the exile of Adam outside Eden will be restored.

## **Conclusion**

The heavenly temple is a significant conception in Second Temple Judaism, that finds its roots in the Jewish scriptures and is well-attested in cognate cultures around Israel. I have surveyed the evidence from Jewish scriptures and Second Temple literature about the heavenly temple and provided key passages that help us understand the nature of the heavenly temple, and its different roles in different texts. In the period of Second Temple Judaism, different texts developed the idea of the heavenly temple for various reasons. The authors do not argue for the existence of the heavenly temple. Rather, the authors assume their readers’ knowledge of the existence of the heavenly temple. It is part of the cultural encyclopedia of most, if not all, ancient Jews. This observation might give us insight into how ubiquitous the idea of the heavenly temple in first-century Judaism is.

We have seen that there are three main reasons for the development of the ideas about the heavenly temple. First, some texts resorted to the heavenly temple as the archetype of the earthly temple which has been in existence since the day of creation, where the earthly temple(s) have been patterned after the heavenly temple. This idea finds its roots in different texts within Jewish scriptures. Second, some other texts expressed dissatisfaction with the earthly temple and shifted the ritual cultic center to the heavenly temple instead of the earthly Jerusalem temple. We have seen how angels have been perceived as priests, and the bloodless sacrificial aroma became the central offering in the heavenly temple. This conception of the heavenly temple is also rooted in Jewish scriptures, especially in the influential work of Ezekiel. Third, a group of texts resorted to the idea of the heavenly temple after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Texts like 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch found eschatological hopes in the indestructible heavenly temple. For those authors, the heavenly temple is the object of God's promises and the place where Jews should look for after the destruction of the second temple.

It is my claim that Luke, as an early Jewish follower of Jesus, uses the same heavenly temple pattern and that Jesus performs atonement in this heavenly temple. In the next chapter, I will show the evidence that Luke adopts the heavenly temple category, then, in the fifth chapter I will show the evidence that Jesus performs atonement in the heavenly temple. Building on the survey of evidence from Second Temple literature, several descriptions of the heavenly temple that occur in Luke will become clear as we put Luke vis-à-vis those Jewish authors.

## **Chapter 4: The Heavenly Temple in Luke-Acts**

### **Introduction**

In the last chapter, I surveyed the evidence from Jewish literature, which supports the existence of a celestial temple or that perceives heaven to be a temple. The chapter established the fact that many early Jews believed that there was a temple in heaven that represents the eternal abode of YHWH, and that earthly temples were thought to be made after the pattern of the heavenly temple.

Having established this point, I now move to the next step in my argument. Luke not only believes that there is a celestial temple, but he also *deliberately creates links between the Jerusalem*

*temple and the heavenly temple*. Jewish sacrifices effected atonement when Jewish priests sprinkled their blood inside the Jerusalem temple, which maintained YHWH's presence (via his *kavod*) in the temple among his people. The purpose of this chapter is to show that Luke links the ritual focus of the Jerusalem temple to the heavenly temple in the passion narratives. The key to understanding Luke's thinking about atonement, then, is to understand Jewish thinking about the heavenly temple and what happened in it, which I explained in detail in the last chapter.

Luke never explicitly mentions the heavenly temple in his double work. Instead, he assumes that his readers bring to their reading of his writings a belief in this celestial temple's existence. Nonetheless, he alludes to this celestial temple in some narrative descriptions and connections he provides in the passion narratives. Thus, I will look into the evidence we have in Luke-Acts for the heavenly temple in the trial and crucifixion scenes, in which Luke creates connections between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple. Within these scenes, there are three sets of evidence: the trial scene with the Jewish council, Jesus's entrance into the paradise, and the crucifixion scene. I will go through these pieces of evidence set by set to establish my claim. Luke wants his readers to think of Jesus as a priest who is offering his blood as a sacrifice in the heavenly temple. *Luke does not replace the Jerusalem temple as the cultic and ritual focal center but links it to the heavenly temple following a significant number of early Jewish authors*. Understanding these connections between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple in Luke-Acts will not only solve the problem of Stephen's speech about the temple but will uncover Luke's view about Jesus's atoning death.

But before I start, a word about the nature of the evidence is necessary. Luke does not say explicitly that he links the heavenly temple to the Jerusalem temple. However, the evidence that I will show in this chapter when taken together, supports my contention that Luke indeed envisions linkage between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple. Thus the pieces of evidence should be considered collectively, pointing together to the heavenly temple as a central ritual locus in Luke's

imagination. When understood together, the evidence appears to be strong enough to support the basic claim that Luke envisions an implicit heavenly temple in his narrative.

### **Jesus and the Jewish Council**

One of the assumptions of this dissertation is that Luke used Mark as one of his sources. Therefore, I will first briefly explore the nature of the heavenly temple in the Gospel of Mark which will shed more light on the nature and function of the heavenly temple in Luke-Acts. For instance, scholars note that Mark connects the Jerusalem temple to heaven, mainly by the “tearing” of heaven at Jesus’s baptism at the beginning of the gospel and the “tearing” of the temple veil at Jesus’s death, where at both locations Jesus is confessed to be the Son of God (Mk 1.10; 15.38).<sup>451</sup>

But this is not the only connection that Mark makes between the temple and heaven. In the trial scene where Jesus stands before the council, Mark states: “Some stood up and gave false testimony against him, saying, ‘We heard him say, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands (τὸν χειροποίητον), and in three days I will build another, not made with hands (ἀχειροποίητον)’” (Mk 14.57–58). Mark states that these accusations against Jesus are false. Yet commentators have found some layers of truth in the witness. R. T. France says: “Mark has gone much further than a hostile witness is likely to have wanted or indeed been able to go, and has woven into the (false) charge a (true) statement of what was by his time a significant theme in Christian preaching and apologetics, the theme of a new sanctuary.”<sup>452</sup> Donald Juel agrees that there is some truth to the claim about the two sanctuaries in Jesus’s statement. Juel argues that “made with hands is used to describe the temple(s) built by men which have been destroyed; not made with hands means made by God’s hands (Exod

---

<sup>451</sup> Note the use of the verb *οἰζῶ* in both instances. See Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16: A New Translation, Notes, and Commentary*, AB27A (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 1067.

<sup>452</sup> R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 606–607. France bases his interpretation on the assertion that God’s presence is in the Christian community in several other NT passages (e.g., Mt 12.6; 1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 1 Pet. 2.4–5). Marcus makes a similar claim: “Although the evangelist calls this a false testimony, he probably thinks it has an element of truth in it: Jesus did on the third day found the church, a Temple not made with hands, by rising from the dead.” See: Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1004.



15.17), referring to the eschatological temple.”<sup>453</sup> Juel connects the eschatological temple to the heavenly sanctuary placed on the top of the cosmic mountain in Moses’s song after the crossing of the red sea.<sup>454</sup> Adela Collins also agrees that the most likely meaning of the temple not made with hands is the eschatological temple, calling it the “eternal temple of divine origin.”<sup>455</sup> Collins also postulates that the author lost hope of the appearance of this eschatological temple on earth, so he calls the testimony false to hint at the distance between the original Jesus’s saying, and Mark’s view.<sup>456</sup>

Regardless of the truthfulness or falseness of the charge, the concept of a temple “not made with hands” in Mark deserves attention as it informs Luke’s imagination of the heavenly temple.<sup>457</sup> This line of interpretation looks at the sanctuary not made with hands as an eschatological temple that will appear in the future, which is the same old, or “eternal” in Collins’ words, abode of YHWH. It is concealed for now but will appear in the future.

Recently Max Botner has modified and developed this line of interpretation, offering supportive evidence for the sanctuary that is not made with hands as a heavenly temple that Jews believed to exist during the Second Temple period,<sup>458</sup> as I have shown in the last chapter. In the case of the two sanctuaries passage in Mark, Christian commentators borrowed heavily from other writings from Jesus’s followers to interpret the temple not made with hands as the nascent community of Jesus’s followers (e.g., 1 Cor 3.16). Thus, modern commentators chose other NT texts to represent the

---

<sup>453</sup> Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*, SBLDS, 31 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 152.

<sup>454</sup> 4Q174 I.2–3 connects the cosmic mountain temple in Exod. 15.17 to the eschatological temple.

<sup>455</sup> Collins, *Mark*, 703.

<sup>456</sup> A few reasons have led to the conclusion that there might be a layer of historical truth to the saying. First, the saying occurs twice in Mark (see also Mk 15:29–30), once in Acts (6:14, though stated as a false accusation too), and, surprisingly, in the Gospel of Thomas (71). Second, the saying is odd to the extent that Eyal Regev judges it: “improbable that a later source would invent such a claim *ex nihilo*.” See: Eyal Regev, “The Temple in Mark: A Case Study about the Early Christian Attitude Toward the Temple,” in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity: Text and Context*, ed. Dan Jaffé, AJEC 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 144.

<sup>457</sup> Even if there is no layer of truthfulness to the claim, my argument below still stands, as it pertains only to the nature of the temple not made with hands as Mark imagines it.

<sup>458</sup> Max Botner, “A Sanctuary in the Heavens and the Ascension of the Son of Man: Reassessing the Logic of Jesus’ Trial in Mark 14.53–65,” *JSNT* (2019): 310–34.

inferential walk, to use Umberto Eco's language,<sup>459</sup> the intertextual framework, to understand Mark.

The question that Botner raises is whether this is the only possible inferential walk that Mark invites his readers to take?<sup>460</sup> Botner argues that we should situate Mark within the intertextual encyclopedia of apocalyptic literature that speaks of ascension, suggesting that Mark pictures Jesus saying he will enter the heavenly temple as a priest and perform a priestly ministry before the divine throne. Botner shows that "the conception of the heavens as a sacred space corresponding to the Jerusalem temple" is the most natural way to understand Mark's sanctuary which is not made with hands.

Botner interprets the meaning of ναὸς ἀχειροποίητος as a reference to a celestial temple that exists in the heavens and is not part of the creation. The author of Hebrews is helpful for this definition: "But when Christ came as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect Dwelling Place not made with hands, that is, not of this creation (οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως), he entered once for all into the holy place, not with the blood of goats and calves but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption." (Heb 9.11–12). The technical definition of a celestial temple as "not made with hands" emphasizes the otherworldly nature of that temple. The author of Hebrew continues: "Thus it was necessary for the sketches of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves need better sacrifices than these. For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, a mere copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf" (Heb 9.23–24). For the author of Hebrews, Jesus entered heaven, which means that Jesus entered into the heavenly sanctuary not made with hands. By implication, when the author of Hebrews highlights the Jerusalem temple as the temple "made with hands," the author is merely asserting the fact that it is an earthly copy of the heavenly sanctuary. The same logic of ἀχειροποίητος/χειροποίητος duality occurs in Paul's letters. For instance,

---

<sup>459</sup> See the introduction to the dissertation.

<sup>460</sup> See the introduction for Eco's definition of the inferential walk.

Paul says: “For we know that, if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς)” (2 Cor 5.1; cf. Col 2.11). Paul compares the flesh body, implicitly, “made with hands,” that is, of this creation, to the resurrected bodies that Jesus’s followers will receive after their death. What is interesting about Paul’s language is that he speaks of the body in the same house language typically applied to the temple. Paul borrows temple language and applies it to the bodies of Jesus’s followers. Thus, again, ἀχειροποίητος refers to the otherworldly nature of the body/temple.

Botner makes two observations about Mark that demonstrate that he, like other Jewish authors, believed in the existence of the heavenly temple. First, Mark seems to be inspired by Isaiah’s request to God: “Look down from heaven and see, from your holy and glorious habitation” (Isa 63.15), in shaping his baptism scene, as if Mark sees the fulfillment of Isaiah’s request to YHWH in the Spirit’s descending from heaven on Jesus in the baptism.<sup>461</sup> Isaiah later asks YHWH to tear the heaven and come down: “May you tear קרעת the heavens and come down” (Isa 63.19). Mark also uses the picture of tearing the heaven in the baptism scene, reflected in his choice of using σχίζω rather than the regular verb ἀνοίγω. Hence, Isaiah’s request that YHWH look down from heaven, the holy indwelling of YHWH, might imply that YHWH lives in a holy sanctuary in heaven. If this is true, it probably means that Mark intends to show the Spirit descending from YHWH’s heavenly sanctuary. The second observation, also related to Mark’s use of σχίζω, is that the scene of rending the heaven in the baptism (1.10) corresponds to the rending of the temple veil (Mk 15.38). Mark uses σχίζω in both occasions, and both occasions are the only locations where σχίζω appears in Mark, suggesting the link between both incidents.<sup>462</sup> Botner concludes: “It seems plausible, therefore, that Mark agrees with the central

---

<sup>461</sup> See also Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox), 49–50, 56–58; Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, WUNT 88 (Tübingen: Mohr Seibek, 1997), 102–108.

<sup>462</sup> Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1067.

premise of the ‘false’ testimony. Israel’s God does indeed sit enthroned in ‘another sanctuary not made with hands.’<sup>463</sup> Mark rejects the notion that Jesus is against the Jerusalem temple, but he does not reject the belief in a heavenly sanctuary not made with hands.

In the same context of the heavenly temple in Mark 14.57–58, Jesus describes his coming on the clouds (Mk 14.62), “which clearly presupposes the Son of Man’s ascension and presentation before the divine throne.”<sup>464</sup> Mark 14.61–62 offers further support to Botner’s claim that Mark pictures Jesus ascending to enter the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>465</sup> When the high priest asks Jesus if he is the messiah, Jesus answers: “I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the power, and coming with the clouds of heaven” (Mk 14.62). The first part of Jesus’s answer seems to align with the Danielic “one like a son of man” (Dan 7.13). Several pieces of evidence suggest that this Danielic figure is a priestly figure, as the passage in Daniel is connected to Enoch’s ascent into heaven as a priest in the Book of Giants (especially 1 *En.* 14.8–15.7). Loren Stuckenbruck shows that the Book of Giants and Daniel both depend on a common theophanic tradition.<sup>466</sup> Enoch ascends into heaven on the clouds (1 *En.* 14.8; cf. Dan 7.13 and Mk 14.62) and enters the sanctuary approaching the divine throne to serve as a priest (Cf. *Jub.* 4.25; 2 *En.* 22.8–10 J).<sup>467</sup> We do have early pictures of Jesus serving as a priest in the

---

<sup>463</sup> Botner, “A Sanctuary in the Heaven,” 319.

<sup>464</sup> Botner, “A Sanctuary in the Heaven,” 319–20. As I will note later, what Botner finds implicit in Mark regarding Jesus’s ascension to heaven, Luke makes explicit in his gospel.

<sup>465</sup> Scholarly literature on Jesus’s response to the high priest is massive. For helpful overviews: D. Catchpole, “The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. XXVI. 64),” *NTS* 17 (1971): 213–26; David Flusser, “At the Right hand of Power,” *Immanuel* 14 (1982): 42–46; T. F. Glasson, “The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark XIV.62),” *NTS* 7 (1961): 88–93; R. Kempthorne, “The Marcan Text of Jesus’ Answer to the High Priest (Mark xiv 62),” *NovT* 19 (1977): 197–208; D. Lührmann, “Markus 14.55–64: Christologie und Zerstörung des Tempels im Markusevangelium,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 457–74.

<sup>466</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans, *JSPSup* 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2007): 211–20.

<sup>467</sup> For the argument that Enoch serves as a priest in the Enochic literature, see: Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 20–25; Andrei Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 70. Orlov identifies Enoch in the Book of Giants as a priest based on two observations: 1) Enoch enters into the celestial sanctuary, where only priests can enter the sanctuary, and 2) Enoch is identified as a priest in other contemporary literature, so there is no reason to reject the notion that Enoch is a priest in the Book of Giants.

heavenly temple. For instance, the author of Revelation pictures Jesus wearing a white cloth that is very similar to the high priest's attire on Yom Kippur (Rev 1.13–16; Lev 16.4).<sup>468</sup> While Mark does not say it clearly, he might implicitly want his readers to envision Jesus as a priest ministering in the heavenly temple. As I will show below, Luke is clearer on Jesus's priestly ministry in heaven than Mark.

The second part of Jesus's answer "seated at the right hand of the power" comes from Psalm 110, where the second lord is said to be a priest (Ps. 110.4) after the order of Melchizedek's priesthood. 11QMelchizedek pictures Melchizedek as an angelic priest and an eschatological judge, and his activities culminate in performing atonement in the heavenly temple (11Q13 II, 7–9). Philip Alexander comments: "Given that Melchizedek is an angel and that the whole stress in the text is on what is happening in the spirit world, it is natural to assume that the atonement he effects is made in the heavenly sanctuary, and since only the high priest can make atonement on the Day of Atonement, then Melchizedek must be the heavenly high priest."<sup>469</sup> Thus Mark seems to equate Jesus's activity in heaven with Melchizedek's activity, namely, priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Botner concludes that Jesus, just like the Danielic figure and Melchizedek, serves as a priest in the heavenly temple in Mark's narrative.<sup>470</sup>

Botner's analysis of the council encounter with Jesus in Mark's narrative is vital for understanding Luke's parallel narrative, which also pictures Jesus serving as a priest in the heavenly temple. Luke omits the false charge which includes the notion of the destruction of the temple made with hands, thus distancing Jesus from any form of accusation that he called for the temple destruction.

---

<sup>468</sup> Cf. Josephus's description in *Ant.* 3.153–159.

<sup>469</sup> Philip Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*, LSTS 61 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 70.

<sup>470</sup> Botner surprisingly concludes that the Son of Man's priestly ministry in heaven means that the community of Jesus's followers does not need to access the Jerusalem temple. Botner claims (326): "Much like Steven's speech in Acts 6-7, that is, Mark's narrative seems to assume that the Son of Man's heavenly session has the potential to relativize the institution of the Jerusalem cult." But Jesus's priestly ministry in the heavenly temple does not necessarily nullify the significance of the Jerusalem temple as a ritual focal center, and even Stephen's speech does not seem to assume the end of the Jerusalem temple worship (See below).

However, Luke does use the same temple language in Stephen's speech (Acts 7.48–50). Luke also records a similar false charge against Stephen and Jesus: "They set up false witnesses who said, 'This man never stops saying things against this holy place 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 6.13–14). Additionally, while Botner has shown that even though Mark does not include an account of a heavenly ascension it should be read as sharing features of the apocalyptic genre, I think Luke has a stronger case in sharing the same features with the apocalyptic genre. Luke does include an account of a heavenly ascension (repeated twice in Lk 24 and Acts 1), and there are some descriptions of heavenly interactions with humans at different points (e.g., Lk 3.21–22; 10.18; Acts 7.55; 9.3–8; 10.9–16) which resembles the apocalyptic works from early Judaism.

Yet much like Mark, Luke pictures the same narrative of the encounter between Jesus and the council. *Luke keeps the conversation between Jesus and the high priest (Lk 22.69) and redacts Mark's narrative in some significant ways to further emphasize the conclusion that Jesus will ascend to enter the heavenly temple.* Nicholas Moore notes that Luke omits Mark's introductory clause "you will see" and the Danielic phrase "coming on the clouds of heaven," and argues that these omissions "reshape the saying into a statement of Jesus's objective position and status, reducing the emphasis on human experience and redirecting the focus towards Jesus's resurrection and ascension rather than his eschatological return."<sup>471</sup> For Luke, regardless if the high priest and other Jewish leaders will see Jesus sitting at the right hand of God or not, Jesus's position at the right hand of God in heaven is a fact. The focus on the resurrection and ascension of Jesus is further highlighted by Luke's addition of "from now on" (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, 22.69). For Luke, this is a proleptic comment that will be realized only when Jesus

---

<sup>471</sup> Nicholas J. Moore, "He Saw Heaven Opened': Heavenly Temple and Universal Mission in Luke-Acts," *NTS* 68 (2022): 38–51 (41). Luke Timothy Johnson makes similar argument. See: Luke T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 359–60. While Luke omits the clause at this place in his narrative, he does use the same language of the appearance of the Son of Man on the clouds elsewhere (Lk 21:27).

ascends to heaven. It is an inaugurated position, but not fully realized, yet presaged and demonstrated at his trial.<sup>472</sup> Luke presents Jesus as changing geographical locations from this very moment during the trial and will unfold this geographical change in the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension narratives.

Furthermore, Luke pictures Jesus sitting at the right hand of the power of God to communicate the idea of a divine throne in the heavenly divine courtroom, which naturally invokes the heavenly realm as a heavenly temple.<sup>473</sup> Even the concept of “the power of God” has cultic resonances, since some early Jewish texts connect the power of God to the temple. For instance, after Heliodorus, commander of Seleucus’s army, attempted to rob the temple’s treasury (2 Macc 3.22–23), the author explains the miraculous divine intervention to protect the temple (2 Macc 3.25–27), and the author describes how Heliodorus “recognized the power of God” in the temple (2 Macc 3.28). Angels appeared to Heliodorus telling him to declare what “the power of God” did to him in the temple (2 Macc 3.33–34). Even when the king asked Heliodorus who else should lead their future military missions to Jerusalem, Heliodorus answers: “If you have any enemy or plotter against your government, send him there, for you will get him back thoroughly flogged, if he survives at all, for there is certainly some power of God about the place. For he who has his dwelling in heaven watches over that place himself and brings it aid, and he strikes and destroys those who come to do it injury” (2 Macc 3.38–39). The author of 2 Maccabees repeatedly connects the motifs of the power of God, the Jerusalem temple, and God’s heavenly indwelling. The author of Wisdom of Solomon also connects the power of God to God’s glory, the *kavod*, and ritual purity (cf. *Wis.* 7.25).<sup>474</sup> The theme of the power of

---

<sup>472</sup> Cf. Eric Franklin, “The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts” *SJT* 23 (1970): 191–200 (192); Martin Bauspieß, “Die Gegenwart des Heils und das Ende der Zeit: Überlegungen zur lukanischen Eschatologie im Anschluss an Lk 22,66–71 und Apg 7,54–60,” in *Eschatologie – Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser, and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 272 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011): 125–48 (139).

<sup>473</sup> For a representative of the traditional scholarly interpretation of Jesus position at the right hand of God as a sign of his vindication, see: J. Plevnik “Son of Man Seated at the Right Hand of God: Luke 22:69 in Lucan Christology,” *Bib* 72 (1991) 331–47.

<sup>474</sup> Cf. D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS 18 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973).

God recurs throughout Luke-Acts, but one of the special promises Jesus made to his disciples that connects the power of God to heaven is that the disciples will receive power from heaven when the Holy Spirit descends upon them (Lk 24.49; Acts 1.8).

All these indicators show that Luke pictures Jesus entering the heavenly temple in the encounter with the council. As we have seen, Luke transposes some of the claims against Jesus from the council encounter scene in Mark to a later occasion in Acts, especially in the events of Stephen's speech and vision. I will come to analyze this passage in a moment, but first I will move to analyze the second piece of evidence that supports my main claim, that Jesus enters the heavenly temple in Luke's narrative, which is his entrance into paradise.

### **Jesus and The Paradise**

In addition to the council encounter, Luke develops the notion of the heavenly temple in the crucifixion narrative through two factors. the idea that Jesus will enter paradise after his death, and some cosmological and creational aspects that are related to the temple. The paradise saying is unique to the Gospel of Luke and deserves special attention.

Luke shows Jesus talking to one of the crucified criminals with him saying, "Today you will be with me in paradise (τῷ παραδείσῳ)" (Lk 23.43).<sup>475</sup> Luke is the only Gospel that records Jesus saying he will enter the paradise following his death. But what does Luke mean by paradise in this context? Paradise (παράδεισος) appears in the Old Greek translations of the Jewish scriptures in reference to gardens, especially the Garden of Eden (e.g., Gen 2.8; Isa 51.3). I have shown in the last chapter that several Second Temple texts envision the paradise as the location of the heavenly sanctuary, and I will expand this evidence further below. In fact, some of the textual witnesses to the Lukan passage, such as

---

<sup>475</sup> My translation is based on the punctuation of the verse in UBS5/NA28: "Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ." However, it is equally possible that the comma comes after σήμερον not σοι, in which case the adverb σήμερον modifies λέγω. The statement will mean: "I tell you today, you will be with me in paradise" without any timing modification of when will Jesus and the criminal will go to the paradise. Regardless, the punctuation does not affect my argument here.



the Curetonian Syriac and the Arabic Diatessaron, read “in the Garden of Eden” instead of τῷ παραδείσῳ.<sup>476</sup> Yet the Garden of Eden is described in Genesis 2–3 as a temple,<sup>477</sup> which further supports my claim that Jesus entered the heavenly temple in Luke-Acts.

Eden functions as a temple in different ways. Gordon Wenham argues that “The garden of Eden is not viewed... simply as a piece of Mesopotamian farmland, but as an archetypal sanctuary, that is, a place where God dwells and where man should worship him. Many of the features of the garden may also be found in later sanctuaries, particularly the tabernacle or Jerusalem temple. These parallels suggest that the garden itself is understood as a sort of sanctuary.”<sup>478</sup> Several examples support Wenham’s claim. For instance, the tree of life indicates that the paradise is a temple. The idea that life exists in its fullness in the presence of YHWH is the essential operating principle behind the whole sacrificial system of Israel, and its purity system.<sup>479</sup> Several figures in Israel’s history planted trees where they worshipped YHWH (e.g., Gen 21.33). Another indicator that the paradise is the archetypal sanctuary is the Menorah, which is also connected to the tree of life. Carol Meyers has shown that the Menorah is designed to resemble the tree of life based on Exod 25.31–35.<sup>480</sup> Furthermore, the geographical description of Eden in Gen 2.10–14 links it to the temple. The flowing rivers from the garden link the garden’s description to Ps 46.5 which pictures a river that makes the city of God glad. Also, Ezekiel 47 describes a river flowing out of the eschatological temple. The descriptions of the cherubim stationed at the east of the garden to guard the way to the tree of life also contributes to the

---

<sup>476</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002), 155.

<sup>477</sup> J. D. Levenson “the Temple and the World” *JR* 64 (1984): 275–98 (especially 297–98); Daniel I. Block, “Eden: A Temple? A Reassessment of the Biblical Evidence,” in *From Creation to New Creation: Biblical Theology and Exegesis*, ed. D. M. Gurtner and B. L. Gladd (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013), 21–27.

<sup>478</sup> Gordon J. Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” in *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*, ed. Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399.

<sup>479</sup> Wenham suggests the based on the Eden Sanctuary construction that the death of Adam happens when he is expelled out of the garden. Adam leaves the realm of life when he is expelled out of the garden and enters the realm of death. Cf. Gordon Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1979), 177, 201.

<sup>480</sup> Carol L. Meyers, *The Tabernacle Menorah* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).

temple-archetypal nature of the paradise. There were two cherubim on top of the ark-cover forming the throne of YHWH in the inner sanctuary of the Dwelling Place (Exod 25.18–22). Other cherubim images were decorating the curtains and the walls of the Dwelling Place (Exod 26.31; cf. 1 Kgs 6.29). Moreover, there were two cherubim that guarded the inner sanctuary of Solomon's sanctuary (1 Kgs 6.23–28).<sup>481</sup> These decorations may function to invoke the memory of the Cherubim in the paradise. Thus, there are similarities between the structures and descriptions of the Dwelling Place, the Jerusalem temple, and the Garden of Eden that support the identification of Eden as a temple.

The idea that Eden was a temple is not surprising, given the fact the temples were viewed to be the gateway to heaven on earth. John Lundquist writes of the function of temples in the ancient Near East: "Temples in their architectonic orientation, express the idea of a successive ascension toward heaven. The Mesopotamian ziggurat or staged temple tower is the best example of this architectural principle. It was constructed of three, five, or seven levels or stages. Monumental staircases led to the upper levels, where smaller temples stood. The basic ritual pattern represented in these structures is that the worshippers ascended the staircases to the top, the deity descended from heaven, and the two met in the small temple which stood at the top of the structure."<sup>482</sup> That is, temples in the ancient Near East were the architectural embodiment of the primordial cosmic mountain, which was the first place to

---

<sup>481</sup> P. J. Kearney also suggests that the building of the Dwelling Place happened over six commandments that YHWH gave to Moses and Israel, which correspond to the six days of creation. Additionally, Moshe Weinfeld argues that YHWH resting on the Sabbath resembles YHWH's resting in Dwelling Place as YHWH's abode, and that the completion of the creation resembles the completion of the Dwelling Place. See P. J. Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy: The P redaction of Exod. 25–40" *ZAW* 89 (1977): 375–87; Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord – the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Gen 1:1–2: 3" in *Milanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de Monsieur Henri Cazelles*, ed. A. Caquot et M. Delcor (Neukirchen: Neukircheneur Verlag, 1981), 501–12.

<sup>482</sup> John M. Lundquist, "The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East," in *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives*, ed. Truman G. Madsen (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1984), 53–76; reprinted in: L. Michael Morales, *Cult and Cosmos: Tilting Toward a Temple Centered Theology*, BTS 18 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 53. Eric Burrows further emphasizes: "the Sumerians and their successors found a special significance in the height of the temples: proximity to heaven and likeness to heaven are ideas that would coalesce. If further the stages of the Ziggurat, leading up to a temple on the summit... some sort of correspondence between the temple and a heavenly model "not made with hands" would be in the imaginations of all." Eric Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," in *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation Between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. S. H. Hooke (London: SPCK, 1935), 60.

emerge from the primordial waters that covered the earth during the creation process.<sup>483</sup> In ancient Israel, the temple cult and rituals are deeply interconnected to the creation of the cosmos, and several cultic rites resemble a process of re-creation, or re-enactment of the creation process, especially when understood in relation to creation mythological language.<sup>484</sup> To illustrate this point, I will use one of Yom Kippur's rites, Aaron's ablution before and after entering the Holy of the Holies.

Aaron undergoes double ritual ablutions, and in between them he manipulates the sanctuary with blood and sends away the scapegoat. The double washing before (Lev 16.4) and after (Lev 16.24) entering the sanctuary is well attested in the ancient Near East. L. Michael Morales argues that in the Hebrew Bible, access to sacred spaces involves crossing a water boundary.<sup>485</sup> According to Morales: "Gen 1–3 sets forth God as water-controller, and the waters surrounding his mount as the (subjugated) primeval waters of chaos . . . [with] Adam dwelling upon the summit of the mount of Yhwh, enjoying life in the divine Presence."<sup>486</sup> Thus, Eden's sanctuary was placed on the top of the cosmic mountain which is surrounded by water from every side. Geoffrey Harper notes that: "Although Eden is not explicitly described as the mountain of YHWH in Genesis, Ezek 28.14 seems to presuppose such an understanding. Moreover, the idea of Eden being a raised locale is implied in Gen 2.10, where a river flows "from Eden" (מֵעֵדֶן) before splitting into four rivers that water the earth. Simple hydrology indicates that Eden must be higher."<sup>487</sup> If Eden is on the top of the cosmic mountain, which is surrounded by primordial water from every side, it is necessary that whoever wants to reach the

---

<sup>483</sup> See: Andrzej Wierciński, "Pyramids and Ziggurats as the Architectonic Representations of the Archetype of the Cosmic Mountain," *Katunob* 10 (1977): 71–87; Mohiy el-Din Ibrahim, "The God of the Great Temple of Edfu," in *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt: Studies in Honour of H. W. Fairman*, ed. John Ruffle, G. A. Gaballa, and Kenneth A. Kitchen (Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1979), 170.

<sup>484</sup> See especially: G. Geoffrey Harper, "*I Will Walk Among You*": *The Rhetorical Function of Allusion to Genesis 1–3 in the Book of Leviticus* (Philadelphia: Penn State University, 2018), 163.

<sup>485</sup> L. Michael Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus*, BTS 15 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 50.

<sup>486</sup> Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured*, 118.

<sup>487</sup> Harper, "*I Will Walk Among You*," 165. Also see: Donald W. Parry, "The Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary," in *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*, ed. Donald W. Parry (Provo, Utah: Deseret Books and FARMS, 1994), 113–37.

heavenly sanctuary in Eden cross water gatherings.<sup>488</sup> On Yom Kippur, Aaron undergoes the first ablution before he enters the Holy of the Holies, which represents Eden’s sanctuary as if Aaron was crossing the waters surrounding the cosmic mountain of Eden. Thus, as Adam was the priest of Eden’s sanctuary on the top of the cosmic mount, so Aaron when he enters the Holy of the Holies in the Dwelling Place, as a high priest, “represents the one able to ascend the summit of the cosmic mountain.”<sup>489</sup> Morales’ interpretation explains why the second ablution that Aaron undergoes happens when he exits from the Holy of the Holies, not by the end of Yom Kippur’s rites. As if Aaron descends from the cosmic mountain and must pass back through the waters to rejoin the mundane sphere of existence. Aaron as a high priest is the only one who can ascend to YHWH’s sanctuary on the cosmic mountain.

I have also noted in the last chapter that several Second Temple Jewish works portray the high priest ministering as an angel in the inner shrine in heaven (e.g., 1QS<sup>b</sup> 4.25).<sup>490</sup> Thus, cultic action and temple services are tied to the myths of the origins as if they were ritual repetitions of the past. The worshipper participates in the victories of the deity over the chaotic powers of the cosmos. Stephen Ricks notes the same meaning of cultic action in the Babylonian Akitu festival, and comments: “By becoming a participant in the victory of the forces of order in the creation through reciting or reenacting the creation, the individual or community also becomes a participant in the fruits of that victory.”<sup>491</sup> Nevertheless, these cultic actions in the temple also serve as a cursor to life as it should be.<sup>492</sup> Aaron’s ascent through the primordial waters, in the first ablution, represents the return of the

---

<sup>488</sup> Compare some of the great events in Israel’s history: Creation, the flood, and the exodus.

<sup>489</sup> Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured*, 261.

<sup>490</sup> Cf. Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT 17 (Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 81–87 and more recently, Matthew L. Walsh, *Angels Associated with Israel in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Angelology and Sectarian Identity at Qumran*, WUNT 2/509 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

<sup>491</sup> Stephen D. Ricks, “Liturgy and Cosmogony: The Ritual Use of Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East,” in Parry, *Temples of the Ancient World*, 122–23. Cf. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 234.

<sup>492</sup> See the discussion in Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1985), 133. Crispin Fletcher-Louis notes: “Within the cultic worldview . . . the God-intended humanity of

exiled Israel into the Holy of the Holies, into Eden, going past the cherubim on the sanctuary's veil, to sprinkle blood and purify the sanctuary from the contamination on the east side of Holy of the Holies. In Gunkel's words – "Endzeit gleicht Urzeit."<sup>493</sup>

But the image of Eden, especially using the language of *paradise*, the exact language that Luke uses, is rich in early Judaism. In Jewish literature from the Second Temple period, the *Pardes of Righteousness* appears in several writings (e.g., 1 *En.* 77.3b; 4Q209 23.8–10 and 4Q210 1 II.19–20). Annette Yoshiko Reed argues that this Pardes of Righteousness lies at the very border of the known world and the otherworld.<sup>494</sup> In the Book of Watchers, antediluvian earth cries out to heaven following the corruption that the giants caused, which causes the archangels to "look down upon the earth from the sanctuary of heaven" (1 Enoch 9.1–2). The flood happens as a cleansing of the earth from the evils of the Giants, and the earth expects eternal righteousness to fill it with joy and blessings of heaven.

The cosmic geography in the second half of the Book of Watchers helps to understand the relationship between Eden, the temple, and Jewish apocalyptic eschatology. Chapters 17–36 show Enoch's tours around the world as the angels guide and instruct him through the journey. One of his stops shows seven mountains fixed at the edge of the world (24.2–3) with the largest among them shaped like a throne with a tree on its top. Archangel Michael explains to Enoch that this mountain, with the tree, is the throne of God on which God will sit when God descends to visit earth. Reed notes: "The tree is described in terms that evoke the Tree of Life in Genesis's account of Eden."<sup>495</sup> The Archangel Michael then instructs Enoch that the tree will be transplanted to the holy House of God

---

Genesis 1 is recapitulated, and sacramentally reconstituted, in Israel's priesthood, in the temple- as- microcosm." See: Crispin H. T. Fletcher- Louis, "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2," *JSHJ* 5 (2007): 57–79 (76).

<sup>493</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Dandenboed und Buprezt, 1985).

<sup>494</sup> Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Enoch, Eden, and the Beginnings of Jewish Cosmography," in Alessandro Scafi, ed., *The Cosmography of Paradise: The Other World from Ancient Mesopotamia to Medieval Europe* (London: The Warburg Institute, 2016): 67–94 (75).

<sup>495</sup> Reed, "Enoch, Eden, and the Beginnings of Jewish Cosmography," 82.

after the final judgment (25.5), leading Reed to conclude that “imagery of the primeval Eden is thus intertwined with imagery of the Temple (cf. Ezek. 47.7–12) to evoke an eschatological Eden as well.”<sup>496</sup> In fact, the eschatological function of the tree is illustrated by the fact that its fruits are saved for the future when the righteous can eat them, enabling long lives just like antediluvian ages (25.5–6). Again, the future eschatology is rounded back to the beginnings of creation and the events surrounding it.<sup>497</sup> When Enoch reaches his final destination, the Pardes of Righteousness, he sees a tree in the center of the garden, vividly described in the text as large, beautiful, glorious, and magnificent, where all the holy ones eat and learn great wisdom (32.4). As we learn from the angel, this is the Tree of Wisdom from which Adam and Eve ate, again connecting the paradise to the eschatological redemption.

The Book of Jubilees pictures angels taking Enoch and placing him in Eden: “He was taken from human society, and we led him into the Garden of Eden for (his) greatness and honor. Now he is there writing down the judgment and condemnation of the world and all the wickedness of mankind. Because of him the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against the people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment. He burned the evening incense of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord” (*Jub.* 4.23–25).<sup>498</sup> The image of Enoch offering incense in Eden highlights his priestly ministry. The author of Jubilees also uses the language of sanctuary in Eden as the heavenly sanctuary. According to the author of Jubilees, Adam also offered incense in Eden as he was leaving the garden (*Jub.* 3.27). The author bases his notions about the incense offerings on the *Tamid* offering: “Aaron shall offer fragrant incense on it; every morning when he dresses the lamps he shall offer it, and when Aaron sets up the lamps in the evening, he shall offer it, a regular incense offering before the Lord throughout your generations”

---

<sup>496</sup> Reed, “Enoch, Eden, and the Beginnings of Jewish Cosmography,” 83.

<sup>497</sup> Cf. Jonathan Stock-Hesketh, “Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21–32,” *JSP* 11 (2000): 27–58.

<sup>498</sup> All translations of Jubilees follow James VanderKam’s translation. See: James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Translation*, CSCO 511, SAT 88 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 28. The vulgate also renders Ενωχἐπύρρστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη (Ecclesiasticus 44:16) as “Enoch placuit deo et translatus est in paradiso.”

(Exod. 30.7–8). Thus, one of the components of the *Tamid* offering is the incense burning that used to accompany the daily animal offering. Picturing Adam and Enoch offering incense in Eden, the author of Jubilees places the ritual offering of *Tamid* into earlier times to show that Moses did not invent it.<sup>499</sup> The connection between Eden and incense is attested also in 4Q209 23.9, a fragmented Aramaic version of 1 Enoch found at Qumran, that uses the term *pardes qushta* ('Paradise of Truth') as a place of fragrant mountains and incense-bearing trees that Enoch sees during his journey to Eden.

Later on in the narrative, the author of Jubilees states that Eve was kept outside the garden the same number of days that a woman was prohibited from entering the temple after giving birth (*Jub.* 3.10–13), applying to paradise the same purity rituals that apply to the sanctuary.<sup>500</sup> Finally, the author of Jubilees states the underlying assumption explicitly: “the Garden of Eden is the Holy of the Holies, and is the residence of the Lord” (*Jub.* 8.19).<sup>501</sup>

The author of 2 Baruch states that a heavenly Jerusalem, with its central building, probably referring to the temple, exists in the paradise since the beginning: “Do you think that this is the city of which I said, ‘On the palms of my hands I have carved you?’ It is not this building that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment that I decided to create paradise. And I showed it to Adam before he sinned. But when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him, as also paradise. After these things, I showed it to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims. And again I showed it also to Moses

---

<sup>499</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees 1–21: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees Chapters 1–21*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018), 261.

<sup>500</sup> Cf. J.M. Baumgarten, “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino Garcia Martinez, STDJ, 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3 – 10; Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3:1–31,” *Bijdragen* 57 (1996): 305–317, especially here 311–312; Michael Segal, “Narrative and Law in the Book of Jubilees: A New Inquiry into the Story of Entering into the Garden of Eden,” *Megillot* 1 (2003), 111–126 (in Hebrew); idem, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>501</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 53.

on Mount Sinai when I showed him the likeness of the Dwelling Place and all its vessels. Behold, now it is preserved with me – as also Paradise.” (2 Bar. 4.1–7). This is a significant passage because the author of 2 Baruch was most likely a contemporary of Luke.<sup>502</sup> The author states that several of Israel’s great figures saw the heavenly Jerusalem, with the heavenly temple in the paradise. When YHWH gave Moses the pattern of the Dwelling Place (Exod. 25.9), it was the heavenly pattern of the sanctuary kept in the paradise. Adam had access to this place before he was expelled from the paradise and lost access. But again we notice the eschatological hope that Jerusalem, while now destroyed, will be restored, though it will be the heavenly Jerusalem with its central building, the temple, that will be restored. Liv Ingeborg Lied notes that this section conveys the core argument of 2 Baruch.<sup>503</sup> The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple will not last forever, since the physical buildings are earthly copies of the city and the temple. Lied argues that the heavenly temple and the paradise are two heavenly entities that were made visible to Adam, Abraham, and Moses.<sup>504</sup> Yet they are two “intimately connected” entities.<sup>505</sup>

This connection between Eden and the temple has been maintained throughout early Judaism and into rabbinic Judaism too (e.g., *Hag.* 14b).<sup>506</sup> Among other New Testament authors, Paul mentions

---

<sup>502</sup> See A. F. J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in *OTP* 1:616, for the dating of 2 Baruch.

<sup>503</sup> Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 253.

<sup>504</sup> Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 255.

<sup>505</sup> Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel*, 256.

<sup>506</sup> In fact, we still see the connection between Eden and the temple even later into medieval Judaism. One interesting passage (Zohar 3:67a; c. 13<sup>th</sup> century) contains an account of the High Priest’s entry in the Holy of Holies that is tied to the Garden of Eden, based on a Talmudic description of the Cherubim: ‘He [the High Priest] entered the place that he entered. He heard the sound of the Cherubim’s wings, singing and striking their upward-extended wings together. He offered the incense, whereupon the sound of their wings subsiding and they rested silent. If the priest merited that there be joy on high, then here, too, at the same time an object of light would go forth, fragrant with the smells of celestial mountains of pure persimmon, and it would suffuse the entire place. The smell would enter the two nostrils, and the heart would be calmed. Everything would then be quiet, and no accusations would be present. The priest would open his mouth in prayer, with proper intention and joy, and would pray his prayer. After he finished, the Cherubim would straighten their wings as before and would sing. The priest would then know that it was a favorable moment and an occasion of joy for all, and the people would know that his prayer had been accepted, as it is written, ‘be your sins like crimson, they can turn snow-white’ [Is 1.18]. He would step back and pray his prayer” See: *The Wisdom of the Zohar (Mishnat Ha-Zohar): Texts from the Book of Splendour*, trans. I. Tishby and F. Lachover, (Mosad Bialik: Jerusalem, 1957), 230.



that he was caught up into the paradise too (2 Cor 12.4), which he equates with the third heaven (2 Cor 12.2).<sup>507</sup> Contemporary Jewish authors variously divided heavens into five (3 *Apoc. Bar.* 11.1), seven (*T. Levi* 3.1; 2 *En* 8-22; *Asc. Isa* 9), and ten heavens (2 *En* 20.3b). The author of the Ascension of Isaiah notes that the paradise is located in the seventh heaven (*Asc. Isa.* 9.7), while the author of the Apocalypse of Moses agrees with Paul that the paradise is in the third heaven (*Apoc. Mos.* 37.5). The paradise in the third heaven in the Apocalypse of Moses is the Garden of Eden, where the author expands the life of Adam and Eve. Another later work, the Apocalypse of Paul, expands Paul's visit to the paradise, especially in chapter 45. An angel leads Paul into the paradise saying: "And I followed the angel by the swiftness of the Holy Spirit, and he placed me in Paradise and said to me, 'Do you see these things, this place? This is Paradise in which Adam and his wife erred.' The place of the just is the paradise of Adam and Eve." Not only that, but Paul sees the very throne of God in the paradise on a tree in the middle of the garden.<sup>508</sup> While some scholars tend to think of several paradises in early Judaism, separating the Garden of Eden from the paradise of the righteous souls following death, this passage from the Apocalypse of Paul shows that they are one place.<sup>509</sup> The Book of Similitudes shows that there is only one Garden of Eden where the elect are kept till the eschatological vindication (e.g., 1 *En* 60.8; 70.34). *In fact, nowhere in Second Temple Jewish literature is the place of the deceased identified as a separate, different paradise from Eden, not even the paradise of truth nor the paradise of righteous in the Book of Watchers.* Kelley Coblentz Bautch notes: "The notion of a paradise, let alone a paradise of righteousness or truth might suggest to contemporary audiences a sort of heavenly

---

<sup>507</sup> Literature on Paul's visit/vision of the paradise/heaven is endless. See, for instance, Peter Schäfer, "New Testament and Hekhalot Literature: The Journey into Heaven in Paul and Merkavah Mysticism," *JJS* 35 (1984): 19–35; A. T. Lincoln, "Paul the Visionary: the Setting and Significance of the Rapture to Paradise in 2 Corinthians 12:1–10," *NTS* 25 (1979): 204–20; R. M. Price, "Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12:1–10)," *JSNT* 7 (1980): 33–40; Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 380–86; Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources," *HTR* 86 (1993): 177–217.

<sup>508</sup> See: A. Hilhorst, "A Visit to Paradise: Apocalypse of Paul 45 and Its Background," in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, TBN 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 128–39.

<sup>509</sup> E.g., Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Dallas: Word Books Inc., 2002), 404.

abode for the deceased. The parades of 1 Enoch 32 clearly does not serve in that capacity. We see other locales functioning as such in the Book of the Watchers. That is, one recalls that the cosmos depicted in the Book of the Watchers is saturated with liminal spaces; thus Enoch is escorted earlier in the narrative (in chapter 22) to the realm of the dead. This realm of the dead is actually a mountain to the west with hollow places in which spirits of the deceased wait until a future day of judgment, not at all a garden paradise.”<sup>510</sup>

Finally, the author of the book of Revelation further emphasizes the eschatological redemption that will happen in “the paradise of God,” and whoever overcomes this world, will receive the right to eat from the tree of life (Rev 2.7; cf. 22.1–5). *Based on these insights from Jewish scriptures and early Jewish literature, it is safe to conclude that to many Jews in the Second Temple period, the paradise of Eden was in fact the archetypal sanctuary, and had ritual and eschatological functions, and that Luke invokes Eden’s sanctuary when he mentions Jesus’s entrance into the paradise.* Ritual acts, like the ceremony of Yom Kippur, aimed at repeating the past, accessing the lost paradise through the Holy of the Holies. Eden also plays an eschatological role in early Jewish apocalyptic literature, where the final redemption is a recovery of the beginnings of creation. That is, the eschaton is a recovery of the arche.

Thus reading the Gospel of Luke among other Second Temple texts would naturally lead readers to understand the paradise to be the sanctuary of Eden. However, looking into the Gospel of Luke itself, there are two further pieces of evidence to support my claim that Luke deliberately pictures Jesus entering the Garden of Eden. First, Luke uniquely connects Jesus’s genealogy to Adam (Lk 3.38). Most scholarly works on Jesus’s genealogy in Luke either focus on its nature in comparison to the Matthean genealogy or focus on Jesus’s sonship to God as a key to understanding the identity of Jesus

---

<sup>510</sup> Kelley Coblenz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void and the Uninhabited Paradise: Otherworldly Sites in The Book of the Watchers,” in *Other Worlds and Their Relation: to This World: Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions*, ed. Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, Erik M.M. Eynikel, Florentino García Martínez, SJSJ 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 48; idem, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: No One Has Seen What I Have Seen*, JSJSup 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

in Luke's narrative.<sup>511</sup> However, As Jeremias long noted, by placing the genealogy of Jesus reaching back to Adam, immediately before the temptation of Jesus in the desert, Luke advances his goal of presenting Jesus as a second Adam, who succeeds in the temptation that the initial Adam failed to pass.<sup>512</sup> Both Jesus and Adam are sons of God in Luke-Acts, but they take different paths when put to temptation.<sup>513</sup> As John Nolland notes: "both contrast and continuity are established between Adam as son of God and Jesus as Son of God. Jesus takes his place in the human family and its (since Adam's disobedience) flawed sonship; but in his own person in virtue of his unique origin (1.35), and also as worked out in his active obedience (4.1–13), he makes a new beginning of sonship and sets sonship on an entirely new footing."<sup>514</sup> Scholars have also noted the function of extending Jesus's genealogy to Adam, so the significance of Jesus extends to include the gentiles. I do not see a contradiction between the significance of Jesus's work and life in Luke-Acts to the gentiles, and Jesus's image as a second Adam. It is precisely because Jesus succeeds as a second Adam that the effect of his atonement will include the gentiles as we will see in the coming chapters. But no matter how we interpret Jesus's genealogy reaching back to Adam in the Gospel of Luke, it is sufficient to show Luke's unique interest in the character of Adam and his relationship with Jesus. Yet while Jesus is said to be the son of Adam, in the following temptation scene he appears in the wilderness, not the paradise! While Adam is

---

<sup>511</sup> See W. S. Kurz "Luke 3:23–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 169–87; E. Lerle, "Die Ahnenverzeichnisse Jesu: Versuch einer christologischen Interpretation (Lk 3:23–38)," *ZNW* 72 (1981): 112–17.

<sup>512</sup> Joachim Jeremias, "Αδάμ," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 1:141, though cf. M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*, SNTSMS 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 234–35. For a recent treatment of Adamic Christology in the Synoptic Gospels, including the discussed Lukan passage, see: Brandon D. Crowe, *The Last Adam: A Theology of the Obedient Life of Jesus in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017).

<sup>513</sup> Michael Kochenash argues that Luke pictures Jesus as the offspring of Adam whose father is God, in comparison with Augustus whose father is Apollo, and his ancestor Aeneas is the offspring of Aphrodite. Kochenash suggests that Luke advances the kingdom of God over Augustus's empire through the comparison. While I do not see problems with Kochenash's suggestion, I find the most suitable context for understanding Jesus's sonship to Adam in the immediate context of temptation. Adam and the temptation are two indicators for the Garden of Eden context. See: Michael Kochenash, "'Adam, Son of God' (Luke 3.38): Another Jesus–Augustus Parallel in Luke's Gospel," *NTS* 64 (2018): 307–25.

<sup>514</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 1:1–9:20*, WBC 35A (Dallas: Word Books, 2002), 174.

expelled from Eden for his choices, Luke intends to portray Jesus as fully obedient to God, which makes it reasonable to expect him to enter into the place from which Adam (his father!) was expelled: the paradise! Jesus then enters the Garden of Eden, the central place in Adam's life, as he obeys God in the wilderness.

The second indicator that shows that the paradise is the Garden of Eden in Luke-Acts is the description of the otherworldly places in the story of the rich and Lazarus (Lk 16.19–31). There are many details in this rich story, but this story has striking similarities with otherworldly places for souls after death in second temple literature. After his death, the rich man goes to Hades, a place of tormenting flames, while Lazarus goes to the bosom of Abraham to be comforted after a difficult life (Lk 16.23). There is a “great chasm” that has been fixed between both places so that no one can pass from one place to another. This great chasm is of particular interest. As we have seen, the *Parables of Enoch* shows that the early patriarchs and the righteous elect dwell in the Garden of Righteous (1 *En.* 60.23) or the Garden of Life (1 *En.* 61.12).<sup>515</sup> The prison of the fallen stars, the fallen angels, as it appears in the *Book of Watchers*, is a different place (1 *En.* 18.9–10). This prison or abyss is located at the end of the earth, where the heavens come to an end and the sky firmament meets the earth. Later on in the same passage (1 *En.* 18.12 and 21.2), we learn that Enoch traveled outside the inhabited world and beyond the bounds of the cosmos, and beyond even the water layers that circle the earth making up the firmament. The interpreting angel who accompanies Enoch tells him that this otherworldly prison is at the end of heaven and earth, indicating that “the place outside the heaven was empty” (1 *En.* 18.14). Bautch comments on this description of the watchers' prison: “This otherworld is something like a penal colony inasmuch as it is removed from civilization and is remote, so much so that this prison is in a cosmic void.”<sup>516</sup> This description of the otherworld as a cosmic void is similar to Luke's description

---

<sup>515</sup> Cf. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other Texts Found at Qumran),” in *Paradise Interpreted*, 37-62 (48).

<sup>516</sup> Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void, and the Uninhabited Paradise,” 44–45.

of the great chasm that exists in the otherworld. Moreover, the division between the two places, the Garden of the Righteous where the early patriarchs, including Abraham, dwell, and the prison of the watchers, resonates with Luke's description of Abraham and Lazarus's place, implicitly in the paradise, while the rich man is in the prison. The "great chasm" between both places in Luke looks much like the cosmic void after which the prison of the watchers is placed.<sup>517</sup> Another similar structure exists in the Testament of Levi, where the author keeps the lowest heaven to the evil souls, while the righteous are in a separate heaven, again establishing the same general structure of two places with a great void between them (*T. Lev* 3.3). Lazarus seemingly went into the paradise after his death, which is the heavenly sanctuary of Eden. This shows that Luke similarly pictures Jesus entering the heavenly sanctuary of Eden following his death.

The evidence from early Judaism suggests that Eden is either a heavenly space, or an analogous place that exists on an elevated level on earth. However, in both cases, Eden is still viewed as a dwelling of God. Taken together, the evidence suggests that Luke intends to show Jesus entering the Garden of Eden following his death, which not only served as the place of the righteous, but also the place of the heavenly sanctuary, the archetypal temple that humanity lost access to with Adam's expulsion outside Eden, but could be gained through the ritual acts in the earthly temple. Luke's notion of the paradise further indicates Jesus's entrance into the heavenly temple.

I now turn to evaluate the evidence of the creational and cosmological connections between the earthly temple and the heavenly temple in the crucifixion scene in the Gospel of Luke.

### **The Crucifixion Narrative**

Luke connects several narrative elements in Jesus's death scene to cosmological and creational elements that are commonly associated with the heavenly temple in ancient Israel's religion and second

---

<sup>517</sup> Admittedly, this construction is filled with several gaps, but the common general structure of two places with a great void between them in the Enochic literature and the Gospel of Luke appears reasonable to me.

temple Judaism. Comparing Luke's narrative to Mark reveals Luke's intentions behind the crucifixion scene. Mark notes the darkness that came over the land at noon (Mk 15.33), then recounts Jesus's cry "Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?" echoing Ps. 22.1, which took place at the ninth hour (15.34). Following Jesus's initial cry on the cross, Mark tells of someone extending a sponge with sour wine to give Jesus a drink while mocking him (15.36), then Jesus cried out loudly again before he gave his last breath (15.37), then the temple's curtain was torn (15.38), and the Roman centurion testified to Jesus that he was "God's son" (15.39).

This narrative sequence differs in Luke's crucifixion scene.<sup>518</sup> We have already noted the novel speech between Jesus and one of the criminals and Jesus's focus on paradise. Yet Luke also omits Jesus's initial cry that echoes Ps. 22.1, and the Jewish confusion of "Eloi" with Elijah. Luke also omits the sour wine drink offering from Mark's narrative. Moreover, while Mark places the tearing of the curtain veil after Jesus's death, Luke situates it before Jesus's death. As Moore notes: "The effect of this is to bring the timing of the darkness (from the sixth to the ninth hour) much closer to the veil tearing and Jesus's death."<sup>519</sup> Finally, Luke is unique in picturing Jesus saying to the Father, "Into your hands I give my spirit" (Lk 23.46). Why does Luke rearrange the narrative materials in this unique way? Luke associates the darkness that came over the land with three elements. the ninth-hour timing, the temple curtain, and Jesus's commending his spirit into the Father's hands.

The ninth-hour timing is crucial in Luke-Acts. While both Matthew and Mark record Jesus's death at the ninth hour, only Luke-Acts develops the significance of Jesus's death at this specific time. During this time of the day, the Jews used to offer the daily evening burnt *Tamid* (תמיד; "continual" or "daily") sacrifice (Exod. 29.38–42; Num. 28.3–8. Cf. 2 Kings 16.15; Ezek. 46.13–15; Neh. 10.34, and 2 Chron. 13.11). In the second chapter, I discussed the different sacrificial offerings in Jewish scriptures,

---

<sup>518</sup> Matthew follows the exact same order of events like Mark (cf. Matt. 27.45–51).

<sup>519</sup> Moore, "Heavenly Temple," 41.

of which, the ascension offering, or the *Tamid*, appears at different locations in Luke's narrative.

Exodus 30.7–8 describes the construction of the incense altar and the institution of the daily incense offering which is to accompany the daily burnt offering of lamb sacrifices. Thus, the *Tamid* offering includes the whole burnt offering (the lamb), the incense offering on the altar of incense, and the priestly ministry of the lamps, evening and morning. The goal of the *Tamid* offering is to keep YHWH's presence among the Israelites. As Klawans comments: "Not only does the daily offering attract the divine presence but also its proper performance serves to maintain that presence among the community."<sup>520</sup> Interestingly, the *Tamid* service alone from all other sacrifices in Israel appears to be an eternal institution in Jubilees, as the author suggests that the *Tamid* service starts with Adam, not Moses, while the sacrificed burnt animal is introduced at the time of Noah. When Noah offers the sacrifice, it attracts YHWH's presence (cf. *Jub* 6.14). Not only that, but Jubilees pictures Moses cutting the covenant with Israel as a memorial of the Noachide covenant, thus the *Tamid* becomes the cultic context (and even embodiment) of both the Noachide and Mosaic covenants.<sup>521</sup> Even the Mishnah, though written after the destruction of the temple, contains a tractate on *Tamid* consisting of 7 chapters, signaling its significance for the Tannaitic rabbis.

Dennis Hamm lists six significant incidents where Luke develops the *Tamid* offering as the appropriate cultic context to the events occurring in those incidents.<sup>522</sup> First, as I have discussed above,

---

<sup>520</sup> Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifices, and the Temple*, 70.

<sup>521</sup> C. T. R. Hayward comments: "Quite striking and remarkable is the way in which Jubilees links Noah's sacrifice, and thus the covenant ritual performed by Moses, to the *Tamid*, the "continual" daily offering in the temple... When the morning and evening *Tamid* is sacrificed, therefore, the writer of Jubilees expects his readers to recall, first, Noah's sacrifice on leaving the ark and its Biblical consequences; second, the covenant which Noah made not to eat blood; third, the covenant renewed with blood by Moses on Mount Sinai; fourth, the Feast of the Weeks (i.e. Pentecost) on which this covenant was ratified; and fifth, the forgiveness which the *Tamid* itself implores from God." C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), 95.

<sup>522</sup> Dennis Hamm, "The *Tamid* Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke's Theology of Worship (Luke 1:5–25; 18:9–14; 24:50–53; Acts 3:1; 10:3, 30)," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 215–31. Mark Kinzer argues that the descent of the Holy Spirit on the disciples (Acts 2:1–2) also happened during the *Tamid* offering time. I am not convinced by his argument, thus do not add this incident to the list. See Mark S. Kinzer, "Sacrifice, Prayer, and the Holy Spirit: The *Tamid* Offering in Luke-Acts," in *Wisdom Poured Out Like Water: Studies on Jewish and Christian Antiquity in Honor of* 200

Zechariah was serving in his daily service in Jerusalem temple, and fulfilling the lot to offer incense in the sanctuary, which is part of the *Tamid* service (Lk 1.8–9; m. *Tamid* 3.1–2; for offering incense during the service see m. *Tamid* 5.2–6).<sup>523</sup> The crowds were praying while expecting Zechariah to come outside, probably to say the priestly blessing (m. *Tamid* 7.1–2).<sup>524</sup> Both Philo (*Spec. Leg.* 1.169) and Josephus (*Ant.* 3.10.1. 237; 14.4.3. 65) mention that the evening *Tamid* offering used to take place at the ninth hour (3.00 pm).<sup>525</sup> Significantly, Luke starts his gospel in the temple with a *Tamid* service, as the *Tamid* sacrifices had a significant function in Luke’s narrative. If the service’s goal was to keep YHWH’s presence among Israel, Luke seems to invoke this divine presence through the frequent reference to the presence of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of his story.

Luke also seems to picture the incident of the Pharisee and Tax Collector taking place in the temple during the *Tamid* service (Lk 18.9–14). The tax collector who appears “standing far off, would not even lift up his eyes to heaven but was beating his breast and saying, ‘God, atone for me, a sinner!’” (18.13). While most translations use “be merciful,” this is not the most accurate translation for the Greek verb that Luke uses: ἱλάσκομαι; which simply means to atone. This verb refers to the daily *Tamid* in LXX Exod. 30.16 and so might imply that the tax collector is there at that particular hour. The tax collector is asking God in the temple to atone for his sins. Based on the use of ἱλάσκομαι in Luke’s parable, Hamm concludes that: “Luke would have the reader understand that the tax collector’s prayer has its focus precisely on the *Tamid* service as a communal liturgy in an attitude of conversion or

---

Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. J. Harold Ellens, Isaac W. Oliver, Jason von Ehrenkrook, James Waddell, and Jason M. Zurawski, DCLS 38 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018) 471.

<sup>523</sup> All quotations from m. *Tamid* are from Naftali S. Cohn, “Tractate Tamid,” in *The Oxford Annotated Mishnah: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes*, 3 Vols., ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen, Robert Goldenberg, and Hayim Lapin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 3:331–360.

<sup>524</sup> Luke does not cast Zechariah uttering the final blessing to the congregants. Instead, Luke depicts Zechariah being silenced. Luke also presents Jesus lifting his hands and blessing his disciples just before his ascension to heaven, by the end of the gospel, in what I will argue is another *Tamid* setting (see the next chapter). Thus, while Zechariah’s service is disrupted, Luke seems to present Jesus as completing Zechariah’s ministry.

<sup>525</sup> Cf. Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 2 Vols., rev. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 2:301.



metanoia.”<sup>526</sup> Thus, while humility and confession of sin are integral elements of Luke’s intentions, the sacrificial *Tamid* context appears to be the ritual to attain righteousness. I will develop the connection between humility and sacrifice in Luke-Acts later, but for now, it is sufficient to show the significance of the *Tamid* service to attain righteousness according to Luke. Of course, the Pharisee does not attain righteousness even though he attends the sacrificial *Tamid* service. Yet again, this further affirms Israel’s prophets’ message that sacrifices do not work mechanically, but have to be associated with humility and mercy (e.g., Hos 6.6).<sup>527</sup> In the case of the Pharisee and tax collector, Hamm summarizes Luke’s view: “To be righteous or justified means to have entered into the spirit of *Tamid* liturgy.”<sup>528</sup>

Luke again highlights the *Tamid* sacrificial offering in the way that he depicts Jesus’s words at the last supper, words that are unique among the synoptic gospels: “Do this as a memorial to or of me (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν)” (Lk 22.19).<sup>529</sup> Christian traditions interpreted the notion of *memorial* in Eucharistic contexts as the occasion to remember Jesus’s death and his saving work. While this is not necessarily wrong, the best context to understand the meaning of ἀνάμνησιν is the sacrificial *Tamid* context. Exod. 30.16 describes the *Tamid* service as a *memorial*, and the Old Greek translator uses μνημόσυνον, which is a synonym of ἀνάμνησιν which Luke uses. If this is true, it means that Jesus offers himself as a memorial offering; as if Jesus is the *Tamid* offering in Luke-Acts. Hamm argues: “Jesus’ death by crucifixion, a literal giving of his body and pouring out of his blood, is here interpreted as an act of worship, a new memorial.”<sup>530</sup> As I will show in the next chapter, this memorial offering of Jesus will be a heavenly one.

---

<sup>526</sup> Hamm, “The *Tamid* Service,” 224; cf. Kenneth E. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*, 2 Vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 2:145.

<sup>527</sup> See Klawans, “Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple,” 75–100.

<sup>528</sup> Hamm, “The *Tamid* Service,” 224.

<sup>529</sup> The same language appears in 1 Cor 11.24–25, which suggests either its early usage within eucharistic services of the nascent Jesus’s movement (whether going back to Jesus himself) or that Luke knew 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians.

<sup>530</sup> Hamm, “The *Tamid* Service,” 227.

When Peter and John visit the temple following Jesus's ascension, Luke is keen to record that this visit took place "at the ninth hour, the hour of prayer" (Acts 3.9). Again, this is the time of the *Tamid* service, and Luke shows all the people of Jerusalem gathering in the temple, just like in Zechariah's incident (Acts 3.11; cf. Luke 1.10). Elsewhere, Hamm argues that Luke's portrayal of Peter and John healing the lame man by the entrance of the temple in this incident is meant to symbolize the healing and atonement of Israel. For instance, the author of Isa 35.6 shows Israel as a lame man leaping.<sup>531</sup> While there is no notion of atonement associated with the healing of Israel in the lame man analogy in Isaiah, I have already shown the connection between *Tamid* and atonement. What is significant about this incident is that it shows the disciples' commitment to worship with the rest of Israel during the atoning *Tamid* service in the Jerusalem temple even after Jesus's death, resurrection, and ascension.

I will discuss in detail in the next chapter two other incidents related to the *Tamid* offerings. Jesus's ascension (Luke 24), and the encounter between Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10). But for now, the significance of the *Tamid* service throughout Luke-Acts raises the following question: *Why does Luke rearrange Jesus's death materials to place Jesus's death at the time of the Tamid offering?* Other pieces of evidence will help answer this question. The Roman centurion according to Luke's version does not say that Jesus was truly "God's Son" but *dikaïos*. We have noted the association between the *Tamid* service and *righteousness* in Luke in the parable of the tax collector and the Pharisee, which further suggests that Luke pictures Jesus embodying the *Tamid* offering which produces righteousness. The centurion also "praised God" (Lk 23.47), a practice usually associated with the temple worship context. The crowds around Jesus's cross in the scene returned to their homes "beating their breasts" (Lk 23.48). I have already shown how the tax collector was standing in the temple during the *Tamid*

---

<sup>531</sup> Dennis Hamm, "Acts 3:12–26: Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame," *PRSt* 11 (1984): 199–217; idem, "Acts 3,1–10: The Healing of the Temple Beggar and Lucan Theology," *Bib* 67 (1986): 305–19.

service, also beating his breast as a signal of repentance during the worship with the rest of the Jews. This shows that the crowds were practicing a temple practice during Jesus's crucifixion. These observations suggest that Luke's redaction of Mark's story shows that Luke is interested in situating Jesus's death within a cultic context.

The tearing of the temple's veil supports the cultic setting of Jesus's death in the Gospel of Luke. Just before Jesus dies on the cross, Luke states that the temple's veil has been torn in two (Lk 23.45). The interpretation of the tearing of the temple's veil has been a place for intense debates throughout history, both in Lukan studies,<sup>532</sup> and other gospels studies.<sup>533</sup> Some scholars understand the tearing of the temple's veil as denoting the end of temple worship in Luke-Acts.<sup>534</sup> Others suggest that the incident signals a new way and access to God.<sup>535</sup> Frank Matera, however, argues that Luke places the tearing of the temple's veil before Jesus's death to avoid the impression that Mark's readers might get thinking that the tearing of the temple curtain is the result of Jesus's death.<sup>536</sup> In response, Joel

---

<sup>532</sup> Some commentators on Luke do not comment on the clause or dismiss it quickly. John Creed ignores it altogether, Alfred Plummer discusses which curtain of the temple is torn but does not touch on its meaning, and Robert Tannehill does not comment on it and the verse does not appear even in his index. See: John M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 288; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 537; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, 2 Vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 1:329.

<sup>533</sup> Harry L. Chronis, "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37–39," *JBL* 101 (1982): 97–114; Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*, SNTSMS 139 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); idem, "The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology: Unveiling the 'ΥΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ'," *BibInt* 15 (2007): 292–306; J. Bradley Chance, "The Cursing of the Temple and The Tearing of the Veil in the Gospel of Mark," *BibInt* 15 (2007): 268–91; Jesper Svartvik, "Rendering the Rending of the Veil: What Difference Does it Make?," in *Making A Difference: Essays on the Bible and Judaism in Honor of Tamara Cohn Eskenazi*, eds. David J.A. Clines, Kent Harold Richards and Jacob L. Wright (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 257–76.

<sup>534</sup> E.g., Norval Geldenhuys, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 611; Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke: A Commentary on the Third Gospel* (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1972), 240

<sup>535</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1514

<sup>536</sup> Frank J. Matera, "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 469–85 (475); idem, *The Kingship of Jesus*, SBLDS 66 (Atlanta, GA: 1982), 137–140; idem, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through Their Passion Stories: Theological Inquiries* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 186. Cf. Dennis D. Sylva, "The Temple Curtain and Jesus' Death in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 105 (1986): 239–50 (250); Francis D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke," (Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 1979), 203.

Green asks why Luke did not omit this reference altogether if he wanted to avoid this impression. He notices that Luke does not mind these redactional omissions elsewhere, so he could have made a similar decision in this case.<sup>537</sup> Instead, Green suggests that Luke intends to communicate the end of the temple not just as a religious center, but even as a cultural center for the nascent Jesus's movement.<sup>538</sup> Green interprets tearing the temple curtain as a cultural barrier between the Jews and the Gentiles which the death of Jesus destroyed. Green asserts that the tearing of the curtain, coupled with the darkness that covered the land, prepares the way for Jesus's death which, in turn, brings the favorable response of the centurion and the crowds at the cross. The darkness for Green indicates the responsibility of the Jewish leadership for the death of Jesus, and the tearing of the temple's veil points to the cessation of the temple as a cultural boundary that socially excludes some from God's presence. Green concludes: "Rather than serving as the gathering point for all peoples under Yahweh, it has now become the point-of-departure for the mission to all people."<sup>539</sup> The tearing of the veil in Luke-Acts thus signifies the collapse of the socio-religious power that the temple held as a sacred architectural symbol, leading finally to open full mission towards the gentiles. Before this mission could take place, Green argues that "the power of the temple to regulate socio-religious boundaries of purity and holiness had to be neutralized."<sup>540</sup>

I disagree with Green's interpretation about the temple. Instead, *I suggest that the tearing of the temple's veil in Luke-Acts captures the connection between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple*. Luke never comments on the meaning of the veil being torn in two, so to understand what he means by this description, we have to remember both Luke's source, Mark, and Luke's otherwise

---

<sup>537</sup> Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*, WUNT II/33 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 96.

<sup>538</sup> Joel B. Green, "The Demise of the Temple as 'Culture Center' in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil," *RB* 101 (1994): 495–515.

<sup>539</sup> Green, "The Demise of the Temple," 512.

<sup>540</sup> Green, "The Demise of the Temple," 506.

positive view of the temple throughout Luke-Acts. First, Mark uses the same verb (σχίζω) for the tearing of heaven during Jesus's baptism (Mk 1.10), and the tearing of the temple's veil (15.38). David Ulansey notes that the occurrences of the motif of tearing in Mark appears at a pivotal moment, at the very beginning of his Gospel and at the very end of Jesus's earthly career.<sup>541</sup> Mark forms an *inclusio*, structuring his Gospel between those two ends, suggesting that the veil of the Jerusalem temple is connected to the heavens. Ulansey concludes that the "veil of the Jerusalem temple was actually one huge image of the starry sky."<sup>542</sup> It is probable then that Luke connects the veil of the Jerusalem temple to heaven too. Second, Luke's positive view continues even after the temple's veil has been torn in two. After the crucifixion scene, the temple next appears when Luke says that the disciples "returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and they were continually in the temple blessing God" (Lk 24.52). Luke's conclusion to his Gospel that includes a depiction of the disciples continuously worshiping God in the temple raises questions about Green's interpretation of the temple's significance. If Luke intended to convey that the temple ceased to be a sacred center following the tearing of the veil, the portrayal of the disciples in an ongoing worship in the temple would seem contradictory. Instead, that conclusion to the Gospel suggests that Luke does not view the temple's destruction as the definitive end of its sacred role. Moreover, we have already seen how Peter and John went to the temple to worship God during the *Tamid* service (Acts 3.1), which shows that Green's claim misses the point. Instead, I suggest that reading Luke's statement about the temple's veil within the cultic context of the crucifixion narrative further deepens the connections that Luke creates between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple.<sup>543</sup>

---

<sup>541</sup> David Ulansey, "The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic Inclusio," *JBL* 110 (1991): 123–25 (123). See also: S. Motyer, "The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost," *NTS* 33 (1987): 155–57; Howard M. Jackson, "The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross," *NTS* 33 (1987): 23–31; Elizabeth Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 186.

<sup>542</sup> Ulansey, "The Heavenly Veil Torn," 125.

<sup>543</sup> I follow Daniel Gurtner's conclusions that the torn curtain in NT writings (Mt 27:51a, Mk 15:38, Lk 23:45, Heb. 6:19, 9:3, 10:20) is best understood as the inner sanctuary's curtain that separates the Holy of the Holies from the Holy

206

Green's interpretation of the darkness is not the only possible one. 2 Enoch is a later Jewish text, though its traditions go back to before 70 CE.<sup>544</sup> It describes Enoch's ascension into heaven as follows:

While Enoch was talking to his people... the Lord sent darkness onto the earth, and it became dark and covered the men who were standing with Enoch. And the angels hurried and the angels grasped Enoch and carried him up to the highest heaven, and the LORD received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity. And the darkness departed from the earth, and it became light. And the people looked, and they understood how Enoch had been taken away. And they glorified God. And they went away into their homes. (2 En. 67.1–3)

The present passage exhibits a sequence of light-darkness-light that bears resemblance to Luke's depiction of the same sequence. In both instances, the authors employ an identical sequence wherein light is initially present, followed by a period of prevailing darkness, and then light returns. Notably, the period of darkness in 2 Enoch corresponds to the momentous event of Enoch's ascension into heaven. This passage from 2 Enoch narrates the ascension event of Enoch into heaven, which parallels 1 Enoch 14, which, as discussed in the preceding chapter, portrays Enoch's entry into the heavenly sanctuary. Thus, it is plausible to infer that the light-darkness-light sequence in Luke signifies Jesus's anticipated entrance into the heavenly temple.<sup>545</sup>

Luke places the tearing of the veil just before Jesus's final loud cry to the Father as if Jesus is reacting to the tearing of the temple's veil. But what sort of communication usually happens between humans and God at the ninth hour? It seems plausible to think of Jesus's final loud cry in Luke as a

---

Place, not the Holy Place's curtain that separates it from the outer forecourt, based on syntactical evidence from the Old Greek translations of the Jewish scriptures. See: Daniel M. Gurtner, "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil," *NovT* 47 (2005): 344–53.

<sup>544</sup> See the evidence in C. Böttrich, "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JSPE* 9 (1991): 35–42.

<sup>545</sup> The resemblances between Luke's account of Jesus's ascension and 2 Enoch's account of Enoch's ascension are striking too. I will discuss those in detail in the next chapter.

prayer, a cultic prayer, at a time when darkness prevailed over the whole cosmos. I have already noted the centurion's praise, and the crowds' beating their breasts in the scene, which further highlights the prayers motif in the crucifixion scene. Luke's juxtaposition of the time of the *Tamid* offering and Jesus's prayer to the Father, when the temple curtain is torn in two, while darkness that prevailed in the cosmos, all together suggests that a cosmic-cultic context is in view. There seems to be a series of connections, a web of cosmic-cultic connections between all these elements. For instance, there is a connection between the temple's veil and the firmament of heaven that separates the spaces and waters (Gen. 1.6–7; note the hiphil מַבְדִּיל).<sup>546</sup> The veil of the Dwelling Place functions similarly to separate the Holy of the Holies from the Holy Place (Exod. 26.33; again note the hiphil וַהֲבַדִּילָהּ). The veil functions similarly in Ezekiel's description of the eschatological temple (Ezek 42.20). Josephus also describes the fabrics of the Dwelling Place as an "imitation and representation of the universe" (*Ant.* 3.180). He then further explains: "When Moses distinguished the Dwelling Place into three parts, and allowed two of them to the priests, as a place accessible and common, he denoted the land and the sea, these being of general access to all; but he set apart the third division for God because heaven is inaccessible to men." (*Ant.* 3.181). Not only is the whole Dwelling Place designed according to heaven according to Josephus, but when he goes on to describe the temple, including the sanctuary veil, Josephus describes it saying: "It was a Babylonian curtain, embroidered with blue, and fine linen, and scarlet, and purple, and of a texture that was truly wonderful. Nor was this mixture of colors without its mystical interpretation, but was a kind of image of the universe" (*J.W.* 5.212) with all that is mystical in heavens embroidered upon it (*J.W.* 5.214). Philo also notes that the Jerusalem temple is a replica of the cosmic temple based on the linen materials of the temple's veil (*Q.E.* 2.85), and notes that the function of the temple's veil is to draw the line between the changeable earthly world and the heavenly space which is

---

<sup>546</sup> While earlier Enochic literature describe Enoch's entrance of the heavenly temple, the later Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 5:24 says that Enoch ascended to the firmament: "Enoch worshiped in truth before the Lord, and behold he was not with the inhabitants of the earth because he was taken away and he ascended to the firmament at the command of the Lord, and he was called Metatron, the Great Scribe" (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 5.24).

without transient events and is unchanging “and (it shows) how they are set off and separated from one another, for the ethereal and airy substance is, as it were, a covering” (*Q.E.* 2.91). Philo had a rule: “In the Dwelling Place, everything is a symbol of corporeal things” (*Q.E.* 2.93) and in the Dwelling Place “the incorporeal world is set off and separated from the visible one... as by a veil” (*Q.E.* 2.94).

This cosmic sanctuary imagery is further extended in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The rising and the setting of the sun are associated with the worship of angels in heaven (e.g., 4Q408 1+1b.8-9; 4Q503 4 I.12; cf. *T. Ab.* 4.4[B]). The author of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice pictures the worshippers as participating in these angelic services when “the light of the sun appears on the earth” (הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְהַאִיר עַל (הָאָרֶץ) and when the evening comes (בְּעֶרֶב). The morning liturgy starts when “the sun ascends and the firmament of the heavens (וּבִצְאֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם) [רָקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם]” (4Q405 1–3.1). I suggest that these angelic services in heaven are imagined based on the morning and evening *Tamid* offerings that took place in the Jerusalem temple. These angelic services which are associated with the sun’s lights are mentioned in relevant proximity to a “Holy of Holies in the heights” (4Q503 13–16.8), where the worshippers pray that the angels be “witnesses for us in the holy of the holies... in the dominion of the light of the day” (4Q503 13-16.11–12). The author of the Temple Scroll anticipates an eschatological temple that will descend from heaven (1Q19 29.9–10), but also connects the heavenly eschatological temple to the day of creation: “I shall sanctify my temple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation, when I shall create my temple establishing it for myself forever, in accordance with the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel” (1Q19 29.823).

This language about light and darkness, the temple’s veil representing the firmament, and the connection between the eschatological heavenly temple resonates well with Luke’s emphasis on the darkness that dominated the cosmos during Jesus’s crucifixion. One significant observation that further indicates Luke’s interest in bringing the heavenly sanctuary to the scene is related to Luke’s language. Luke has already mentioned the darkness period, but in 23.45 he repeats: “The sun stopped shining,”



(τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος), a genitive absolute that is unusually redundant. Luke usually omits Mark's similar redundancies (cf. Lk 4.40 with Mk 1.32, in addition to Luke's omission of Mark's note about the timing of Jesus's crucifixion in Mk 15.25). His repetition of the darkness language shows his interest in the creational connection to the temple. Luke has previously connected darkness with evil (Lk 22.53) and contrasts this evil clearly with Jesus's teaching in the temple. In other places, Luke connects the sun to the eschaton too (e.g., Luke 21.25; Acts 2.20). In Paul's vision in Acts 26.13, Paul describes Jesus as "a light from heaven, brighter than the sun" (Acts 26.13). Thus, when Luke emphasizes the absence of the sun during the darkness time he highlights the fact that during the *Tamid* offering time in the Jerusalem temple, and concurrent with the tearing of the temple curtain, the sun begins to shine again at the moment of Jesus's death.<sup>547</sup> Moore argues that: "The hour of the evening sacrifice, the rending of the sanctuary veil, and the transition in the heavens that allows the sun's light through once more are simultaneous events."<sup>548</sup>

Luke puts all these elements together to prompt Jesus's final cry: to give his spirit into the Father's hands, in the heavenly temple. Here Luke reminds the reader of Jesus's response to the high priest, that "from now" he will be seen at the right hand of God, and anticipates the full realization of Jesus's entrance into the heavenly temple in the ascension. The function of the tearing of the veil of the temple is to elucidate the cosmological connection with the heavenly temple in cultic and creational language. Luke creates a cultic-cosmic thread in the crucifixion narrative that aims at linking the Jerusalem temple with the heavenly temple. Luke shapes the crucifixion materials in ways that serve his aim. Jesus enters the heavenly temple, hinted at in the trial narratives, expected in his speech to the criminal on the cross as Jesus plans to enter the paradise after his death, but only realized when Jesus eventually ascends to heaven (Lk 24, Acts 1).

---

<sup>547</sup> Notably, the author of the Gospel of Peter adds that the sun shines again at the ninth hour (6.22).

<sup>548</sup> Moore, "Heavenly Temple," 43.

In chapter five I will discuss the ascension narrative in Luke-Acts within the wider context of the ascension narratives in the second temple apocalyptic literature, but it is significant to note that this fact culminates all evidence I presented in this chapter: Jesus does ascend to heaven. Jesus does enter the heavenly sanctuary. The last time Jesus is seen in the Gospel of Luke is while ascending to heaven, which is the same opening scene to Acts of the Apostles, yet the next time Jesus is seen he is standing in heaven at the right hand of God (Acts 7).

### Stephen's Vision

Stephen's speech has been another focal point of debate in Lukan scholarship.<sup>549</sup> Stephen's views about the temple have puzzled scholars, especially considering that Luke's attitude toward the temple seems to take a sharp turn at this point.<sup>550</sup> Lloyd Gaston's position on Stephen's views about the temple illustrates well how Stephen is seen as a radical revolutionary against Judaism and its religious center, the Jerusalem temple, as supersessionist approaches dominate the studies of Luke-Acts.<sup>551</sup>

---

<sup>549</sup> Questions about the speech vary from its authenticity, to its shape and tradition formation, to the sources Luke used. See Peter Dschulnigg, "Die Rede des Stephanus im Rahmen des Berichtes über sein Martyrium (Apg 6,8–8,3)," *Judaica* 44 (1988): 195–96; J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1970), 77–81; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2002), 25; H. Alan Brehm, "Vindicating the Rejected One: Stephen's Speech as a Critique of Jewish Leaders," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 266; James D. G. Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 2006), 86; Todd Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 85–94; Marion Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 57–70; Delbert Wiens, *Stephen's Sermon and the Structure of Luke-Acts* (N. Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1995), 82; John Kilgallen, *The Stephen speech: A literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2–53*, AnBib 67 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976).

<sup>550</sup> These works are helpful treatments of the temple criticism in Stephen's speech and vision: E. Larsson, "Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflexions on Acts 6–7," *NTS* 39 (1993): 379–95; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 131–63; N. H. Taylor, "Stephen, the Temple, and Early Christian Eschatology," *RB* 110 (2003): 62–85; Graham N. Stanton, "Stephen in Lukan Perspective," *Studia Biblica* 1978, III. *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, JSNTSup 3 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 345–60; Dennis D. Sylva, "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46–50," *JBL* 106 (1987): 261–75.

<sup>551</sup> This is not to say that supersessionist views went unchallenged. Numerous works challenge these views, though not necessarily related to Stephen's view of the temple. See: Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 18, 41–74; Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel*, 369–81; Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 159; D. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, JSNTSup 119 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 67–71. One notable exception that asserted Stephen's positive attitude toward the temple in his speech is: C. K. Barrett, "Attitudes to the Temple in Acts," *Templum Amicitiae*, ed. W. Horbury, JSNTSup 48 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 345–67.

Gaston says: “It will be our contention that Stephen represents the climax of the growing opposition to the temple among certain groups within Judaism and that what for them was only a possibility, that the Messiah would destroy the temple, becomes in the case of Stephen a clear statement.”<sup>552</sup> Gaston does not view Stephen criticizing the temple like other Jewish sects did, as the clause “within Judaism” might imply. To the contrary, for him Stephen “must have already engaged in preaching the gospel of freedom from the law and temple to the Jews of Antioch and elsewhere... Stephen's opposition to the temple differs from that of other contemporary groups in that it does not reflect the desire for a more purified cult but is rather directed against the temple in principle.”<sup>553</sup> Not only that, but Stephen’s opposition to the Jewish temple “is really without parallel within Judaism or the church in the period before A.D. 70. In one sense he is heir to the criticism of the temple which was undertaken by those opposed to the profanations of the Hasmonaeans, but Stephen goes far beyond anything that could have been said there, especially in the statement that the Messiah will destroy the temple.”<sup>554</sup> Gaston also claims that a later Jewish prejudice developed in late antiquity that all followers of Jesus were opposed to the temple, and this later conception developed based on viewing all Jesus’s followers as opponents of the temple just like Stephen.<sup>555</sup>

The reason behind this characterization of Stephen lies in some statements in his speech just before his death.<sup>556</sup> The story begins in the Synagogue of the Freedmen (Acts 6.8–7.1) where some of the synagogue leaders argued against Stephen, though Luke, vaguely enough, does not state the topic of

---

<sup>552</sup> Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*, NovTSup 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 154.

<sup>553</sup> Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 156.

<sup>554</sup> Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 158.

<sup>555</sup> Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 161.

<sup>556</sup> The significance of Stephen’s speech on shaping modern scholarship exceeds the study of Luke-Acts. James Dunn’s historical reconstruction of the parting of the ways between Judaism and Jesus’s movement depends on his view of a division between temple-centered Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity, exemplified in Acts by Stephen. See: James D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SKCM, 2006), 63–71. Also Paul Barnett, *Jesus and the Rise of Early Christianity: A History of New Testament Times* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002), 219–21.

the debate. He only mentions that “they could not withstand the wisdom and the spirit with which he spoke” (Acts 6.10). In revenge, those leaders stirred some false witnesses to claim the following: “We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God” (Acts 6.11). Those leaders stirred up the people of Israel as well as the leaders of the whole nation against Stephen, and pushed false witnesses to claim further: “This man never stops saying things against this holy place 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 6.13–14). It is important to note that Luke highlights the fact that those are false witnesses set up by the synagogue leaders to frame Stephen, which means that the author does not want his readers to believe this charge against Stephen or Jesus. The reader should perceive these leaders as liars, especially since Luke highlights it twice (vv. 12, 13).

Stephen responds to the charges, alluding to almost 30 different passages from Jewish scriptures, to defend himself. He is accused of blasphemy against God, Moses, the temple, and the law. Thus, he defends himself against these four false charges in his speech, which takes the form of a narrative defense. Stephen does acknowledge God as the “God of Glory” (θεὸς τῆς δόξης, Acts 7.2) who appears and talks to the patriarchs of Israel. Stephen also acknowledges that Moses “was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and was powerful in his words and deeds” (Acts 7.22) and was the savior of Israel that God raised (Acts 7.25), yet Stephen also highlights that the Israelites rejected Moses’s leadership (Acts 7.27; 35). Moses in Stephen’s view is the ruler and liberator (Acts 7.35). But the Israelites “were unwilling to obey him; instead, they pushed him aside, and in their hearts, they turned back to Egypt” (Acts 7.39). Luke is thus directing the reader’s attention to the locus of the problem. not God, nor the temple, but humans, especially the Israelites. They decided to worship the golden calf instead of YHWH, so “God turned away from them and handed them over to worship the host of heaven” (Acts 7.42). Stephen also defends himself against the false accusation that he undermines the Law. Stephen asserts that the law is “living oracles” gifted to the Israelites (Acts 7.38),

and Luke shows how Stephen's defense is rooted in Jewish scriptures through extensive allusions.

Moreover, Stephen asserts that the law was given “ordained by angels” (Acts 7.53). So Stephen answers three out of the four charges, those against God, Moses, and the law. He still needs to address the charge against the temple, which Luke has him doing in a way that many scholars have misunderstood.

Stephen says:

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?’ (Acts 7.48–50)

Two claims in this passage have led to radical conclusions like those of Gaston. First, Stephen states that the temple was “made with human hands,” a description that is similar to the one used to describe Israel’s creation of the idol, thus potentially implying that the temple is an idolic place (cf. the similar language in Acts 17.24). Second, Stephen claims that YHWH does not live in human-made buildings, so YHWH does not live in Jerusalem temple in the present day of Stephen (and Luke on a second level), and implicitly, never lived in the Jerusalem temple at all.<sup>557</sup>

While Lukan scholars tend to compare the description “made with hands” (ἐν χειροποιήτοις) to the language of idolatry, as if Stephen describes the temple being made with hands just like any idol, I suggest reading this description in relation to the heavenly temple language. *The regular description of the heavenly temple, YHWH’s eternal abode, in ancient Israel’s religion and Second Temple literature is that it is not made with human hands, but YHWH’s hands.* Several observations support this claim.

---

<sup>557</sup> Weinert, “Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts,” 88–90; Monica Selvatici, “‘The Most High Does not Dwell in Houses Made with Human Hands’: A Study of Possible Hellenistic Jewish Parallels for the Jerusalem Temple as Idolatry in Acts 7:48,” *Antiteses* 10 (2017): 1063–80.

The charge against Stephen uses more general language, where he is accused of speaking against “the holy place” instead of the more specific language of “temple” (Acts 6.13).<sup>558</sup> Moreover, Stephen starts his speech referring to “this place” where the Israelites were to come and worship YHWH (Acts 7.7). As Stephen advances in his speech, readers notice that God appears to Moses on Mount Sinai, where God tells Moses: “The place where you are standing is holy ground” (Acts 7.33).<sup>559</sup> Stephen conflates Moses’s experience with the people’s experience at Sinai (Exod. 19). Yet instead of arriving at their destination, the holy place, to worship YHWH, they worshipped “the works of their hands,” idols like the golden calf, Moloch, and Rephan (Acts 7.41, 43). One often neglected intertext to Stephen’s speech is the Song of Moses and the Israelites following the exodus (Exod 15), which I have discussed in the last chapter. Moses and the Israelites sang after the exodus:

You brought them in and planted them on the mountain of your own possession, the place, O Lord, that *you made your abode*, the sanctuary, O Lord, that *your hands* have established.  
(Exod. 15.17)

YHWH’s purpose is to lead the people of Israel out of slavery into a place called several names. the mountain, the place, YHWH’s abode, the sanctuary made with YHWH’s hands. The language of planting also seems connected to the Garden of Eden. The author of Psalm 78 who retells the exodus journey uses similar language (Ps. 78.54) and adds that YHWH obtained the holy mountain

---

<sup>558</sup> UBS5/NA28 Greek text retains τοῦτου in brackets, indicating a textual problem that is not easily solved. The textual apparatus shows a division between important witnesses, some includes the word (e.g., B C 33 69, Palestinian and Hearclean Syriac translations, and Sahidic and Bohairic Coptic translations), while others exclude it (P74, x, A D E H P, Old Latin translation, Vulgate, Armenian and Ethiopic translations). Metzger notes: “In view of the balance of these possibilities, the Committee decided to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.” The inclusion or exclusion of the word might change the object of the reference, in terms of what is the holy place? As Metzger notes: “The addition of τοῦτου after ἁγίου... allows (if indeed it does not require) the phrase to refer to the place of the assembly of the Sanhedrin.” While this interpretation is a possibility, I do not see it necessary a requirement as Metzger says. As I show, Stephen picks the language of the “holy place” later in Acts 7.7 in reference to the temple, making it more probable that the holy place in question is the temple, not the Sanhedrin assembly location. See: Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 298.

<sup>559</sup> Not Mount Horeb (cf. Exod. 3.1). Josephus also identifies the place where God appears to Moses as Mount Sinai (*Ant.* 2.264).

through his right hand. But Israel will also indwell this holy place, not just YHWH. They will be *planted* on the mountain, YHWH's abode, the sanctuary made by YHWH's hands alone. We have already seen the significance of YHWH's cosmic mountain as the eternal divine abode and how it impacts the ritual language of the temple. The Dwelling Place resembles YHWH's eternal sanctuary on the cosmic mountain, so when the Israelites enter the land of Canaan and live there, they will live in the land that resembles YHWH's territory. The Israelites will be living with YHWH. But the most significant observation to note is that the Dwelling Place, though made with Bezalel's hands, is still the creation of YHWH's hands.<sup>560</sup> As YHWH has shown Moses the heavenly pattern of the Dwelling Place (Exod. 25. 8–9), it is easy to understand why YHWH's abode is made with YHWH's hands, not with human hands.

Similar language also occurs when David wanted to build a temple, but God said through the prophet Nathan: “And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will *plant* them, so that they may live in their own place and be disturbed no more, and evildoers shall afflict them no more, as formerly” (1 Sam 7.10). Later in the narrative, YHWH tells David that his offspring will build the temple (1 Sam 7.12–13). Again, we have the language of a place that is YHWH's abode and Israel's abode too. They both live together. Again, the language of planting connects both places to the Garden of Eden.

Both passages from Exodus 15 and 1 Samuel 7, having been interpreted together within early Judaism (e.g., 4Q174 1.2–3), highlight the implanting of Israel in a peaceful place and both help make sense of Stephen's speech. Stephen explains that Moses entered “the holy place” where he met with YHWH (Acts 7.33) and YHWH informed him about his goal to free the Israelites from slavery. Thus

---

<sup>560</sup> Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan of Exod. 39.43 pictures Moses examining the final shape of the Dwelling Place, then blesses the workers: “that the shekinah of YHWH might dwell in the works of your hands.” Targum Neofiti also mentions: “And Moshe surveyed all the service, and, behold, they had made it as the Lord had commanded, so had they made it. And Mosheh blessed them, and said, May the Shekinah of the Lord dwell within the work of your hands!”

Stephen states that the goal of the exodus journey was to arrive at the peaceful indwelling of YHWH, so that Israel could live with YHWH. However, what often happened in Israel's history, as Stephen retells it, is that Israel worships other idols, which are made with human hands instead of living in YHWH's abode which is made with YHWH's hands. Even when Stephen addresses the Dwelling Place, it is represented vis-à-vis Moloch's tent. Stephen speaks highly of the Dwelling Place, calling it "the tent of testimony" (Acts 7.44). God gave Moses a design "ordering him to make it (the Dwelling Place) according to the pattern he had seen" (Acts 7.44). In contrast, the tent of Moloch is "made" by the Israelites (Acts 7.43). Stephen connects the origin of the temple, the holy place, to the heavenly origin of the Dwelling Place. So Stephen starts positively and says nothing negative against the earthly Dwelling Place. During the time of David, he "found favor with God and asked that he might find a dwelling place for the house of Jacob" (Acts 7.46). Luke crafts the language here carefully. First, David seeks to "find" (εὑρεῖν) a house, not to build one, presumably the house that YHWH built with YHWH's hands. Second, David is represented as seeking a dwelling place for the house of Jacob, Israel, not YHWH (σκήνωμα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰακώβ).<sup>561</sup> We have seen in 1 Sam 7.10 that YHWH promised to appoint a place for Israel to plant them, and at the same time, a promise that David's offspring will build a temple for YHWH. Moses's song depicts both places as just one place, made with YHWH's hands.

I suggest that we approach Stephen's statements within the context of Exodus 15 and 1 Samuel 7. Stephen's statement that the "Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands" resonates well with Moses's song. YHWH himself built his own sanctuary with his own hands, not with human hands, where Moses refers to the heavenly temple of YHWH on the cosmic mountain. Stephen's view is rooted in Jewish scriptures. The temple is not the creation of humans, but the creation

---

<sup>561</sup> Perhaps this is the reason behind the confused scribal variant σκήνωμα τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ that exists in the majority of the Byzantine manuscripts.



of YHWH, even though humans built it. This is the reason that Stephen highlights the heavenly origin of the Dwelling Place just a few verses before he comments on Solomon's temple, to show that the Dwelling Place's goal is to resemble YHWH's heavenly abode. When Stephen moves to Solomon's temple, he is not making a new claim that YHWH does not live in the temple generally, but that he does not live in a temple made with human hands. But the Jerusalem temple is not built with human hands as we have seen, but with YHWH's hands, even though human hands put it together. This temple paradox has confused scholars regarding Stephen's comments on the nature of the temple. The temple is made with YHWH's hands, but it is also built with human hands,<sup>562</sup> which means that the temple as YHWH's abode is not a static concept. It could be a sacred building that YHWH consecrated to indwell among his peoples, but it also could be a place that YHWH abandons, depending on Israel's relationship with YHWH.

YHWH's permanent and eternal abode is the heavenly temple, and to the extent that Israel will maintain her relationship with YHWH, YHWH will live in the temple among the people. This temple paradox appears in Solomon's prayer during the consecration of the temple (1 Kings 8.22–53). Solomon states repeatedly throughout the prayer that YHWH's abode is in heaven, but YHWH's name will remain in the temple if, and only if, Israel walks according to the divine statutes and keeps the commandments.<sup>563</sup> Solomon makes this point several times in his prayers; in fact, he acknowledges that YHWH's permanent residence is not in the Jerusalem temple: "Will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built!" (1 Kings 8.27). Solomon also urges YHWH to hear the people's repentance "from heaven" and so stay among his people in the temple: "That your eyes may be open night and day toward this house, the

---

<sup>562</sup> Similarly, the author of Psalm 127 writes: "Unless YHWH builds the house, those who build it labor in vain." (Ps. 127:1). This passage suggests that God must also be the builder of the house that humans build.

<sup>563</sup> On the name of YHWH and its relation to the YHWH's mode of existence, see Sommer, *The Bodies of God*; Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: Leshakken Shemo Sham in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002).

place of which you said, ‘My name shall be there,’ that you may heed the prayer that your servant prays toward this place. Hear the plea of your servant and of your people Israel when they pray toward this place; O hear in heaven your dwelling place; hear and forgive” (1 Kings 8.29–30). So YHWH’s dwelling place is in heaven, but YHWH keeps the divine name in the temple to the extent that Israel maintains their relationship with YHWH. Josephus expands Solomon’s prayer in this relevant language: “You have an eternal house (οἶκον μὲν αἰώνιον), O Lord, and such a one as *you have created for yourself out of your own works; we know it to be the heaven*, and the air, and the earth, and the sea, which you pervade, nor are you contained within their limits. I have indeed built this temple to you, and your name, that from there, when we sacrifice and perform sacred operations, we may send our prayers up into the air, and may constantly believe that you are present, and are not remote from what is your own.” (*Ant.* 8.107–108). Josephus’s version of Solomon’s prayer describes heaven as YHWH’s eternal abode, but YHWH’s name lives in the temple to be close to Israel. Josephus also brings up sacrifices as the Jewish way to maintain the relationship between Israel and YHWH. Most significantly, Josephus highlights the fact that YHWH indwells in the temple “when it pleases you to dwell here” (καὶ πεπεισμένοι διατελοῖμεν ὅτι πάρει). It is not the eternal indwelling of YHWH, but it resembles the eternal indwelling of YHWH, and depending on Israel’s relationship with YHWH, if it pleases YHWH, YHWH will live in the temple.

Another piece of evidence that supports my claim is that Stephen quotes Isa 66.1–2 to show that YHWH does not live in the earthly temple: “Heaven is my throne” (ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος). Again, this quote shows that Stephen highlights heaven as the temple of God, where there is the royal throne of God. Several second-temple Jewish texts attest to the fact that the divine courtroom where the throne of God exits correlates to the temple (cf. 1 *En.* 14.8–20; *T. Lev.* 3.4–5 and 5.1).

The Jewish author of the Sibylline Oracles speaks in language that is close to Stephen’s: “The great God, whom no hands of men (χερὶ θνητῇ) fashioned / in the likeness of speechless idols of

polished stone. / For he does not have a house (οἶκον), a stone set up as a temple” (*Sib. Or.* 4.8–11).<sup>564</sup>

This is not a negative comment about the centrality of the temple in Jerusalem, but it does emphasize the permanent eternal divine abode that humans can neither build nor ruin.<sup>565</sup>

Stephen speaks just like Solomon and other second temple authors. He maintains that YHWH’s eternal abode is not on earth but in heaven. *Stephen uses the description “made with hands” (χειροποιήτοις) just as the technical opposite of YHWH’s eternal abode in heaven, which is not made with human hands (ἀχειροποιήτοις).* As I have shown above, the expression “made with hands” is a common way to describe earthly materials, while “not made with hands” is a common way to describe heavenly materials in the first century. The author of Hebrews describes the heavenly temple as “the greater and perfect Dwelling Place *not made with hands, that is, not of this creation* (τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως)” (Heb 9.11). The author of Hebrews explains what is meant by the heavenly temple not made with hands. it is not of this earthly creation. The author of 4 Ezra describes the heavenly Jerusalem in a similar language: “And Zion shall come and be made manifest to all people, prepared and built, as you saw the mountain *carved out without hands*” (4 Ezra 13.36). The heavenly Zion that the author of 4 Ezra expects during the eschaton is not made with hands too. The author of 4 Ezra connects this heavenly Zion to the cosmic mountain too.

---

<sup>564</sup> John Collins confirms that the only suspected passage in the Sibylline Oracles, Book 5, could be a later Christian redaction is 256–59. See John J. Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in *OTP* 1:391.

<sup>565</sup> Philo makes a similar statement: “What sort of habitation ought we to prepare for the King of kings, for God the ruler of the whole universe, condescending in his mercy and lovingkindness for man to visit the beings whom he has created, and to come down from the borders of heaven to the lowest regions of the earth, for the purpose of benefiting our race? Shall we prepare him a house of stone or of wooden materials? (λίθων μὲν ἢ ξυλίνης ὕλης) Away! such an idea is not holy even to utter; for not even if the whole earth were to change its nature and to become on a sudden gold, or something more valuable than gold, and if it were then to be wholly consumed by the skill of workmen, who should make it into porticoes and vestibules, and chambers, and precincts, and temples-- not even then could it be a place worthy for his feet to tread upon” (*Che* 1:99–100).

My suggestion is that Stephen's focus is on the heavenly temple as the permanent divine abode and that his description of "made with hands" highlights that the earthly structure of the building is not the permanent divine abode, but the divine presence in the temple depends on the status of Israel's relationship with YHWH. This is the temple paradox that stands behind the whole priestly regulations of ritual and moral impurities. The very goal of the priestly legislation and the sacrificial system is to keep YHWH's presence in the temple, which means that this divine presence was not guaranteed. The sanctuary needs regular purification for YHWH to remain in the temple. Ezekiel saw YHWH's glory abandon the temple (Ezek. 11.23) just after YHWH said to the Israelites, "You shall know that I am the Lord, whose statutes you have not followed and whose ordinances you have not kept" (Ezek. 11.12). Thus, YHWH left the temple when the Israelites did not follow his commandments, which results in the impurities piling up on the altar without any purification.<sup>566</sup> Stephen speaks in the same manner, not attacking the temple, but the Jewish leadership of the temple who did not maintain YHWH's presence in the temple.

Stephen thus highlights the heavenly temple as the permanent abode of YHWH. The following verses picture Stephen receiving a vision of this heavenly temple: "Filled with the Holy Spirit, he gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God (δόξαν θεοῦ) and Jesus standing (ἑστῶτα) at the right hand of God (δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ). "Look," he said, "I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God! (ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ θεοῦ)" (Acts 7.55–56). Stephen looks into heaven, and finds it open. Inside heaven, he sees "the glory of God," a key cultic term, the *kavod*, that refers to the presence of YHWH in the temple in Jewish scriptures. One key passage describes the presence of YHWH's glory: "Then the cloud covered the Dwelling Place, and the glory of the Lord filled the

---

<sup>566</sup> When Ezekiel receives a vision of the eschatological temple, in which YHWH will return to indwell among the Israelites, he sees it connected to the Garden of Eden as the future eschatological sanctuary (esp. chapters 40–48). See: Martha Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira," in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housleh, CTSR 30 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 63–78, especially here 64–67.

Dwelling Place. Moses was not able to enter the Dwelling Place of meeting because the cloud settled upon it, and the glory of the Lord filled the Dwelling Place” (Exod 40.34–44). One must interpret Stephen’s vision of the glory of God in the same terms: it is a vision of the heavenly temple. In fact, Stephen started his speech talking about the glory of God appearing to Abraham (Acts 7.2). Luke bookends the scene with God’s *kavod*. The connection between the clouds which filled the Dwelling Place, and the heaven which Stephen saw open, further strengthens my conclusion that Stephen sees the heavenly temple.

Jesus’s position, standing (ἐστῶτα), in heaven, also supports the claim that Stephen had a vision of the heavenly temple. Several scholars have observed that this standing position is cultic.<sup>567</sup> Most recently, David Moffitt says. “Jesus’ posture is remarkably similar to that of a high priest in the Holy of Holies who stood before the mercy seat to offer the blood on Yom Kippur.”<sup>568</sup> In his encounter with the council during his trial, Jesus predicted that he would be seen *sitting* (καθήμενος) at the right hand of God (Lk 22.69). The way that Luke depicts Jesus’s posture as standing, instead of sitting, in heaven, might be another hint at Jesus’s ministry in the heavenly temple. Luke probably wants to picture Jesus ministering as the high priest in the heavenly temple, just in front of the heavenly altar.<sup>569</sup> The only other reference to Jesus’s standing in heaven is in Revelation, which as I have shown in chapter 3, places a strong emphasis on the heavenly temple and its rituals. The author says about his vision of Jesus: “Then I saw between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders a Lamb standing (ἐστηκὸς) as if it had been slaughtered, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the

---

<sup>567</sup> C. P. M. Jones, “The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings,” in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 128; Johnson, Acts, 139; David Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand: The Sacrificial Significance of Jesus’ Exaltation in Acts,” *NTS* (2016): 549–68 (564).

<sup>568</sup> Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand,” 564. Moffitt notes that other NT authors also imagine Jesus’s standing at the right hand of God as a high priest (e.g. Rom 8.34; Heb 1.3, 7.25, 8.1–2, 9.11–12, 10.12–13).

<sup>569</sup> While Paul does not picture Jesus standing, he connects Jesus’s position in heaven “at the right hand of God” as Jesus “intercedes for us” (Rom 8.34). Intercession is a priestly duty, which shows that early followers of Jesus understood his ministry in heaven in priestly terms.

seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth” (Rev 5.6). Notably, the author of Revelation uses the same verb ἵστημι that Luke uses to describe Jesus. The image in Revelation, however, shows Jesus as a lamb offered as a sacrifice in the heavenly temple. While Luke does not say it explicitly, Revelation shows that there is at least one other first-century Jesus-follower author who sees Jesus’s standing position in heaven presenting a sacrificial offering.<sup>570</sup>

In summary, Stephen’s defense against the fourth charge, that he speaks against the holy place, involves a distinctive perspective toward the temple. God’s presence in the temple is closely connected to the relationship between YHWH and Israel. Apparently, Stephen views this relationship as in need of repair. The people of Israel rejected God’s salvation when God appointed Moses as a leader: “God through him (Moses) was rescuing them, but they did not understand” (Acts 7.25). This lack of understanding continued throughout Israel’s history: “Our ancestors were unwilling to obey him; instead, they pushed him aside” (Acts 7.39). Stephen describes the Jewish leadership of his day: “You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as your ancestors used to do. Which of the prophets did your ancestors not persecute? They killed those who foretold the coming of the Righteous One, and now you have become his betrayers and murderers.” (Acts 7.51–52). The real object of Stephen’s attack is not YHWH, Moses, the Law, or the temple, but this specific segment of Jewish leadership.

Luke uses Stephen’s speech and vision to show that God is doing something new with Israel, and as I will explain later, with the Gentiles too. Jerusalem’s temple was made to resemble God’s heavenly indwelling, where God will keep God’s name in the temple as long as Israel maintains the relationship with God. However, Luke pictures something new happening now in Jesus’s priestly ministry in the heavenly temple.

---

<sup>570</sup> See the discussion of this connection in Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 368–70; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT II/94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 246–48.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have shown that Luke connects the Jerusalem temple with the heavenly temple. I have shown that the Dwelling Place's pattern was given to Moses as the heavenly pattern that he should follow in building the earthly Dwelling Place. It is Israel's gateway to YHWH's heavenly sanctuary on the cosmic mountain's summit. When the high priest ministers in the Holy of the Holies, he is in fact ministering in the heavenly temple. Luke develops these connections through the trial and crucifixion narrative, highlighting Jesus's entrance into the paradise, which represents Eden's sanctuary. Moreover, Luke maintains Jesus's priestly ministry in the heavenly temple in Stephen's vision.

Luke connects the Jerusalem temple to the heavenly temple, and understanding the nature of the service Jesus performs in the heavenly temple requires careful examination. In the following chapter, I will address this issue by drawing on our understanding of heavenly temple worship during the Second Temple period. The chapter will also explore the role and significance of Jesus's ascension within Luke's narrative. The ascension holds central importance for Luke, as indicated by its mention at both the conclusion of the Gospel and the beginning of Acts. I will investigate why the ascension is pivotal to Luke's narrative and what it reveals about Jesus's role.

## Chapter 5: Ascension and Atonement in Luke-Acts

### Introduction

Scholars have long debated the meaning of the ascension narratives in Luke-Acts. For many, it is part of the so-called Easter story, just following the resurrection.<sup>571</sup> Others focus on the glorifying exaltation of Jesus in heaven. Joseph Fitzmyer, for instance, considers the ascension as “nothing more than the appearance from Glory in which Christ took his final leave from the community of his followers.”<sup>572</sup> Mikael Parsons sees the ascension event as basically a farewell event that culminates Jesus’s ministry in Luke 24 and commences the ministry of the church in Acts 1.<sup>573</sup> Arie Zweip argues that the ascension scenes should be understood as rapture scenes in which Jesus is taken to heaven similar to Elijah and Enoch.<sup>574</sup> According to Zweip, the narratives in Luke 24 and Acts 1 do not even narrate the same event.<sup>575</sup> Matthew Sleeman looks at the ascension from the perspective of critical

---

<sup>571</sup> E.g. John F. Maile, “The Ascension in Luke-Acts,” *TynBul* 37 (1986): 29–59 (55). More recently, H. J. de Jonge argues that the ascension should be considered part of the resurrection event, hence Luke presents the resurrection and ascension as if they are happening in the same day in Luke 24. See: H. J. de Jonge, “The Chronology of the Ascension in Luke and Acts,” *NTS* 59 (2013): 151–71.

<sup>572</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost,” *TS* 45 (1984): 424

<sup>573</sup> Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*, JSNTSup (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987). See also Carol L. Stockhausen, “Luke’s Stories of the Ascension: The Background and Function of a Dual Narrative,” *Proceedings* 10 (1990): 259.

<sup>574</sup> Arie W. Zweip, *The Ascension of The Messiah in Lukan Christology*, NovTSup 87 (Leiden: Brill, 1997). I do see merit in Zweip’s argument. Elijah’s experience, especially, mirrors that of Jesus in Acts 1, for in both there is a nexus between ascending to heaven and anointing earthly successors with a dynamic portion of the Spirit (2 Kgs 2.9–14; Acts 1.5, 8–11). Ezra and Baruch, with the teaching preceding their assumptions, notably match Jesus’s forty-day period of farewell (4 *Ezra* 14.1–48; 2 *Bar* 76.1–5). Finally, as these raptured Jewish heroes are typically preserved in some exalted heavenly state where they anticipate a climactic return to earth at the end of the age, so the ascended, exalted Lucan Jesus awaits his glorious Parousia (Acts 1.11; 3.20–21). Whether these experiences should be called rapture or ascension, I do not see an essential difference.

<sup>575</sup> Zweip argues that Luke retains, from his sources, the primitive kerygma conjoining Jesus’ physical resurrection and heavenly exaltation in one key moment of the history of salvation (Acts 2.32–36; 5.31; 13.30–37; cf. Luke



space theory, where spaces are not perceived as just negative vacuum, but as productive of meaning.<sup>576</sup>

Jesus will continue to interrupt the production of earthly spaces from his heavenly space, creating the thirdspace which represents the struggle to bring the ideal space into the realistic earthly space.<sup>577</sup>

There has been some focus on the eschatological function of the ascension, but it has been mostly related to the delay of the Parousia.<sup>578</sup>

While these attempts to understand the significance of the ascension event in Luke-Acts have their strengths, I do not think any of them *fully* represent the value of the event. The ascension event is loaded with cultic language, which is not easily noted if Luke's writings are not situated within their

---

22.69;23.42–43; 24.26). In this framework, Jesus' ascension - coterminous with his resurrection and exaltation - is implicitly conceived as a type of journey to heavenly enthronement at the right hand of God, from which station he returns to earth over forty days to prove himself alive and provide farewell instructions to the apostles. On the other hand, the dramatic "taking up" to heaven which follows in Acts 1.9-11 emerges as another, different type of ascension. The already exalted Lucan Jesus now undergoes a final, observable rapture and awaits his future, climactic Parousia which will take place "in the same way as you saw him go into heaven." See Zweip, *The Ascension of the Messiah*, 80–117.

<sup>576</sup> Matthew Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts*, SNTSMS 146 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). Sleeman builds on the work of leading geography theorists, like Homi Bhabha, Henri Lefebvre, and Edward Soja, to advance the intersectional studies of Biblical spaces and critical space theory. In a nutshell, those theorists suggest that space could be conceived in three different statuses: First place, which is the normal physical space, second space, which is the imagined space (or the desired version of space), and the third space, which is the intersection point between the first and second space. In Luke's case, Sleeman argues that the ascension event is the thirdspace, which links the normal first space with the imagined, or desired, secondspace. The kingdom of God is the second space, and Luke's narrative represents the struggle to bring the thirdspace. See: Henri Lefebvre, "La production de l'espace," *L'Homme et la société* 31–32 (1974): 15–32; Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso Press, 1989); idem, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996). For an introduction to the basic space-theoretical concepts and their relationship to Biblical Studies, see: Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp, eds., *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007). For a survey of the use of critical space theories in Biblical Studies, see: Patrick Schreiner, "Space, Place, and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends," *CBR* 14 (2016): 340–71.

<sup>577</sup> Hence, Luke records in the Gospel "all that Jesus *began* to do and teach" (Acts 1.1), because the rest of the story in Acts is also Jesus's doing. See Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension*, 51–52. Cf. François Bovon, "L'importance des médiations dans le projet théologique de Luc," *NTS* 21(1975): 23–39; Daniel Marguerat, *Les Actes des apôtres* 1–12, CNT 5a (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007), 51.

<sup>578</sup> E.g., P. A. van Stempvoort, "Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," *NTS* 5 (1958): 30–42; Eric Franklin, "Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," *SJT* 23 (1970): 191; Robert O'Toole, "Luke's Understanding of Jesus' Resurrection-Ascension-Exaltation," *BTB* 9 (1979): 111; Erich Gräßer, *Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, WUNT 137 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 305–10. A major critique of the concern over the Parousia in Luke-Acts generally is: John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 92 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

early Jewish context.<sup>579</sup> And if this is true, we need to unpack the reasons for which Luke depicts the ascension event in a cultic perspective. Moreover, while scholars such as Parsons and Zweip have compared Luke's ascension narratives with other Jewish ascension narratives, they have not evaluated Jesus's ascension in Luke-Acts in terms of the goals of the ascension trips in early Judaism. As we have seen, many of the ascension Jewish narratives depict the protagonists entering the celestial temple.

Luke, a Jewish author, contemplated the temple cult in light of two pivotal events that occurred in the first century. The initial event was the destruction of the temple, which led to divergent approaches to the temple cult by various Jewish groups, as demonstrated earlier. The second event was the life and death of Jesus, which Luke perceived to be deeply intertwined with the ascension. As elucidated in the previous chapter, Luke formulated his temple theology more towards the celestial temple in response to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. The decimation of the Jerusalem temple was a source of lamentation rather than celebration for Luke. The objective of this chapter is to explicate the association between Jesus and the heavenly temple in Luke's mind, namely, that Jesus ascended to heaven in Luke-Acts to effect kipper in the heavenly temple.

There are several pieces of evidence in the ascension narratives in Luke-Acts that show that Jesus enters the heavenly temple when he ascends to heaven in order to effect atonement in the heavenly temple, which brings salvation to his followers. First, the ascension narratives in the Gospel of Luke (Lk 24.50–53) and Acts (Acts 1.9–11) reflect a Jewish cultic context in which Jesus performs priestly duties. Second, the central theological theme of the ascension narrative in Acts (Acts 1.1–11) is

---

<sup>579</sup> Rick Strelan exceptionally notes that the ascension event is rooted in cultic language, but he finds the cultic experience to be merely the creation of the early followers of Jesus. The event invokes their liturgical worship, instead of the Jewish cultic practices. I argue, instead, that the ascension event should be viewed from the perspective of the Levitical sacrificial system, not just as an event that reflects the liturgical practices of the early followers of Jesus. See: Rick Strelan, "The Ascension as a Cultic Experience in Acts," in David K. Bryan and David W. Pao, eds., *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts: New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 213–33. Cf. Nelson P. Estrada, *From Followers to Leaders: The Apostles in the Ritual of Status Transformation in Acts 1–2*, JSNTSup 255 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004).

that the ascension event effects the eschatological restoration of Israel. Third, Luke shows that Jesus offers himself as a cosmic sacrifice in Peter's speech on the Pentecost (Acts 2.14–36), which enables repentance and the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2.31; 5.31). Finally, Luke presents the purification of the Gentiles as a result of Jesus's sacrifice (Acts 10).

I will go through these cumulative pieces of evidence which will lead to the final conclusion that Jesus effects atonement in the heavenly temple.<sup>580</sup>

### **The Sacrificial Context of the Ascension Narratives**

The first ascension narrative occurs in the last four verses of the Gospel:

Then he led them out as far as Bethany,<sup>581</sup> and, lifting up his hands (ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ), he blessed them (εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς). While he was blessing them (ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτούς), he withdrew from them and was carried up into heaven. And they worshiped him (αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν) and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and they were continually in the temple (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) blessing God (εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν). (Lk 24.50–53)

This passage is full of cultic elements pertaining to Israel's temple worship. Jesus raises his hands in order to bless the disciples, and Luke is keen to repeat the language of blessing twice. The

---

<sup>580</sup> The text of the ascension narratives is affected by the complicated textual nature of the Book of Acts. Scholars have long noted that the so-called Western text of Acts (represented by witnesses like Codex Bezae and the Latin traditions) is significantly different from the Alexandrian textform. Due to space limitations, I will not discuss the textual variants, but will follow the text of NA28/UBS5 as the established critical text. For further discussions of the text of Acts, see: D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 286–300; idem, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition, Vol. 1: Acts 1:1–5:42–Jerusalem*, JSNTSup 257 (London: T&T Clark, 2004). For discussions of the textual variations in the ascension narratives, see: Eldon J. Epp, "The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts," in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 131–45, reprinted in Eldon J. Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962–2004* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 212–25; Arie W. Zwiep, "The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24.50–3; Acts 1.1–2, 9–11)," *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–44, reprinted in Arie W. Zwiep, *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*, WUNT 2/293 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 7–37.

<sup>581</sup> On the location of the ascension, see: Peter Atkins, "Luke's Ascension Location: A Note on Luke 24:50," *ExpTim* 109 (1998): 205–6, reprinted in: Peter Atkins, *Ascension Now: Implications of Christ's Ascension for Today's Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2001), 147–50.

combination of lifting hands and pronouncing blessing is an essential part of the priest's duties in first-century Israel (e.g., 2 Enoch 56.1; 57.2; 64.4),<sup>582</sup> especially during the Tamid service, in an extension of the Aaronide blessing (e.g., Lev 9.22).<sup>583</sup> Additionally, the disciples offer worship and return back to the temple to continue worshipping God. The combination of these elements does not just invoke the cultic context of Israel's temple worship but also hints at a specific high priest from Israel's history that Luke might want to bring into the scene. The way that Luke designs the ascension narrative in these verses parallels Sirach 50.20-23. Scholars have long noted that Luke crafts Jesus in the same way the author of Sirach crafts the high priest Simeon, Son of Onias.<sup>584</sup> The author, Ben Sira, celebrates the life of Simeon, "who in his life repaired the house, and his time fortified the temple" (Sir. 50.1).<sup>585</sup> The author then goes on to describe the architectural strength that Simeon added to the temple. Ben Sira presumably watches Simeon serving in the temple and goes on to describe Simeon's ministry. The author writes:

"Then Simon came down and raised his hands (καταβὰς ἐπῆρεν χεῖρας αὐτοῦ) over the whole congregation of Israelites, to pronounce the blessing of the Lord (δοῦναι εὐλογίαν κυρίου) with his lips and to glory in his name, and they bowed down in worship (ἐν προσκυνήσει) a second time to receive the blessing from the Most High (τὴν εὐλογίαν παρὰ ὑψίστου). And now bless

---

<sup>582</sup> Cf. Kelly M. Kapic, "Receiving Christ's Priestly Benediction: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Exploration of Luke 24:50–53," *WTJ* 67 (2005): 247–60.

<sup>583</sup> Cf. Num 6.24–26. "Outside the Temple the priests lift up their hands opposite their shoulders, but in the Temple above their heads—except for the high priest, who does not lift his hands higher than the diadem. R. Judah says: Even the high priest lifts his hands above the diadem, as it says: And Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people and blessed them" (*m. Tamid* 7.2).

<sup>584</sup> See, for example, David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), 234; P. A. van Stempvoort, "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," *NTS* 5 (1958): 30–41; G. Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*, SANT 26 (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1971), 168; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 180–223; Hamm, "The Tamid in Luke-Acts," 216; Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus*, 54–55; Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 281.

<sup>585</sup> Simeon II, son of Jochanan (Onias in Greek), is known as the Righteous or the Just as he was the last priest from the Zadokite priestly line. See Josephus, *Ant.* 12.4–10). While Luke might be criticizing non-Zadokite priesthood in the temple from that period forward, based on his portrayal of Jesus as a Priest after Simeon, there is no other evidence to support this idea.

the God (εὐλογήσατε τὸν θεόν) of all, who everywhere works great wonders, who exalts our days from birth and deals with us according to his mercy. May he give us gladness of heart and may there be peace in our days in Israel, as in the days of old.” (Sir. 50.20-23).

Hamm notes that there are five parallels, at least, between both passages.

- a) The raising of hands (Lk 24.50//Sir 50.20a)
- b) the blessing pronouncement (Lk 24.50-51a//Sir 50.20b)
- c) the worship attitude (Lk 24.51b//Sir 50.21)
- d) the blessing of and praising God (Lk 24.53//Sir 50.22a) and,
- e) the joyful heart (Lk 24.52b//Sir 50.23)

Luke intends his readers to understand Jesus’s ascension and the disciples’ response in the same way Simeon blesses Israel within a specific temple service.<sup>586</sup> The context of Simon’s blessing then can shed more light on the meaning of ascension in the Gospel of Luke.

To begin, it is necessary to examine the type of temple service that Ben Sira describes in the scene of Simeon’s priestly blessing. One interpretation is that the service depicted is associated with Yom Kippur.<sup>587</sup> However, Hamm, building on Fearghas Fearghail’s work, argues the ritual described in Sir 50 matches the descriptions of the ascension offering which, as we discussed earlier, was offered twice a day; namely, the Tamid (Exod 29.38–42; Num 28.1–10).<sup>588</sup> While we do not have descriptions

---

<sup>586</sup> Nolland comments: “This degree of parallelism can hardly be accidental.” Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1227.

<sup>587</sup> See the history of interpretation in Fearghas O. Fearghail, “Sir 50:5–21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole-Offering?” *Bib* 59 (1978): 301–16.

<sup>588</sup> The suggestion about Yom Kippur rests mainly on the clause “house of the veil” (Sir 50:5), suggesting the connection with the veil of the inner sanctuary. Fearghail, however, argues that this would be unusual way of describing the inner sanctuary, and it would be more natural to understand the clause as a reference to whole temple building, hence the author uses “the house.” M. R. Lehmann also does not find any parallels between Yom Kippur as practiced in Qumran with the descriptions of Ben Sira, hence concludes that Ben Sira intends the service to be the more regular Tamid. See: M. R. Lehmann, “‘Yom Kippur’ in Qumran,” *RQ* 9 (1961): 117–12.

of the Tamid offering from the first century, Fearghail argues that there is no reason to think that the Mishnah's descriptions of the Tamid would be essentially different than the practice of Tamid offering before the destruction of the temple. If this is true, then five out of the six elements of the Tamid service that occur in the Mishnah (m. Tamid 6.3-7.3) occur in Sirach 50. The six elements are. a) the incense offering, b) the high priest's exit from the Holy Place, c) the priestly blessing, d) the ascension offering, e) the libation offering, and f) the singing with the trumpets by the end of the service. The account in Sirach 50 lacks only the incense offering. Patrick Skehan and Alexander Di Lella have pointed out that the incense offering is not included because Sirach 50.5 refers to Simeon's exit from the Holy Place after the morning incense offering.<sup>589</sup> The Tamid service, thus, appears to be the appropriate context for the temple service of Sirach 50.<sup>590</sup>

What does it mean, then, for Luke, to design the ascension narrative of Jesus after Simeon's temple service? Ben Sira situates Simeon's temple service as the culmination of his synthesis of Jewish wisdom and piety over the course of the vast majority of the book (Sir 1.1–42.14) and retelling the history of Israel's ancestors down to Ezra (chaps. 44–49). Considering that Simeon II was the last priest from the lineage of Zadok, he represents the legitimate leadership of Israel during the Seleucids' rule of Israel, when there was no national king to lead Israel. But this leader is also a priest, hence his leadership represents not only the wisest way of leading the people but also the appropriate religious

---

<sup>589</sup> Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M., *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 551. Hamm suggests that Ben Sira, as an observer from outside, would not have the opportunity to see the incense offering, which happens inside the sanctuary. See Hamm, "The Tamid in Luke-Acts," 219.

<sup>590</sup> Otto Mulder criticizes the Tamid interpretation as "based on a few scant details from Tanakh and the rabbinic tradition" (173), and proposes Rosh Hashanah as the appropriate occasion for the service based on the trumpet blast in v. 16. Yet Mulder admits: "The fact that Ben Sira mentions the priestly trumpet blast in combination with the call to remembrance (50:16a/16d) is unique with respect to the Second Temple period. Conclusive evidence in Torah in support of Rosh Hashanah, however, remains extremely limited" (173). See: Otto Mulder, *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel*, JSJ 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 168–75.

life of Israel. The offering of the Tamid is the daily sacrificial duty of Israel, hence Ben Sira pictures the daily life of Israel as ideally perfect under the leadership of Simeon.

I have shown that Luke describes several important moments in his narrative as happening at the same time as the Tamid offering. Luke describes Jesus as a priest who leads a service temple after the model of Simeon II. Notably, Luke closes the Gospel with Jesus offering a blessing that Zechariah did not offer at the beginning of the Gospel due to being silenced (Lk 1.20, 22).<sup>591</sup> Thus Jesus fulfills the priestly duty of Zechariah. Jesus, then, is the new priest of Israel, who is able to lead the new community into worship.<sup>592</sup> However, the nature of the sacrifice that Jesus offers, akin to that of Simeon, requires further examination. A few verses before the ascension narrative, Jesus says to the disciples:

Thus it is written, that the Messiah is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. And see, I am sending upon you what my Father promised, so stay here in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high. (Lk 24.46–49)

The juxtaposition of this passage with the priestly presentation of Jesus in the ascension narrative is telling. I suggest that Jesus is the sacrifice, which is suggested here by the notion of the Messiah's sufferings. It is important to note that the sacrificing process *starts* with the death of the sacrifice, *followed* by the purification of the sanctuary and the worshipper, which then enables the repentance and forgiveness of sins. In Luke's narrative, Jesus dies on the cross, and ascends into heaven to offer his blood as the cosmic sacrifice, which will enable the purification of his followers,

---

<sup>591</sup> Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus*, 74.

<sup>592</sup> Cf. Matthew Sleeman, "The Ascension and Heavenly Ministry of Christ," in *The Forgotten Christ: Exploring the Majesty and Mystery of God Incarnate*, ed. Stephen Clark (Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 140–90.

resulting in repentance and forgiveness of sins. The Spirit plays a significant role in this context as we will see.

Luke indicates that Jesus is the sacrifice by using a special verb to note that Jesus has been “lifted up” (ἀνεφέρετο) into heaven (Lk 24.51). The verb occurs eight times in the New Testament, six of them in reference to sacrificial offerings (cf. Heb 7.27; 9.28; 13.1; Jam 2.21; 1 Pet 2.5; 2.24). The verb is also used extensively in Old Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures, and other early Jewish works, to indicate offering sacrifices (e.g. Gen 8.20; 22.2, 13; Exod 24.5; Exod 29.18, 25; Exod 30.9; Lev 2.16; 3.5, 11, 14, 16; 4.10, 19, 26, 31; 6.8, 19; 7.5, 31; 8. 20, 21, 27, 28; 9.10, 20; 14. 20; 16.25; 17.5–6; 1 Esdr 5.49; Is 57.6; 2 Macc 1.18; 2.9). I. Howard Marshall notes: “The choice of ἀναφέρω is unusual, and unlikely to be due to a copyist at a time when ἀναλαμβάνω had become the established term for the ascension.”<sup>593</sup> Marshall is right about the verbs used for ascension to heaven, where ἀναλαμβάνω and μετατίθημι have been used to describe Enoch’s ascension (Gen 5.24; Sir 44.16; 49.14; Heb 11.5 respectively) and Elijah’s ascension (Sir 48.9, 12; 1 Macc 2.58). *Why does Luke choose a verb that is used predominantly in texts about sacrificial offerings, and is highly uncommon in ascension narratives, to describe Jesus’s ascension?* Taking into consideration the fact that Luke crafts the whole scene after Simeon’s Temple service, it is highly probable that Luke makes the point that Jesus is ascending into heaven as a sacrifice.

Luke offers more evidence that Jesus ascends into heaven as a sacrifice, but before I discuss the sacrificial process in Luke-Acts, I will highlight another Jewish work that resembles Luke’s narrative of the ascension. A passage that I quickly mentioned in the last chapter, 2 En 67.1–3, shows several similarities between the account of Jesus’s ascension and Enoch’s ascension, where the latter clearly

---

<sup>593</sup> Marshall, *Luke*, 909.



ascends into the heavenly temple as indicated by the parallel passage in 1 Enoch 14 which we have discussed earlier. Some of these similarities include the following:<sup>594</sup>

Conversation settings	“While Enoch was talking to his people” (2 En. 67.1)	“Having said that, as they were watching” (Acts 1.9)
Description of the ascension event	angels “carried him up to the highest heaven” (67.2)	“he withdrew from them and was carried up into heaven” (Lk 24.51) <sup>595</sup> “he was lifted up, and a cloud took him out of their sight” (Acts 1.9)
The audience witnessed the event	“And the people looked” (67.3)	“While he was going... they were gazing up toward heaven” (Acts 1.10)
Explanatory comments	“and they understood how Enoch had been taken away” (67.3)	“This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven (Act 1.11)

<sup>594</sup> For the following comparison, I am indebted to Zwiep, *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*, 50.

<sup>595</sup> Note the imperfect passive verb ἀνεφέρετο, which suggests that Jesus has been carried up into heaven by others. Acts 1:10 shows that angels were present in the event of the ascension, which further indicates that angels have carried Jesus into heaven, just like Enoch (cf. 1 En 87:3; 90:31; Jub 4:23; 2 En 3:1; 67:2). Cf. Tobias Nicklas, “Angels in Early Christian Narratives on the Resurrection of Jesus: Canonical and Apocryphal texts,” in *Angels—The Concept of Celestial Beings: Origins, Development and Reception*, ed. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schopflin, DCLY (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 293–311.

Worshipful response	“And they glorified God” (67.3)	“they were continually in the temple blessing God” (Lk 24.53)
Return of the witnesses	“And they went away into their homes” (67.3)	“and [they] returned to Jerusalem with great joy” (Lk 24.52)  “then they returned to Jerusalem” (Acts 1.12)
The presence of angels in the event	“And the angels hurried and the angels grasped Enoch” (67.2)	“suddenly two men in white robes stood by them” (Acts 1.10)

Zwiep notes that Enoch’s description as standing “in front of his face for eternity” (67.2; cf. 21.3; 22.5–7; 39.8; 42.6) suggests Enoch’s continuous priestly role in heaven.<sup>596</sup> The priests stand similarly during their priestly ministry (Num 16.9; Deut 10.8; 17.12; 18.5; 1 Kgs 8.11; 2 Chr 5.14; Ezek 44.15). Enoch also frequently blesses others (2 *En* 56. 1; 57.2; 64.4) which resembles Jesus blessing his disciples (Lk 24.50–53). Earlier in the same context, Enoch’s sons and the elders tell him: “For the Lord has chosen you, to appoint you to be the one who reveals, who carries away our sins” (64.5).<sup>597</sup> The priestly role of Enoch in the heavenly temple is closely tied to carrying away, or purifying, the sins of the community. Luke establishes a connection between Jesus and Enoch, which

<sup>596</sup> Zwiep, *The Ascension of the Messiah*, 49.

<sup>597</sup> Grant Macaskill’s translation reads “bear away” instead of “carry away” which does not change the meaning. Enoch is perceived as a priest whose main task is to atone for the community’s sins. See: Grant Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, SJS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 310. For more on Enoch’s description as a priest in 2 Enoch, see: Grant Macaskill, *The Entangled Enoch: 2 Enoch and the Cultures of Late Antiquity*, SVTP 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2024), 279–80.

can be explained by the suggestion that Luke portrays Jesus as serving as a priest in the heavenly temple. Both figures fulfill priestly roles within this celestial context. While it is possible that Luke knows 2 Enoch, they both at least share the same celestial cultic sphere in which Enoch and Jesus serve as priests in the heavenly temple.

Luke intentionally crafts the ascension narratives in cultic language and imagery. This cultic context requires an explanation, and I will show that by putting other pieces of evidence together, the best explanation is that Jesus offers himself as a cosmic sacrifice as he ascends into heaven. I now turn to the connection between Jesus's ascension and the restoration of Israel in the ascension narrative.

### **The Restoration of Israel in the Ascension Narratives**

Luke situates the ascension narrative in Acts within a context that focuses primarily on the restoration of Israel. The passage reads as follows:

When he had said this, as they were watching, he was lifted up, and a cloud took him out of their sight. While he was going and they were gazing up toward heaven, suddenly two men in white robes stood by them. They said, "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up toward heaven? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven. (1.9–11)

This passage is both preceded and followed by notions of the restoration of Israel.<sup>598</sup> Just before Jesus ascends to heaven, the disciples ask: "Lord, are you at this time restoring the kingdom of Israel?" (Acts 1.6). Jesus's answer does not include any negative response about the eschatological restoration

---

<sup>598</sup> See: David L. Tiede, "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1," *HTR* 79 (1986): 278–86; Andy Johnson, "Resurrection, Ascension and the Developing Portrait of the God of Israel in Acts," *SJT* 57 (2004): 146–62; David W. Pao, "Jesus's Ascension and the Lukan Account of the Restoration of Israel," in Bryan and Pao, *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*, 137–56; David K. Bryan, "The Heavenly Lord Over All: A Comparison of Second Temple Jewish Ascents Into Heaven and Acts 1:9–14," Unpublished Paper Presented to the Book of Acts Section, Chicago, IL, SBL Annual Meeting 2012.

of Israel, nor does he rebuke the disciples because of their question.<sup>599</sup> The only thing that Jesus criticizes about their question is their desire to know the timing. In the same context of the ascension, Luke is keen to highlight that Jesus was teaching the disciples “concerning the kingdom of God” (1.3).<sup>600</sup> As we will see later in the narrative, Luke will continue to be interested in the “times of the restoration of all things” (3.21). When Jesus ascends into heaven, a cloud takes him away from their sight. We have seen the cultic connotations of the cloud, where it serves as the *kavod*, the glory of YHWH’s presence. But it is important to note the similarity with Daniel’s imagery of the Son of Man who rides a cloud into heaven and takes his position beside the “Ancient of Days” after suffering at the hands of the nations (Dan 7.13–14). In Daniel, the Son of Man represents the vindication of Israel in contrast to the nations, who have been represented as animals.<sup>601</sup> Hence, Luke’s focus on Jesus’s ascension in Acts 1.9–11 becomes “the direct answer to the disciples’ question of 1.6.”<sup>602</sup> That is, by the disciples’ question, Luke emphasizes that Jesus’s ascension is intrinsically linked to eschatological expectations regarding the restoration of Israel. Although Luke does not explicitly state the specifics of this connection, there are hints within the text that provide insight into the relationship between the ascension and Israel’s restoration.

Jesus moves to explain what would be the programmatic statement of Acts, in which the Spirit plays a significant role: “But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth” (1.8). There

---

<sup>599</sup> C. K. Barrett comments: “It is nearer to the truth to say that Luke uses the question to underline the non-nationalist character of the Christian movement.” I find Jesus’s reaction to the question to point in the opposite direction of Barrett’s conclusion. The question and Jesus’s answer both assume a unique and special restoration of Israel as a kingdom. See: C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. 1, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 76. For the case of the national restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts, see: Oliver, *Luke’s Jewish Eschatology*.

<sup>600</sup> On the connection between Jesus’s teaching on the kingdom of God and the disciples’ question about the fate of Israel, see: Anthony Buzzard “Acts 1:6 and The Eclipse of the Biblical Kingdom” *EvQ* 66 (1994): 197–215.

<sup>601</sup> I will show later the importance of Daniel’s metaphorical language for Luke’s development of the gentiles’ purification.

<sup>602</sup> N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 655.

are several pieces in this verse that, when taken together, show that the restoration of Israel depends on the ascension of Jesus.

First, Luke highlights that the spirit will descend upon the disciples (1.8) which parallels Lk 24.49 where Luke says that the disciples will receive power “from on high.” Both verses invoke Isaiah’s expectation that “The spirit comes upon you from on high” (Isa 32.15).<sup>603</sup> The context of the chapter in Isaiah contains the expectation of the Spirit’s arrival which will bring about the end of Judah’s desolation when YHWH restores Israel.<sup>604</sup> Second, Luke’s designation of the disciples as “witnesses” evokes Isaiah’s picture of the blind and deaf people serving as witnesses when YHWH restores them (Isa 43.10, 12; cf 40.1–2; 42.18). Third, the final section of v. 8, which includes Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and the ends of the earth also highlights Isaiah’s expectations about Judea and Samaria yearning for restoration as one people within the whole nation of Israel (Isa 11.13; 40.9–11).<sup>605</sup> Jason Staples has shown that the term “Israelite” within second temple Judaism refers to the whole twelve tribes of Israel, while the term “Jew” refers to the descendants of the southern kingdom of Judah only.<sup>606</sup> The prophetic texts that expect the eschatological restoration of Israel include the northern kingdom of Israel, with its ten tribes, not just the restoration of the kingdom of Judah. As I will show below, Luke addresses Israel as all the twelve tribes, not just the southern kingdom. Moreover, the clause “the ends of the earth” (ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς) appears only seven times in all the Greek literature, four times appear only in Isaiah (8.9; 48.20; 49.6; 62.11).<sup>607</sup> Luke does quote Isa 49.6

---

<sup>603</sup> See the discussion in David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016), 91–96; I. Howard Marshall, “Acts,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 528.

<sup>604</sup> Cf. Matthias Wenk, *Community—Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JPTSUP 19 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 234.

<sup>605</sup> E. Earle Ellis, “The End of the Earth (Acts 1:8),” in E. Earle Ellis, ed., *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, Bib Int 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 53–63; Joel Green, “Salvation to the End of the Earth (Acts 13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles,” in I. Howard Marshall and D. Peterson, eds., *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 83–106.

<sup>606</sup> Jason A. Staples, *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism: A New Theory of People, Exile, and Israelite Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), especially here 51–52.

<sup>607</sup> The other three times are Psalms of Solomon 1.4, Lk 24.47; Acts 13.47.

in Acts 13.47, where the ends of the earth refer to the gentiles, and in Lk 24.47, which is a parallel text to Acts 1.8, he explicitly refers to the gentiles.<sup>608</sup> Hence, all components of Acts 1.8 refer to the restoration of Israel, just before the ascension narrative.

Following the ascension narrative, Luke incorporates a story about choosing a disciple to replace Judas (Acts 1.12–26). Matthias, the chosen disciple, never appears again in the narrative, which raises the question of why Luke mentions this story. Luke seems to be interested in the number of the disciples. At several points in the narrative, Luke uses numerical language. Judas “was numbered” (κατηριθμημένος) among the disciples (1.17). When Matthias was chosen, “he was added to the eleven” (συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκά) disciples (1.26). Seemingly, Luke’s only interest in this story is to make the disciples twelve again.<sup>609</sup> Earlier in the Gospel, Luke mentions that the twelve disciples “will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Lk 22.30). The number twelve (δώδεκα) occurs twelve times in the Gospel of Luke,<sup>610</sup> which might indicate Luke’s intention to further emphasize the significance of the number. Luke envisions the eschatological restoration of the whole tribes of Israel immediately before the Pentecost and the pouring of the Spirit. Echoing prophetic voices, Luke paints a picture where the twelve tribes of Israel are restored before they can receive the Spirit.<sup>611</sup>

The ascension is closely tied to the restoration of Israel through its association with the concept of “heaven” (οὐρανός). The term appears four times in Acts 1.10–11 alone, also further emphasized in the ascension language of Jesus being “lifted up” (1.2, 9, 11). Three key passages in Acts will help us understand the significance of the Ascension to the restoration of Israel following the theme of heaven.

---

<sup>608</sup> So Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Paulist, 1988), 18–19.

<sup>609</sup> So Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEKNT 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 124–25; Marguerat, *Les Actes des Apôtres 1–12*, 60.

<sup>610</sup> Lk 2.42; 6.13; 8.1, 42–43; 9.1, 12, 17; 18.31; 22.3, 30, 47.

<sup>611</sup> Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 82.

Peter's speech on the Pentecost (Acts 2), the association of forgiveness of sins and ascension (Acts 5.31), and the purification of Cornelius (Acts 10).

### **The Cosmic Sacrifice**

On the day of Pentecost, the Spirit is poured over the disciples, and a set of divided tongues of fire descends over the disciples (Acts 2.3). As we have seen in 1 Enoch, the tongues of fire were surrounding the heavenly temple which Enoch entered, marking the borders of the divine presence. The tongues of fire appear in another work from the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire* (1Q29), which describes Aaron's ephod:

They shall shed light on you. And he shall go out with it with tongues of fire. The left-hand stone on his left side will show itself to the eyes of all the assembly until the priest has completed his speech. And afterwards the... has gone up... And you shall keep and d[o al]l [that] he shall speak to you. And the prophe[t]... preaches rebellion... (1Q29 1.2).

The following lines then explain the function of the "tongues of fire" imagery:

They shall give light to thee, and he/it shall go forth together with it, with flashes of fire. The left-hand stone which is on his left hand... side shall shine forth to the eyes of all the assembly until the priest finishes speaking. (1Q29. 1 II.1-2)

This interpretive text comments and expands upon Exod 28.9-11 and connects Aaron's ephod stones with the tongues of fire image. Another parallel passage appears in the *Apocryphon of Moses* (4Q376) connects the tongues of fire to the sacrificial ministry and the *kavod* cloud that indicated the divine presence:

[...and before the de]puty of the anointed priest [...a young bul]lock from the herd and a ram [...] [...] for the Urim [...] the stone, like [...] [...]they will provide you with light and he will go out with it with tongues of fire; the stone of the left side which is at its left side will shine to

the eyes of all the assembly until the priest finishes speaking. And after [the cloud (?)] has been removed [...] and you shall keep and d[o al]l [that] he tells you. And the proph[et...] [...] who speaks apostasy [...] [...]YHWH, God of... in accordance with all this judgment. And if there were in the camp the Prince of the whole congregation, and [...] his enemies, and Israel is with him, or if they march to a city to besiege it or in any affair which [...] to the Prince [...] ... [...] to field is far away [...]. (4Q376 I.1-3)

The passage refers to the anointed priest, who engages in a sacrificial ministry associated with the Urim and Thummim, a ritual intended to discern YHWH's will (cf. Lev 8:8; Num 27:21). Another figure mentioned is the prophet who advocates apostasy. Both figures also appear in the *Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire*, suggesting that the context of these fragments relates to a specific priestly sacrificial ministry, which seeks to discern YHWH's will in opposition to a particular false prophet. The ministry of the Urim and Thummim culminates in a shining stone, which enables the congregation to know YHWH's will. The issue requiring discernment in the passage seems to pertain to warfare, where the leader of the congregation seeks divine guidance on whether to proceed, as indicated by the language in the third column of the fragment. Of particular importance for my analysis is the connection between the ephod stone, the tongues of fire, and what appears to be the *kavod* cloud. Although the precise term for cloud does not occur in the passage, it seems a plausible reconstruction in I.2. The clause “he will go out with it with tongues of fire” (ויצא עמו בלשנות אש) could also allude to the *kavod* cloud. What exactly is the priest going out “with” (עמו)? It is possible that this refers to the *kavod* cloud, affirming YHWH's will to the audience. If this is true, then the association between the tongues of fire and the *kavod* cloud is telling. It might have been an image associated with the divine presence in cultic contexts. The connection between the “tongues of fire” image and the Jewish cultic ministry sheds more light on the meaning of the tongues of fire in the Pentecost scene. Something is happening at Pentecost that connects the disciples to the heavenly sanctuary. The association between the fire



tongues and the Spirit in Acts 2 marks the divine presence. People from different backgrounds noticed what was happening in Jerusalem, which needed an explanation, highlighted in the question: “What does this mean?” (2.12). Peter gives a long speech in which he explains what is happening. Peter begins his explanation that the disciples are not drunk, but there is a fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy happening now:<sup>612</sup>

This is what was spoken through the prophet Joel. ‘In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy. And I will show portents in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood, and fire, and smoky mist (αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ). The sun shall be turned to darkness and the moon to blood, before the coming of the Lord’s great and glorious day. Then everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved. (Acts 2.16–21)<sup>613</sup>

Peter quotes Joel 3.1–5 (LXX, equivalent of MT 2.28–32),<sup>614</sup> in which he uses an interpretive method similar to the *Pesher* method, a well-known hermeneutic from the Dead Sea Scrolls. In this

---

<sup>612</sup> Scholars have long noted the prophetic setting of Peter’s sermon on the Pentecost. For a summary of the relevant discussions, see: Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter’s Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter’s Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*, ed. Robert A. Kraft, SBLMS 15 (New York: Abingdon, 1971), especially here 27–28; Craig A. Evans, “The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon,” *ZNW* 74 (1983): 148–50, reprinted in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993), 210–12; Robert Sloan, “‘Signs and Wonders’: A Rhetorical Clue to the Pentecost Discourse,” *EQ* 63 (1991): 225–40; Robert C. Tannehill, “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts,” *NTS* 37 (1991): 400–14; Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 31; Daniel Treier, “The Fulfillment of Joel 2:28–32: A Multiple-Lens Approach,” *JETS* 40 (1997): 13–26; Paul A. Himes, “Peter and the Prophetic Word: The Theology of Prophecy Traced through Peter’s Sermons and Epistles,” *BBR* 21 (2011): 227–43.

<sup>613</sup> There are several textual variants in this passage, especially between the Alexandrian and Western texts. I follow the text of NA28. For a discussion of the textual variants, see: Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 255–58.

<sup>614</sup> Luke’s version of the quotation differs from both the MT and LXX in few places. For instance, he uses “in the last day” instead of Joel’s “after this days,” which gives Pentecost a stronger eschatological taste. Luke also adds “God says” before the quotation from Joel “I will pour out my spirit” to further indicate that Pentecost is the divine realization of Joel’s prophecy. As those differences do not affect my argument, I do not discuss them in detail here. See: Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, EKKNT; Vol. 1 (Zürich: Benziger, 1986), 117; Johnson, *Acts*, 49.

interpretive method, one uses a scriptural passage and applies it to a contemporary situation pertaining to a specific group.<sup>615</sup> Luke pictures Peter quoting from Joel, and applying the text to his contemporary situation pertaining to the group of disciples.

Peter, as Luke portrays him, sees that Joel's prophecy is realized in the descending of the tongues of fire upon the disciples. The long-anticipated last days have arrived now when God pours God's spirit "upon all flesh" (v. 17).<sup>616</sup> A specific cosmic phenomenon is closely associated with the pouring of the Spirit in this passage from Joel. God will show signs that will signal the pouring of the Spirit: "Blood, fire, and smoky mist" (v. 19). The meaning of those apocalyptic signs in Joel's original context, then in Luke's context in Peter's speech, is not explicitly clear.<sup>617</sup> However, I suggest that these signs, while apocalyptic in nature, has another cultic meaning as they refer to Jesus's cosmic sacrifice in the heavenly temple.

Joel records YHWH's promises of an extraordinary future event when YHWH will pour his spirit upon the people of Judah indiscriminately. Everyone will be able to receive some form of

---

<sup>615</sup> See George Brooke, "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RQ* 10 (1981): 483–503; Ida Fröhlich, "Peshet, Apocalyptic Literature and Qumran," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991 Vol. I & II*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 295–305; Daniel A. Machiela, "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries: Historical Context and Lines of Development," *DSD* 19 (2012): 313–62.

<sup>616</sup> The universalistic scope in Joel's prophecy has been puzzling readers over history. Why, all of sudden, does Joel change his focus from Israel's restoration, to "all flesh"? It is possible that Joel implicitly meant all flesh *within Israel*, though that is not the direct sense of the text. Mordecai Schreiber looks at other places in the Jewish scriptures to find allusions to the meaning of pouring the Spirit. When some young men informed Moses that Eldad and Medad are prophesying, Moses responded: "I wish that all the Lord's people were prophets and that the Lord would put his Spirit on them!" (Num 11.29). The pouring of the Spirit means the spirit of prophecy, in which there is a especial connection between humanity and the divine. Schreiber argues that Joel expects all humanity, Jews and non-Jews alike, to receive the divine spirit. It is "inspiration emanating from the Lord, without any precise message, but rather a general motivation to do good." Hans Wolf agrees that Joel is "influenced in this respect by the Torah, canonized in his time, in which dreams are viewed as a legitimate mode of revelation." See: Mordecai Schreiber, "I Will Pour out My Spirit on All Flesh (Joel 3:1)," *JBQ* 41 (2013): 123–29 (128); Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos*, trans. Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow, ed. S. Dean McBride, Jr., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 66. Cf. Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence From Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>617</sup> The most extensive study of Joel 3.1-5 in Acts 2 is John Strazichich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, Bib Int 82 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), especially 255–88.

prophetic connection with the divine, whether in the form of visions or dreams. The event will break all social, gender, and age barriers between all people. Yet the event will not take place among Joel's immediate audience, but for the descendants in the future. There are signs that YHWH promises to give on that day, in the sky and on earth, which will indicate that YHWH's promised day has arrived. Scholars have traditionally understood the signs as apocalyptic signs, where blood, fire, and smoke refer to the wars and the destruction in the end, and the darkened sun and bloody moon are eschatological imagery that will usher the reign of YHWH on earth.<sup>618</sup> Most recently, Lourdes García Ureña argued that Joel reflects on the black-colored image of ancient eclipses when he speaks of the darkened sun.<sup>619</sup>

While these interpretations are not mistaken, I propose a different reading: *Joel refers to a cosmic sacrifice and that the signs represent the offering of a cosmic sacrifice that will usher in the reconciliation between YHWH and Judah.* The key piece of evidence is this: *the only other setting where the terms “blood, fire, and smoke” (דָּם וָאֵשׁ וְתַיִמְרוֹת עֶשֶׁן (MT))// αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνου (LXX)) consistently appear together in once cluster in the rest of the Jewish scriptures is in the sacrificial offering context.*<sup>620</sup> That is, these terms as they stand in Joel (and Acts) are not only apocalyptic, but also indicate a sacrificial process. The three terms (blood, fire, and smoke) appear

<sup>618</sup> E.g., Willem S. Prinsloo, *The Theology of the Book of Joel* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985), 85; James L. Crenshaw, *Joel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 171. Leslie Allen connects the event to the Exodus plagues, where the Nile turned into red, sandstorms happened, and darkness prevailed during the day: “Joel’s terminology for the latter portent significantly echoes that used of an Exodus plague in Ex. 10.17, 20. It alludes to a reddish obscuring of the moon through sandstorms and the like, whose color ominously suggested bloodshed.” See: Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 101; Elie Assis, *The Book of Joel: A Prophet between Calamity and Hope*, LHB/OTS 581 (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 205.

<sup>619</sup> Lourdes García Ureña, “Darkness or Blackness? A Semantic Study of חֹשֶׁךְ (Joel 3:4),” *JBL* 142 (2023): 111–27. Cf. F. R. Stephenson, “The Date of the Book of Joel,” *VT* 19 (1969): 224–29; John Barton, *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 98.

<sup>620</sup> To my knowledge, Arvid Kapelrud and Marvin A. Sweeney are the only ones who proposed a sacrificial interpretation of Joel’s prophecy. Kapelrud, particularly, offers this interpretation within his wider approach to Joel as a liturgical work poetically performed by the prophet. See: Arvid Kapelrud, *Joel Studies*, Uppsala Universitets Absskrift 1948: 4 (Uppsala: A-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln), 139–40; Marvin A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets, Vol. 1: Hosela, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah*, Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2000), 175.

consistently the sacrificial process of the ascension offering (Lev 1.5, 7, 9), the well-being offering (Lev 3.2, 3, 5), the purification offering (Lev 4.5-6, 12, 16-18, 31, 34) and are assumed in the guilt offering (5.9). A fire on the altar must be burning producing smoke that ascends into heaven to satisfy YHWH, while the blood is used to purge the sancta (Lev 6.12). *There is no other context in which the three key terms appear together.*

As Marvin Sweeney notes:

The images of “blood, fire, and columns of smoke,” appear to be destructive at first sight and suggest the motif of Yhwh’s battles against the nations that oppress Israel in the following passages. But these images are also the images of the altar at the Jerusalem Temple. Animals are slaughtered for sacrifice, and the treatment of blood is an important part of the sacrificial ritual.

Once the animal is slaughtered and prepared for the altar, it is set on fire and consumed entirely, resulting in a thick column of smoke that will stand over the site of the Temple complex.

Although the imagery is destructive, it is also constructive in the sense that the Temple sacrificial ritual is intended to maintain or to restore the order of the created world.<sup>621</sup>

Hence, while these terms represent apocalyptic warfare language, they also refer to sacrificial language in Joel (and Acts). Before I explore the terms in Acts, some background about the terms in Joel is in order. Joel is not the only prophet who connects the warfare language with sacrificial images within the context of YHWH’s day. Isaiah 34 employs similar language for YHWH’s last day, where

---

<sup>621</sup> Sweeney, *The Twelve*, 175. Joel Barker, while finds Sweeney’s proposal to be “interesting,” says: “It is difficult, however, to argue that sacrifice is in view in the manifestation of Yhwh’s power in Joel 3:3–4.” Barker does not explain why it is difficult. As Sweeney explains, the destruction of the enemies (*herem*) is a purification method, which could be easily connected to the sacrificial system with its ultimate purificatory goal. See: Joel Barker, *From the Depths of Despair to the Promise of Presence: A Rhetorical Reading of the Book of Joel* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, IN, 2014), 211.

there is explicit sacrificial language connected with the warfare terminology. YHWH declares war against the nations who oppress Judah, but saves the enemies' armies to be offered as sacrifices:

For YHWH is enraged against all the nations and furious against all their hordes; he has doomed them, has given them over for slaughter. Their slain shall be cast out, and the stench of their corpses shall rise; the mountains shall flow with their blood. All the host of heaven shall rot away, and the skies roll up like a scroll. All their host shall wither like a leaf withering on a vine or fruit withering on a fig tree. When my sword has drunk its fill in the heavens, upon Edom it will fall, upon the people I have doomed to judgment. YHWH has a sword; it is sated with blood; it is gorged with fat, with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams. *For YHWH has a sacrifice in Bozrah, a great slaughter in the land of Edom* (Isa 34.2–6)

The imagery of war is interconnectedly woven into the sacrificial language.<sup>622</sup> YHWH's sword is smeared with the fat and blood of lambs and goats. Other sacrifices include bull calves, bulls, and, strangely, "wild oxen," which are never mentioned as sacrifice offerings before. We will see the significance of these strange animals as we look into Acts 10 below, but for now, it is sufficient to note the loaded sacrificial language connected with YHWH's day. Simultaneously, cosmic elements appear in the scene, where the "host of heaven" refer to the stars,<sup>623</sup> and "the skies" will roll up out of fear of YHWH's day. The author of First Isaiah describes Edom later: "The streams of Edom shall be turned into pitch and her soil into sulfur; her land shall become burning pitch. Night and day it shall not be

---

<sup>622</sup> See: Marvin Pope, "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Is 35, 40–66," *JBL* 71 (1952): 235–43; Odil Hannes Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 55 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja*, SBS 121 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985), 36–37; Johan Lust, "Isaiah 34 and the herem" in *The Book of Isaiah - Le livre d'Isaïe: les oracles et leurs relectures*, ed. Jacques Vermeylen, BETL (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 275–86; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 452–55.

<sup>623</sup> Cf. Mark 13:25.

quenched; its smoke shall go up forever” (vv. 9–10).<sup>624</sup> The language of victory over the Edomite enemies employs sacrificial terms, where there will be burning smoke going up day and night, the same timings as the Tamid offerings.<sup>625</sup> In a parallel passage that points to YHWH’s rule from Jerusalem, the author of First Isaiah writes: “On that day... the moon will be abashed and the sun ashamed, for YHWH of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will be glorified” (Isa 24.23).<sup>626</sup> The signs in the sky, including the darkening of the sun and the moon, are connected to the enthronement of YHWH, when YHWH will defeat the enemies and the eschatological sacrifice is offered.

A similar approach to YHWH’s day is reflected in Jeremiah’s words about the connection between apocalyptic warfare and sacrificial language in the eschaton:

That day is the day of YHWH God of hosts, a day of retribution, to gain vindication from his foes. The sword shall devour and be sated and drink its fill of their blood. *For YHWH God of hosts holds a sacrifice in the land of the north by the River Euphrates.* (Jer 46.10)

The image of YHWH’s warfare is again interconnected with sacrificial offering, where YHWH is depicted as offering the enemies as sacrifices to vindicate Judah. We note the same connection between YHWH’s victory in the final war and sacrificial offerings in Ezekiel:

As for you, mortal, thus says YHWH God. Speak to the birds of every kind and to all the wild animals. Assemble and come, gather from all around to the sacrificial feast that I am preparing

---

<sup>624</sup> For a recent argument that Isa 34 belongs to First Isaiah, see: Joshua Berman, “Measuring Style in Isaiah: Isaiah 34–35 and the Tiberias Stylistic Classifier for the Hebrew Bible,” *VT* 71 (2021): 303–16.

<sup>625</sup> Claire Matthews notes: “The imagery of the slaughter .. in vv. 2–4 is not only taken up again, but expanded in vv. 5ff. to that of a sacrifice .. just as the image of the mountains flowing with the blood of the slain in v. 3 is transformed into an image of the sacrificial blood and fat saturating both YHWH’s sword, and the land of Edom.” Matthews argues that the sacrificial language is an early layer in the rhetoric against the Edomite enemy, and not the result of later redaction of the book. See: Claire R. Matthews, *Defending Zion: Edom’s Desolation and Jacob’s Restoration (Isaiah 34–35) in Context*, BZAW 236 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 51.

<sup>626</sup> Cf. Isa 13:10: “For the stars of the heavens and their constellations will not give their light; the sun will be dark at its rising, and the moon will not shed its light.”

for you, *a great sacrificial feast on the mountains of Israel*, and you shall eat flesh and drink blood. You shall eat the flesh of the mighty and drink the blood of the princes of the earth—of rams, of lambs, and of goats, of bulls, all of them fatted calves of Bashan. You shall eat fat until you are filled and drink blood until you are drunk, at *the sacrificial feast that I am preparing for you*. (Ezek 39.17–19)<sup>627</sup>

The flesh of the mighty refers to the victory over Gog (Ezek 39.11), the enemy of Israel.<sup>628</sup> YHWH will defeat them and offer them as a sacrifice for Israel to partake in.<sup>629</sup> Sacrificial animals are, like Isaiah's, lambs, goats, bulls, and calves. Significant to note is the association between these sacrifices and the restoration of Israel that Ezekiel predicts: "Now I will restore the fortunes of Jacob and have mercy on the whole house of Israel" (v. 25). The whole house of Israel refers to the twelve tribes, emphasized through Jacob's name who is the father of the twelve tribes. Moreover, YHWH promises in the same context: "I will never again hide my face from them when I pour out my spirit upon the house of Israel, says YHWH God" (v. 29). Thus, the expectation is that YHWH will defeat the enemies, make a sacrificial feast, restore Israel, and all these events are connected to the pouring out of YHWH's Spirit. As I will show below, all these events are connected in Acts.

Zephaniah uses similar language that connects YHWH's day with sacrificial offerings, but this time YHWH punishes Judah:

---

<sup>627</sup> Cf. the connected passage in the Animal Apocalypse (1 En 89:10-12).

<sup>628</sup> Matthews notes the connection between Isa 34 and Ezek 39: "Ezek 39 describes YHWH's judgment on the peoples as a sacrificial feast in which the bodies of the slain serve as food for the birds of the air and beasts of the field (39:17ff.), imagery often cited as a potential influence on the Edom oracle in Isa 34." See: Matthews, *Defending Zion*, 177.

<sup>629</sup> Cf. Rev 19.17–18.

Be silent before YHWH God, for the day of YHWH is at hand! YHWH has prepared a sacrifice; he has consecrated his guests. And on the day of the YHWH's sacrifice, I will punish the officials and the king's sons and all who dress themselves in foreign attire. (Zeph 1.7–8)

Zephaniah proclaims that YHWH will offer a sacrifice on that day. Remarkably, Zephaniah uses the “day of YHWH” in parallel with the “day of the YHWH's sacrifice,” noting the centrality of the sacrificial theme on YHWH's day. Perhaps the most important fact to note about this passage is that the sacrifice is used for the consecration of YHWH's guests (הַקִּדִּישׁ קִרְאִיו),<sup>630</sup> that is, the Jews who need purification before they can partake in YHWH's table.<sup>631</sup> The prophetic author continues to describe YHWH's day in the rest of the chapter, where it will be “a day of darkness and gloom, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of trumpet blast” (v. 15–16).<sup>632</sup> Again we see the connection between the cosmic signs and the sacrificial language on YHWH's day, especially the darkness. YHWH will still punish the nations, but Zephaniah still expects an eschatological offering that Israel and the nations will bring: “At that time I will change the speech of the peoples to a pure speech, that all of them may call on the name of YHWH and serve him with one accord. From beyond the rivers of Cush my suppliants, my scattered ones, shall bring my offering” (Zeph 3.9–10).

The prophetic messages contribute significantly to the understanding of Joel's message, which aligns with the prophetic tradition concerning the eschatological sacrifice on YHWH's day. Joel emphasizes both victory in war and sacrifice on the last day, themes that are also reflected in the book of Acts. But let's look in Joel 3.1–5 first to determine its meaning within its immediate context before

---

<sup>630</sup> Note the NET translation: “He has ritually purified his guests.”

<sup>631</sup> Contrary to other prophets, Zephaniah pictures the slaughter of Judah in order to be consecrated so the Jews can participate in YHWH's table. Is Judah the sacrifice of the guest who will participate in the sacrifice served on YHWH's table? Zephaniah is not clear, but his focus is on the purification before participation with YHWH, which aligns with the purposes of the Levitical sacrificial system. See the discussion in Adele Berlin, *Zephaniah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 79.

<sup>632</sup> Note the connection between the trumpet blasts in Zephaniah, which refers to the war trumpets, and the temple trumpets blast that we saw in Simeon's temple service



we move to the quotation in Acts. Initially, Joel laments the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, which brought about the cease of sacrifice: “The grain offering, and the drink offering are cut off from the house of YHWH. The priests mourn, the ministers of YHWH” (Joel 1.9). Joel encourages Judah’s priests to repent and pray: “Put on sackcloth and lament, you priests; wail, you ministers of the altar. Come, pass the night in sackcloth, you ministers of my God! Grain offering and drink offering are withheld from the house of your God” (1.13). That is, one of the main elements of Judah’s worship that Joel hopes to be restored is the temple’s sacrificial worship.<sup>633</sup> He is looking for the day when YHWH will restore Judah and its temple. Joel, then, unfolds his expectation of YHWH’s coming day: “Blow the trumpet in Zion; sound the alarm on my holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble, for the day of YHWH is coming, it is near— a day of darkness and gloom, a day of clouds and thick darkness! Like blackness spread upon the mountains” (2.1–2). Noteworthy here is the same association between the trumpet blasts on the holy mountain, and the cosmic signs, especially of thick darkness, which Joel further explicates: “The sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining” (2.10). Within the descriptions of YHWH’s day, Joel offers an invitation to the people to repent:

Yet even now, says YHWH, return to me with all your heart, with fasting, with weeping, and with mourning; rend your hearts and not your clothing. Return to YHWH your God, for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, abounding in steadfast love, and relenting from punishment. Who knows whether he will not turn and relent and leave a blessing behind him, a grain offering and a drink offering for YHWH your God? (2.12–14)

Again Joel is concerned with the temple offerings, and through his rhetorical question hopes that YHWH will restore the temple with its offerings if the people repent. As Douglas Stuart notes:

---

<sup>633</sup> Gösta Ahlström, *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem*, VTSup 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 133.

“The time is coming when it may be hoped in faith, meal offerings (מִנְחָה) and drink offerings (נֶסֶךְ), in contrast to the present dearth (1.9, 13), will again be available to give to Yahweh.”<sup>634</sup> Thus, Joel encourages the people to get prepared for a response from YHWH. The trumpets should blast, and the congregation should be fasting and sanctified (2.15-16). These descriptions sound like preparations for Yom Kippur rituals. Priests to offer repentance within the sanctuary: “Between the vestibule and the altar, let the priests, the ministers of YHWH, weep” (2.17). In response, YHWH delivers his people. “I am sending you grain, wine, and oil, and you will be satisfied; and I will no more make you a mockery among the nations” (2.19). While the text does not say that these are offerings, being in proximity to the people’s desire of renewed grain and drink offerings, it seems plausible that Joel means restored temple service here. The resources became available again so that the people can now bring offerings to YHWH.

As a result of the restoration of Israel, YHWH says: “You shall know that I am in the midst of Israel and that I, YHWH, am your God and there is no other” (2.27). We have seen that the point behind the sacrificial system is to maintain YHWH’s presence among his people.<sup>635</sup> Joel’s notions about restored offerings, then, align with the ultimate goal of the Levitical sacrificial system, to maintain YHWH’s presence among his people.<sup>636</sup> Like Ezekiel who connected the pouring of the Spirit with the sacrificial feast, I suggest that Joel also connects the pouring of the spirit with *a cosmic sacrifice*, indicated by the key terms. blood, fire, and columns of smoke (2.30). What enforces my suggestion that Joel speaks of sacrifices here, in addition to the evidence from other prophetic texts

---

<sup>634</sup> Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, WBC 31 (Dallas: Word, 2002), 253.

<sup>635</sup> Barker notes: “In those rhetorical units the text indicates that the relationship between Yhwh and the people is in jeopardy since the sacrificial system is in shambles. Essentially, Joel 3:1–5 restores the broken spiritual relationship, which corresponds to the restoration of physical security in Joel 2:18–27. Not only will Yhwh satisfy the people’s needs for sustenance and security, Yhwh will provide continued prophetic intermediation through the presence of the divine Spirit.” Barker is to be commended for noting the brokenness of the sacrificial system, yet he does not explain how Joel perceives the restoration of YHWH’s presence in connection to the sacrificial system. See: Barker, *From the Depths of Despair to the Promise of Presence*, 206.

<sup>636</sup> The last verse of the book has “The Lord dwells in Zion” as the ultimate goal (3.21).

about YHWH's day, is that Joel uses "columns of smoke" (ותימרות עשן). תמרה is synonymous with עמוד, which is used extensively in the Torah to refer to YHWH's presence during Israel's journey in the wilderness and in the Dwelling Place (e.g., Exod 33.9–11; Num 12.5), and which Joel might have in mind. Not only that, but the Old Greek translator chose to translate תמרה to ἀτμίδα, which Ben Sira used to describe the incense offering of the Dwelling Place (ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ; Sir 24.15). The Old Greek translator of Leviticus used the same term to refer to the incense offering that the high priest offers on Yom Kippur inside the sanctuary, over the ark-cover (ἡ ἀτμὶς τοῦ θυμιάματος τὸ ἱλαστήριον; Lev 16.13).<sup>637</sup> The same term occurs in the Old Greek translation of Ezekiel to refer to the fragrant cloud of the incense offering ascending to heaven (ἡ ἀτμὶς τοῦ θυμιάματος ἀνέβαινεν; Ezek 8.11). *Thus, the image of a "column of smoke" that Joel uses, and Luke quotes in Acts, refers, most probably, to the incense offering smoke.* There is no other way to imagine the reason for the *columns* of smoke.<sup>638</sup> Luke uses the same noun in quoting Joel (αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ; Acts 2.19). That the moon turns into "blood" is another sign that the sacrifice is a cosmic one.<sup>639</sup> Most prophetic traditions we explored above speak of the darkness of the moon, but only Joel speaks of the moon turning into blood. I suggest that, based on the heavy sacrificial language of Joel, that the bloody moon is a sign of a cosmic sacrifice, where the sacrificial blood has been applied to the moon.<sup>640</sup>

<sup>637</sup> Note the combination with "fire" in the same context.

<sup>638</sup> Commentators who use "mushrooming smoke" (e.g., Crenshaw, *Joel*, 167) are, in my opinion, more influenced by modern images of nuclear smoke than with the real meaning of the text.

<sup>639</sup> While Crenshaw argues that the notion of the sun, moon, heaven, and earth is just a merism for "everywhere," Colin Toffelmire shows that "references to the "heaven," the "earth," the "sun," and the "moon," frame the arrival of the Day of YHWH as an event occurring on a stage the size of the cosmos itself." It is not a figurative speech to refer to every place, but a reference that there is a cosmic event happening. See: Crenshaw, *Joel*, 153–54; Colin M. Toffelmire, *A Discourse and Register Analysis of the Prophetic Book of Joel*, SSN 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 134.

<sup>640</sup> Some early Jews believed that the moon and other parts of the cosmos were impure and required purification. One passage that can help answer this question is Job 25.5 where the stars are impure: "The moon is not bright (לא יאהיל) and the stars are not pure (וּכְכָבִים לֹא־זָכוּ) in his sight." It is possible that כָּךְ might mean bright or shiny, given that in the same verse the moon is said to be darkened, hence the stars will be not bright in God's eyes just like the moon. However, the same verb is used in Job 9.30 as a reference to purification procedures: "I wash myself with soap and cleanse (וְהִזְכֹּתִי) my hands with lye" (Job 9.30). In fact, the whole heaven is unclean in Job: "The heavens are not clean (לֹא־זָכוּ) in his sight" (Job 15.15), in the same way that humans could be unclean (Job 15.14). In those three passages from Job, the Old Greek translator used the noun καθαρὸς or the cognate verb ἀποκαθάρωμαι to

Drawing on the rich history of prophetic tradition connecting YHWH's day with sacrificial offerings, along with Joel who focuses on the pouring of the Spirit, we turn to investigate the quotation from Joel 3.1–5 in Acts. I suggest that *Luke quotes from Joel to underscore the point that there is a cosmic sacrifice that took place in heaven while Jesus is being enthroned, an event that enabled the pouring of the Spirit*. I will come back to the connection between the cosmic sacrifice and the pouring of the Spirit in a moment, but we need to understand Peter's logic in his speech in which the citation from Joel occurs.

Peter portrays Jesus as God's Messiah whom some of the Jewish leaders killed on the cross (2.22–23).<sup>641</sup> In two verses, Luke mentions the death of Jesus three times. “You crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the law. But God raised him up, having released him from the agony of death” (Acts 2.24). However, Jesus is more powerful than death, so the war in which Jesus is involved is against death, the enemy. God freed Jesus from the authority of death by the resurrection (2.24). Peter then gives the reason for his thoughts (note the causal γὰρ in 2.25), citing Ps. 16.8–11 in vv. 25–

---

indicate the state of purity. Hence, heaven and stars are impure in God's eyes in Job. The author of Lamentations also uses the same Hebrew verb to indicate the state of purity: “Her princes (נִדְרִיָּה) were purer (זָכוּ) than snow, whiter (צָחוּ) than milk; their bodies were more ruddy than coral, their hair like sapphire” (Lam 4.7). The Old Greek translator uses ἑκαθάρωθησαν to translate זָכוּ. But this verse might shed more light on the relationship between purity and brightness. The author uses זָכוּ to describe the rulers of the Jews as consecrated ones and uses נִדְרִיָּה which is elsewhere used to describe the Nazirites (e.g., Num 6.8; Jud 13.5–7; 16.7), in relationship to the white snow, to show how the rulers of Israel were pure in the past. The author also makes a parallelism between זָכוּ and צָחוּ to compare the purity of Israel's rulers to the whiteness of the milk. Being pure, then, might have been perceived visually as being white in some cases in early Judaism. The author of Psalm 51 might mean something similar when he says: “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow” (Ps 51.7). The author uses the established purification procedures with the hyssop (e.g., Exod 12.22; Lev 14.4–6, 49–52; Num 19.6–18) to show how he will be white more than snow after God purifies him. The author of First Isaiah also indicates that Israel's sins will be purged and they will shine as snow (Isa 1.18). Hence, when the author of Job says that stars are unclean where they do not give light, and parallels this statement with the clause “The moon is not bright,” the author might be hinting at the impurity of the moon too. Joel makes a similar statement: “The earth quakes before them, the heavens tremble. The sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining” (Joel 2.10), which if connected to the other passages from Job, might indicate that the moon is not pure in Joel. Thus, when the moon turn into red in Joel, it might mean that the blood of the cosmic sacrifice has been applied to the moon to purify it.

<sup>641</sup> Richard Bauckham recognizes vv. 22–24 and 32–33 as major kerygma summaries in Acts. See: Richard Bauckham, “Kerygmatic Summary in the Speeches of Acts,” in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007), 213.

28.<sup>642</sup> As David claims that he will be rescued from Sheol/Hades (Ps. 16.8–11), he must be speaking about someone else other than himself, since he died, and his tomb is still known to everyone living during this time (v. 29). Peter then explains that God has sworn an oath (ὄρκῳ ὤμοσεν) to David. The content of this oath to David is “that he would put one of his descendants on his throne. Foreseeing this, David spoke of the resurrection of the Messiah, saying, ‘He was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh experience corruption.’” (Acts 2.31). That is, according to Peter, David speaks of the Messiah as the one who will be resurrected and enthroned. 2 Sam 7 shows David’s desire to build a temple for God, but God promises that he will “raise up” (LXX. ἀναστήσω!) his offspring and establish his kingdom. This offspring will build the temple, and God will protect his kingdom forever (2 Sam 7.13). In this passage there is an emphasis on the eternality of the offspring’s kingdom (2 Sam 7.15, and twice in v. 16). Therefore, the promise that God made to David, one of the fathers of Israel, is that Israel’s kingdom will never fail. Peter believes that all these threads come together in the resurrection and ascension of Jesus (Acts 2.31–32). God raised Jesus, who was enthroned in heaven after his ascension as a declaration that Jesus defeated the enemies (Acts 2.33). Peter quotes Ps. 110.1 to make his point that it was not David who ascended to heaven and got enthroned, but Jesus. To put it simply. Jesus is resurrected and ascends into heaven to be enthroned as the heir of David’s kingdom.

Peter’s quotation from Joel 3:1–5 plays a significant role in his speech, though I suggest that there is a piece that the scholarship has missed. *Before Jesus is enthroned in heaven, he offers his blood as an atonement in the heavenly temple* as expressed in the combination of “blood, fire, and columns of smoke” that Peter quotes from Joel. *Jesus’s blood offering is the cosmic sacrifice*. We have seen the darkness that prevailed during Jesus’s death, in further agreement with Joel’s expectations about YHWH’s day. And just as Joel invited the people of Israel to repent so that they can receive the Spirit,

---

<sup>642</sup> On Peter’s use of Psalm 16, see: Gregory V. Trull, “Views on Peter’s Use of Psalm 16:8-11 in Acts 2:25-32,” *BibSac* 161 (2004): 194–214.

so Peter invites his audience in Jerusalem to repent and be baptized so that they “will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” (2.37). Hence, the purpose of Luke’s quotation from Joel is to explain the cosmic sacrifice that Jesus offered, followed by the quotation from Psalms 16 and 110 to explain the enthronement of Jesus in heaven. The Epistle to the Hebrews is another text from the circles of Jesus’s followers that follows the same pattern, where Jesus offers his blood as an atonement in the heavenly temple, and is enthroned as a king in heaven: “He is the reflection of God’s glory and the exact imprint of God’s very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word. When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb 1.3).

But Luke connects the dots further in Peter’s speech. Peter says: “Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God (τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ)<sup>643</sup> and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this that you see and hear” (2.33).<sup>644</sup> I have shown in the last chapter that Jesus’s position at the right hand of God in Stephen’s vision betrays Jesus’s priestly ministry. Luke here develops the same idea that Jesus is performing an eschatological priestly ministry in the heavenly temple. Note the temporal relationship between the participles ὑψωθείς and λαβὼν on one hand, and the main verb ἐξέχεεν on the other hand. After Jesus ascended to the right hand of God, and received the promise, he poured out the Spirit. In other words, the pouring of the Spirit *must* happen after Jesus’s ascension to the right hand of God. There is a causal relationship between the ascension and the pouring of the Spirit. We find this causal relationship explicitly in the Gospel of John: “Nevertheless, I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not

---

<sup>643</sup> See the discussion of the dative below.

<sup>644</sup> Janusz Kucicki argues that the source of the Pentecost event, including the pouring of the Spirit, is Jesus, who received the Spirit during his baptism (Lk 3.21) in order to extend this Spirit baptism to those who follow him (Lk 3.16), hence Jesus is still present in the church through his Spirit. Max Turner takes a similar direction to interpret the Pentecost christologically, where Jesus serves as “Lord of the Spirit.” However, while both recognize the significance that Luke attaches to the relationship between the exalted Jesus and the Spirit, they do not recognize the nature of the connection between Jesus and the Spirit, which is Jesus’s offering himself as a sacrifice. See: Janusz Kucicki, *The Function of the Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles: A Key to Interpretation of Luke’s Use of Speeches in Acts*, Bib Int 158 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 61; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 277–78.

come to you, but if I go, I will send him to you” (John 16.7). While the literary relationship between John and Luke-Acts is not clear, it attests the existence of the causal relationship between the ascension and the pouring of the spirit which Luke seems to share implicitly.<sup>645</sup>

We will see the function of the Spirit as a ritually purifying power later, but for now, it is important to note that Luke sees Jesus’s ascension to the right hand of God as the reason for the pouring of the Spirit. Luke sees the ascension event as YHWH’s day, which appears in the quotation from Ps. 110.1, especially when the author says: “Until I make your enemies your footstool.” Just as the prophetic tradition about YHWH’s day emphasizes YHWH’s victory over Judah’s enemies, so Luke here presents the enemies of Jesus defeated under his seat. Based on the images of Jesus’s victory over death in vv. 25–28 and v. 31, it seems safe to conclude that Jesus’s enemy is death. YHWH vindicated Jesus through the resurrection.

Thus, to summarize our findings so far. Luke portrays Jesus as ascending into heaven, offering his blood as a cosmic sacrifice, and then getting enthroned in heaven. This has been indicated by the quotation from Joel, and the notion of Jesus’s ascension at the right hand of God which enables the pouring of the Spirit. I now turn to explore another passage that connects Jesus’s ascension with the benefits of the sacrifice: repentance and forgiveness of sins.

### **Ascension and Forgiveness**

I have shown in the second chapter that the direct goal of the Levitical sacrificial system is to purify the altar, and ultimately, the purification of the worshipper, though in an indirect way. The ritual and moral purities add miasma to the sanctuary, which needs to be purged first before repentance and forgiveness of sins can be possible. The offering of the sacrifice purifies the altar, which allows the worshipper to repent and YHWH forgives their sins. Keeping this ultimate objective of the sacrificial

---

<sup>645</sup> See: Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand.”

system in mind, I suggest that Luke points to Jesus's ascension as a mandatory condition for the realization of repentance and forgiveness of sins.

The clearest place where Luke makes this claim is in Acts 5.31–32:

God exalted him at his right hand (τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ) as Prince (ἀρχηγόν) and Savior that he might give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins (δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν). And we are witnesses to these things, and so is the Holy Spirit whom God has given (καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός) to those who obey him.

Luke presents a significantly direct explanation of Jesus's ascension as the key event for atonement through three elements. The term “Prince,” repentance and forgiveness of sins, Jesus's posture at the right hand of God, and the pouring of the Spirit.<sup>646</sup>

First, the term ἀρχηγός occurs in the New Testament only in Acts 3.15; 5.31; Heb 2.10, and 12.2. The references to Jesus as an ἀρχηγός in Hebrews appears in the context of his atonement ministry within the celestial Dwelling Place. The author of Hebrews uses ἀρχηγός to name Jesus in the beginning (2.10) and end of his epistle (12.2), and in between explains how Jesus becomes ἀρχηγός. Of special importance here is Heb 12.2 since it associates two terms that appear in Acts 5.31: “Looking to Jesus the Prince (ἀρχηγόν) and perfecter of our faith, who for the sake of the joy that was set before him endured the cross, disregarding its shame, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God (ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ).” The author names Jesus ἀρχηγός as he describes Jesus's posture at the right hand of God. We find the same association between naming Jesus as a Prince (ἀρχηγός) and his posture at the right hand of God (τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ) in Acts 5.31. This unique similarity between Acts and Hebrews suggests that they both think of the celestial cultic sphere.

---

<sup>646</sup> Barrett calls this verse “an admirable summary of Lucan theology.” See: Barrett, *Acts*, 1:290.



Second, the author states that God exalted Jesus to God's right hand as prince and savior, with the purpose of giving repentance and forgiveness of sins to Israel. I have shown that repentance and forgiveness of sins are the two main benefits of atonement in the Levitical sacrificial system which Luke knew. Using the purpose infinitival phrase δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,<sup>647</sup> Luke ties Jesus's ascension to the benefits of atonement, in which the former is the cause of the latter. The exaltation of Jesus, his ascension, is portrayed as *the means* through which atonement is achieved. Something about Jesus's ascension *achieved* those benefits of atonement to Israel. The only logical implication is that *Jesus effected atonement in the heavenly sanctuary*.<sup>648</sup> What enforces this conclusion is that Luke links those two benefits to *Israel*. How can Israel receive repentance and forgiveness of sins? According to Leviticus, as we have seen, it is through atonement. Luke is careful in his language too, saying that repentance and forgiveness of sins are given to Israel. Repentance here is not an action that Israel undertakes, which means that Luke is not thinking about Israel's remorse and sinful attitudes that need to be changed. Several commentators resorted to the idea that Luke means God's giving the opportunity, or the time, for Israel to repent. Conzelmann is perhaps the clearest when he says: "Despite the wording, Luke means the opportunity for repentance."<sup>649</sup> But we do not need to go against Luke's wording. Repentance would not be complete without a sacrificial offering, and God gives Israel repentance by providing the needed sacrifice: Jesus. This interpretive direction aligns perfectly with the sacrificial system's design to procure and maintain atoning benefits. As we have seen, the two significant benefits of atonement are the ability to repent, and the forgiveness of sin. Luke's emphasis

---

<sup>647</sup> Daniel Wallace notes that Luke commonly uses causal infinitives to retrospectively look at the reason of his main statement. This grammatical category, however, is rare outside Luke-Acts. See Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 596.

<sup>648</sup> Ethelbert Stauffer was the only scholar during the twentieth century who saw heavenly atonement in this verse: "Von nun an ist der Christus unser Anwalt zur Rechten des Himmelsthrones...unser Hoherpriester, der im himmlischen Heiligtum steht und vor Gottes Angesicht für uns eintritt." See: Ethelbert Stauffer, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Verlag W. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1947), 119. David Moffitt has recently defended the same interpretation. See: Moffitt, "Atonement at the Right Hand," 563.

<sup>649</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 42.

on Jesus's exalted position in Acts is consistent with the hierarchical structure of the Levitical sacrificial practice, where the priestly activities at the altar, within the sanctuary, play a central role in drawing near to YHWH and conveying the sacrifice into YHWH's presence. This understanding suggests that Jesus's presence at God's right hand is a fundamental element of his atoning sacrifice.

Third, we have seen that Jesus's posture as standing in heaven to the right hand of God represents his role as a ministering priest within the heavenly temple. Luke reinforces the idea that Jesus ascended to the right hand of God in Acts 5.31 too. The wording τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ is a dative of place, meaning that God exalted Jesus *toward* God's right hand.<sup>650</sup> Is it a coincidence that Luke maintains Jesus's position at the right hand of God in Acts 2.33 and 5.31, where both passages have sacrificial implications? I suggest that Luke is intentional in showing Jesus ascending to that very position as he serves as a priest, offering his blood within the heavenly sanctuary to effect atonement. The notion about Jesus's position at the right hand of God in both passages does not specify Jesus's posture in heaven. However, both passages appear before the notion in Acts 7.56, where Stephen sees Jesus "standing" to the right hand of God. Jesus's position in heaven in Acts 2.33 and 5.31 should be understood in light of Luke's development of the full picture of Jesus's position in heaven as "standing" in Acts 7.56.<sup>651</sup> Luke portrays Jesus after the model of Israel's high priests, undertaking a priestly ministry in heaven. What kind of priestly service can lead to repentance and forgiveness of sins? As I suggested, this is an atoning service that takes place in the heavenly sanctuary.

Finally, both Acts 2.33 and Acts 5.31–32 further support linking Jesus's pouring out of the Spirit to his exaltation to the Father's right hand, indicating that the ascension of Jesus *precedes* the reception

---

<sup>650</sup> Friedrich Blass and Annelies Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 107.

<sup>651</sup> Barrett notes: "τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ is ambiguous, as at 2:33. The ambiguity should probably be resolved in the same way as there; that is, the dative should be taken as instrumental." Barrett thus suggests understanding τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ as a reference to God's action, exalting Jesus "by his right hand." While Barrett's suggestion is not impossible, my suggestion to understand the dative as a reference to locality ("God exalted him toward his right hand") aligns more with the regular indirect objective meaning of the dative case. See Barrett, Acts 1:290.

of the Spirit. I will develop my discussion of the role of the spirit in Acts in a moment, but we need to attend to what Luke says in Acts 5.32. The Holy Spirit serves as a witness, just like the disciples serve as “witnesses to these things” (μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων). Two questions here must be raised here: What does it mean for the Spirit to be a witness? And what is the antecedent of “these things”? The clause τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων probably refers to Jesus’s crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension as these are the events that Peter discusses in Acts 5.30-31. Luke might mean that the disciples are witnesses in that they saw those events, and Luke has already shown the disciples present at those three significant events. But I suggest the Spirit is a different witness. *The Spirit is a witness to Jesus’s atoning activity in heaven, which allowed the pouring of the Spirit.* When Jesus ascended into the heavenly sanctuary, he effected atonement, which led to the pouring of the Spirit. Peter’s audience, the priests, already saw the pouring of the Spirit on the disciples on Pentecost. This pouring of the Spirit witnesses Jesus’s completed priestly activity in heaven.

Overall, the association between Jesus’s ascension and the conveyance of a priestly service into God’s presence underscores the sacrificial concept of atonement underlying Luke’s narrative in Acts. The correlation between Jesus’s ascension to the right hand of God, the complete repentance, and forgiveness of the sins of Israel, all reflect a sacrificial logic that emphasizes the salvific effects of Jesus’s exalted position. What is the role of the pouring of the Spirit in this atonement narrative then? The best place to understand the function and value of the pouring of the Spirit is Luke’s story of Cornelius’s conversion in Acts 10.

### **The Pouring of the Spirit**

The story of Cornelius, a Gentile who receives the Holy Spirit, and its connection with Peter’s vision of God instructing him to kill and eat impure animals in Acts 10, plays a significant role in

Luke's development of his theology,<sup>652</sup> yet less attention has been given to the way in which the account of Cornelius's purification correlates with the Levitical sacrificial system of atonement.<sup>653</sup>

Luke narrates Cornelius's account of joining the Jesus movement immediately after Paul's account.

Luke then returns back to Paul in Acts 11. This narratological placement of Cornelius's account just in the middle of Luke's story of Paul serves to explain Paul's subsequent ministry among the Gentiles.<sup>654</sup>

I will approach the story from a Jewish cultic perspective, where God's purifying work through the Spirit is not simply a matter of divine declaration, but rather the direct result of Jesus's ascension into the heavenly sanctuary. Acts 10 consists of three major parts. Cornelius's vision (vv. 1–8), Peter's vision (vv. 9–16), and the encounter between Cornelius and Peter (vv. 25–47).

Luke introduces Cornelius as a Roman centurion who is a righteous person and fears God along with his family.<sup>655</sup> Cornelius gave alms generously to the people (presumably, Israel), and used to pray

---

<sup>652</sup> Dennis MacDonald notes that the account of Cornelius's conversion "is a pillar supporting Luke's entire literary and theological construction." See: Dennis R. MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 19.

<sup>653</sup> Some key works are: Martin Dibelius, "The Conversion of Cornelius," in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. H. Greeven (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 96–107; Walter Wilson, "Urban Legends: Acts 10:1–11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives," *JBL* 120 (2001): 77–99; Clinton Wahlen, "Peter's Vision and Conflicting Definitions of Purity," *NTS* 51 (2005): 505–18; François Bovon, "Tradition and Redaction in Acts 10:1–11:18," in *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II*, ed. François Bovon and Glenn E. Snyder, WUNT 237 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 110–28; John R. L. Moxon, *Peter's Halakhic Nightmare: The 'Animal' Vision of Acts 10:9–16 in Jewish and Graeco-Roman Perspective*, WUNT II/432 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); G. D. Nave, *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*, SBLAB 4 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 208–17; David H. Warren, "'Can Anyone Withhold the Water?' (Acts 10:47): Toward an Understanding of Luke's Argument in the Story of Cornelius," in *Early Christian Voices In Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*, ed. David Warren, Ann Graham Brock, and David Pao, Bib Int. 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 131–42; Timothy W. Reardon, "Cleansing through Almsgiving in Luke-Acts: Purity, Cornelius, and the Translation of Acts 15:9," *CBQ* 78 (2016): 463–82; Thomas A. Wayment, "Peter, Cornelius, and Cultural Boundaries," in *The Ministry of Peter, the Chief Apostle: The 43rd Annual Brigham Young University Sidney B. Sperry Symposium*, ed. Frank F. Judd Jr., Eric D. Huntsman, and Shon D. Hopkin (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book, 2014), 211–26; Ronald D. Witherup, "Cornelius over and over and over again: 'Functional Redundancy' in the Acts of the Apostles," *JSNT* 15 (1993): 45–66; J. David Woodington, "Charity and Deliverance from Death in the Accounts of Tabitha and Cornelius," *CBQ* 79 (2017): 634–50; Zachary K. Dawson, *The Message of the Jerusalem Council in the Acts of the Apostles: A Linguistic Stylistic Analysis*, LBS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 77–132; vanThanh Nguyen, *Peter and Cornelius: A Story of Conversion and Mission* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012); Robert C. Tannehill, "'Cornelius' and 'Tabitha' encounter Luke's Jesus," *Int* 48 (1994): 347–56.

<sup>654</sup> Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Acts*, ANTC (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2003), 123.

<sup>655</sup> The characterization of Cornelius in Acts 10 has more implications than what I cover here. For a full discussion, see Alexander Kyrychenko, *The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel: The Role of the Centurion in Luke-* 261

to God (again, presumably, Israel's God). Later on, when Cornelius's guards arrive at Peter's place, they describe Cornelius as someone who is just, who fears God,<sup>656</sup> and who is respected among the Jews (10.22). Cornelius had a vision of an angel, who appeared to him at the ninth hour, saying. "Your prayers and your alms have ascended as a memorial before God" (Αἱ προσευχαί σου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, 10.4). Luke introduces the story using sacrificial language. First, Cornelius sees the vision in the ninth hour. We have seen that this time is significant for Luke, as it is the time of the evening Tamid offering. Luke wants the whole scene to be read within this sacrificial framework. Second, Luke depicts Cornelius's prayers and charitable alms ascending to heaven as a memorial before God. This statement is full of sacrificial imagery. Cornelius's charity works and prayers are, in Luke's view, a sacrificial offering, that ascends in front of God as a memorial (μνημόσυνον). Later on, when Peter arrives at Cornelius's house, Cornelius repeats the angel's statement. "Cornelius, your prayer has been heard, and your alms have been remembered before God" (Κορνήλιε, εἰσηκούσθη σου ἡ προσευχή καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον

---

Acts, BZNW 203 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 162–81; Bonnie J. Flessen, *An Exemplary Man: Cornelius and Characterization in Acts 10* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011), 68–90.

<sup>656</sup> Θεοσεβής occurs seven times in the Old Greek translation of Jewish scriptures and other Jewish writings, applied only to Jewish figures (Exod 18.21; Job 1.1, 8; 2.3; Jdt 11.17; 4 Macc 15.28; 16.1). However, Josephus applies the term to both Jews and non-Jews figures, including David (Ant. 7.130, 153), Jewish rebels (Ant. 12.284), Hyrcanus (Ant. 14.308), and Poppaea, the consort of Nero who supported the Jews (Ant. 20.195). Josephus also speaks of some Gentiles who were σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν as they contributed to the temple (Ant. 14.110). Whether God-fearers were a designated group of Gentile members of the synagogue is debated. For a summary of the different possible meanings of Θεοσεβής, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 146–48, 168–74. For the argument for the existence of this category, see: D.-A. Koch, "The God-Fearers between Facts and Fiction: Two Theosebeis Inscriptions from Aphrodisias and their Bearing for the New Testament," *ST 60* (2006): 62–90. A. Thomas Kraabel spelled much ink arguing against the existence of such group: A. Thomas Kraabel, "The God-fearers Meet the Beloved Disciple," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson, A. Thomas Kraabel, George W. E. Nickelsburg, and Norman R. Petersen (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 276–84; idem, "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers,'" *Numen* 28 (1981): 113–26; idem, "Synagoga Caeca: Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretation of Evidence for Judaism in the Early Christian Period," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 219–46; idem, "Immigrants, Exiles, Expatriates, and Missionaries," in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*, ed. Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger, NovTSup 74 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 71–88; idem, "The God-Fearers—a Literary and Theological Invention," *BAR* (1986): 47–53.

τοῦ θεοῦ, 10.31). The statement occurring at both the beginning and middle of the story highlights its significance for Luke, who wants the reader to situate the story within Israel's sacrificial system.

Luke's language of "Memorial" and alms beings "Remembered" both invoke the memorial portion of the offerings in the Levitical sacrificial system (e.g., Lev. 2.2; 5.12; 6.15). Cornelius's prayers and alms ascend to heaven as if they are offerings that take place in the Jerusalem temple. In contrast, the charity offerings are depicted ascending, probably into the heavenly temple. Almsgiving has sacrificial and atonement functions in Second Temple Jewish literature. The author of the Book of Tobit, for instance, states:

Prayer with fasting and almsgiving and justice is good... it is better to give alms than to store up gold. For alms deliver from death and will purge away every sin. Those who give alms and do justice will have fullness of life. (Tob 12.8–9)<sup>657</sup>

The author of Ben Sira also states:

He who performs an act of charity offers a sacrifice of praise... The sacrifice of a righteous man is acceptable, and its memorial will not be forgotten. (Sir 35.4b, 9)

That Cornelius's prayers ascend as memorial offerings before God might explain why Luke situates Cornelius's current vision exactly during the Tamid offering. Cornelius might have been praying at this time. Luke's description of Cornelius as praying constantly (διὰ παντός, 10.2), might hint at a regular cultic habit of praying during the morning and evening services. In this way, the scene of an angel appearing to Cornelius during the Tamid service time is similar to Zechariah's service in the Jerusalem temple where an angel appeared to him during the Tamid service too. The descriptions of

---

<sup>657</sup> I am indebted to Matthew Thiessen for this reference and the following one. Johnson lists the following citations in support: *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* 4; *Tanchuma Wayera* 1; 1QS 8.1–9; 4QFlor 1.1–6). See: Matthew Thiessen, "A Worthy Cornelius and Divine Grace: Complicating John Barclay's Paul and the Gift," *CBQ* 84 (2022): 462–79 (471); Johnson, *Acts*, 183.

both Zechariah and Cornelius share a few similarities too. Both are said to be righteous, both pray during the Tamid offering time, and both are described as doing good before God. Luke wants the reader to see Cornelius vis-à-vis Zechariah.<sup>658</sup>

After setting the stage in strong cultic language, Luke has Peter see a vision (vv. 9–16). In the vision, Peter sees a net full of animals, including four-footed animals, reptiles, and birds. Then a heavenly voice, probably referring to God,<sup>659</sup> tells Peter to do something contrary to the dietary laws given by Moses. to kill and eat animals declared impure by the Mosaic Law. Peter declines the offer, highlighting his compliance with Mosaic legislation. The animals, he says, are common (κοινός) and impure (ἀκάθαρτος). God then tells him not to call common (κοινός) what God has purified (ἐκαθάρισεν). This conversation between the heavenly voice and Peter happens three times.

Regardless of the vision's meaning for the actual status of the animals, Peter ultimately concludes that its implications extend beyond the realm of food regulations. In Acts 10.28, he boldly declares that, while it was commonly understood that a Jew like himself should not associate too closely with a Gentile like Cornelius, God had revealed to him to “call no one common (κοινός) or impure (ἀκάθαρτος)” (cf. Acts 11.3). Peter's self-realization reflects a logical deduction that in his vision, God was conveying that certain animals that were once considered impure had now been made pure. Peter, thus, links the vision about the impure animals to the impure gentiles,<sup>660</sup> as his response to

---

<sup>658</sup> See the full development of the similarities in Wilson, “The Smell of Sacrifice.”

<sup>659</sup> Peter addresses the voice as “Lord” several times, and later on, Peter speaks of God showing him the vision (10:28). While it is not certain beyond any doubt that the heavenly voice is God's voice, I am more inclined that the speaker in the vision is God. Luke uses a similarly vague language when God speaks during Jesus's baptism (3.21–22) and during the transfiguration incident (9.36).

<sup>660</sup> The inherent impurity of the animals in Peter's vision, and Peter's concern about consuming impure food, make it more likely that Luke's concern about the Gentiles' impurity is related to their ritual impurity (not only moral purification). On the impurity of the Gentiles in early Judaism, see: Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), especially here 45–48, idem, “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism,” *AJSR* 20 (1995): 285–312; Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Cornelius represents God's heavenly message about the food laws.<sup>661</sup> There is a connection between Gentiles and impure animals. Jason Staples argues that: "Throughout early Jewish visionary literature, to have a vision of animals was to see the nations in symbolic form."<sup>662</sup> Staples shows that the utilization of animal imagery to symbolize nations and empires is a remarkable and influential characteristic in early Jewish literature. The *Animal Apocalypse*, for instance, portrays a figurative retelling of the world's history, with human individuals and nations represented as recognizable animals, while divine figures are depicted in human form. The neighboring nations of Israel are showcased as unclean animals, such as wild asses, wolves, and hyenas. Similarly, the Book of Daniel employs animal imagery to represent nations and empires in its visionary material, which parallels Peter's vision more closely than previously thought. These monstrous hybrid beasts embody empires that have assimilated and absorbed several nations, blurring the distinctions between them. The use of monstrous beasts to represent empires is also apparent in later Jewish literature, with *4 Ezra* 11.1–12.39 and the *Testament of Naphtali* 5.6–8 including comparable symbolism for the nations that will hold the twelve tribes of Israel captive. Animal imagery to represent nations is not restricted to the apocalyptic genre but is found in other texts, such as Isa. 65.25, which depicts the wolf and the lamb grazing together, and the lion eating straw like the ox, as a metaphorical depiction of peace. The consistent use of animal imagery to represent nations and empires suggests a deeply rooted belief in Jewish literature that animals could serve as powerful metaphors for political and social realities. The *Animal Apocalypse* associates particular animals with specific nations or empires, such as Egypt, Assyria/Aram, and Babylon, respectively, which highlights the regularity with which animal imagery was employed to represent these political entities. Moreover, the consistent depiction of Israel as cattle or sheep implies that there was a clear understanding of its unique relationship with YHWH. As

---

<sup>661</sup> Origin rhetorically asks: "Does not the apostle Peter seem to you to have transposed onto humanity (what is said about) all these quadrupeds, reptiles, and birds with great clarity?" (*Hom. Lev.* 7.4).

<sup>662</sup> Jason A. Staples, "'Rise, Kill and, Eat': Animals as Nations in Early Jewish Visionary Literature and Acts 10," *JSNT* 42 (2019): 3–17 (5).



domesticated animals, Israel was protected by YHWH, while the other nations were wild and predatory. Hence, the regular use of animal imagery to represent particular nations or empires suggests a clear understanding of the political landscape, while the consistent depiction of Israel as cattle or sheep emphasizes the unique relationship between Israel and YHWH.

These examples serve to show that the animal imagery of the Gentiles was common in the Second Temple period. Peter's vision of the animals prepared him for his visit to Cornelius. Somehow, God was instructing Peter through the vision that the Gentiles have been "purified." This purification is demonstrated to Peter, as Peter is speaking at Cornelius's home about Jesus's death, resurrection, and the coming judgment, the gift of the Spirit is poured out "*even* upon the Gentiles" (Acts 10.45). Luke does not affirm explicitly that the Gentiles have been purified, though he will declare this fact later in Acts 15. Regardless, this conclusion follows not only from Peter's comment in 10.28, but ultimately, and more explicitly, from the fact that the Gentiles have become receptacles fit for the Spirit. Gentiles are also among those to whom the Spirit can be given. Luke employs the story of Cornelius's joining Jesus's followers to explicate God's answer to the question of Gentile inclusion. Nevertheless, this incorporation, particularly to the extent that the account of Cornelius's conversion echoes the Pentecost events Acts 2, implies that the forgiveness of sins, repentance, and purification that Jesus made accessible to the Jews are now equally accessible to Gentiles. The outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles suggests that these Gentiles have undergone a process of purification and are therefore capable to receive the Spirit.

Further confirming that Luke uses cultic categories while crafting Cornelius's account, Peter begins his speech using the language of acceptance: "In every nation the person who fears him and does what is right is welcomed before him (δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἔστιν)" (Acts 10.35), which underscore the result of Gentiles' right doings. The terminology of acceptance is cultic, and has been used in the Old

Greek translation to refer to the acceptance of the sacrifice.<sup>663</sup> “If the offering is a burnt offering from the herd, you shall offer a male without blemish; you shall bring it to the entrance of the Dwelling Place, for acceptance in your behalf before YHWH (αὐτὸ δεκτὸν ἐναντίον κυρίου)” (Lev 1.3), “When you offer a sacrifice of well-being to YHWH, offer it in such a way that it is acceptable on your behalf (δεκτὴν ὑμῶν θύσετε)” (Lev 19.5). Isaiah also uses the same language about the Gentiles’ eschatological offerings: “These I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my altar (τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ἔσονται δεκταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου); for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples” (Isa 56.7). Luke uses the same terminology applied to the Gentiles to affirm that they are now accepted.

Luke makes several statements about the purification of the Gentiles after Acts 10. David Moffitt shows that two interrelated passages comprehend our understanding of the purification process of the Gentiles. First, the summary conclusion that Luke formulates concerning the outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household in Acts 11.16-18. Second, Peter’s comments in Acts 15.8-9 which establish the connections between repentance, forgiveness of sins, the Gentiles’ purification, and the reception of the Spirit more explicitly.<sup>664</sup>

In Acts 11, Peter defends his conduct at Cornelius’s house to those who are offended by his association with Gentiles. He clarifies that, while speaking to Cornelius, God outpours the Spirit on him and his household. Based on the Spirit’s presence, Peter declares in 11.17, “If God gave the same gift to them [i.e., Gentiles] as also to us who believe upon the Lord Jesus Christ, who am I that I should be able to hinder God?” The implications of Gentiles receiving the Spirit are immediately apparent to those who challenge Peter: they conclude that God must have granted “repentance that leads to life”

---

<sup>663</sup> Kyrychenko, *The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel*, 173.

<sup>664</sup> Moffitt, “Atonement at the Right Hand,” 560–61.

even to the Gentiles (τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔδωκεν εἰς ζωὴν, Acts 11.18). Significantly, this “Gentile Pentecost,” as Stephen Wilson calls it,<sup>665</sup> prompts them to reason retrospectively from the presence of the Spirit to the conclusion that the Gentiles have been given repentance unto life, which implies that their sins have been forgiven and thus they have been purified (cf. Luke 24.47; Acts 2.38; 5.31). In Acts 15.8–9, Peter affirms that God, who knows the heart, bore witness to the Gentiles that they had heard and believed in the word about Jesus by giving them the Spirit: “And God, who knows the human heart, testified to them by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us, and in cleansing their hearts by faith (τῇ πίστει καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν) he has made no distinction between them and us.” As Moffitt shows, these two summaries of the Cornelius account reveal two related points: (1) the language of “the repentance unto life” and “the purification of the heart” are closely linked expressions that refer to the same state, which is the ability to receive the Spirit; and (2) the reception of the Spirit serves as proof that allows one to infer retrospectively that the Gentiles must have been granted the required forgiveness and corresponding purification process. The connection between the state of forgiveness and purity on one hand, and the ability to receive the Spirit on the other hand, corresponds remarkably well with the fundamental logic of atonement achieved through sacrifice and the corresponding presence of God with the people.

### **Eschatological Cultic Atonement**

My argument that Luke implicitly adopts a cultic atonement perspective fit well within the early Jewish expectations of an eschatological cultic atonement. Some early Jewish texts involve the expectation that there is a priestly figure who will perform eschatological atonement on behalf of the Jews. In his descriptions of the eschatological temple, Ezekiel indicates that a specific royal figure will provide for the eschatological sacrificial atonement:

---

<sup>665</sup> Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 23 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 177.

But this shall be the obligation of the Prince regarding the burnt offerings, grain offerings, and drink offerings, at the festivals, the new moons, and the sabbaths, all the appointed festivals of the house of Israel. he shall provide the purification offerings, grain offerings, the ascension offerings, and the offerings of well-being, to make atonement for the house of Israel. (Ezek 45.17).

The context of the passage indicates that in the eschatological age, all the people will provide for the operation of the eschatological temple by making offerings to the Prince. The people will provide the temple tax which will contribute to different offerings that the Prince will offer on behalf of his people, which shows the need for eschatological cleansing.<sup>666</sup> Elsewhere, the mentioned prince is described as Davidic shepherd (Ezek 34.23–24; 37.24–25), an image that plays a critical role in Luke’s characterization of Jesus.<sup>667</sup> The basic message of the passage, however, is that there is cultic atonement in the eschatological age.<sup>668</sup>

Malachi also predicts that on the last day, YHWH will come to the temple and purify the Levite priests to offer to YHWH:

See, I am sending my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple... and he will purify the descendants of Levi and refine them

---

<sup>666</sup> See Stephen L. Cook, *Ezekiel 38–48: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 22B (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018), 235.

<sup>667</sup> As Sarah Harris has shown, Ezekiel, particularly Ezekiel 34, plays a significant role in Luke-Acts by providing a foundational text that Luke draws upon to develop the motif of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd-king. This motif is used to highlight Jesus’s identity and mission, especially in his care for the lost, the sick, and the marginalized. The same passages from Ezekiel about the Davidic Prince play a key role in Matthew’s shepherd imagery too. See: Sarah Harris, *The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative*, LNTS 558 (London: T&T Clark, 2016), 104–105, 155; Michael P. Barber, *The Historical Jesus and the Temple: Memory, Methodology, and the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 70–71.

<sup>668</sup> Ezekiel seems to envision the new world as a place and age where sin will continue to exist among the Jews. YHWH, however, provides the sacrificial system as the provision means for forgiveness of sins. Hence, the eschatological atonement is not a once-for-all event in Ezekiel, but an ongoing effective atonement. See: Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 659. Cf. Tova Ganzel, “First-Month Rituals in Ezekiel’s Temple Vision: A Pentateuchal and Babylonian Comparison,” *CBQ* 83 (2021): 390–406.

like gold and silver, until they present offerings to the LORD in righteousness ( מגישי מנחה ( בצדקה). (Mal 3.1-3).

The prophet then describes the eschatological Jewish offerings: “Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to YHWH as in the days of old and as in former years” (Mal 3.4). The prophet maintains that eschatological offering will please YHWH, comparing it to the accepted sacrifices that Israel offered in the past.

Traditions about the Melchizedek develops further the eschatological cultic atonement. I have mentioned 11QMelchizedek briefly earlier and how it impacted some early Jesus followers, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. One passage is of significant relevance to the eschatological atonement in Luke specifically:

And liberty will be proclaimed for them, to free them from [the debt of] all their iniquities. And this [wil]l [happen] in the first week of the jubilee which follows the ni[ne] jubilees. And the d[ay of aton]ement is the e[nd of]the tenth [ju]bilee in which atonement shall be made for all the sons of [light and] for the men [of] the lot of Mel[chi]Zedek. (11QMelchizedek 2.6–8)<sup>669</sup>

The passage shows that there is an expectation for an eschatological atonement made for the Sons of the Light. The text does not identify who are the Sons of the Light, but the term recurs widely in the Dead Sea Scrolls to refer to the members of the community who viewed themselves as loyal to God.<sup>670</sup> According to this passage, there is an expectation of an eschatological Day of Atonement.

---

<sup>669</sup> I follow Martinez and Tigchelaar’s reconstruction. See Martinez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 1:1207.

<sup>670</sup> In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the cosmic division between the Light and the Darkness plays a role in the distinction between goodness and evil, knowledge and ignorance, power and weakness, in a dualistic sense. God is described as “The God of lights” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 9.10–12 and 23.1–3; 1Q34 3.II.1–4; 11Q5 26.9–15). Humans are also divided into Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness, especially in *Serekh Ha-Yahad* (1QS 10.1–10). Each individual inherits parts of the light and darkness upon their birth, but God may shine God’s light into the hearts of God’s chosen (1QS 2.3–4, CD 13.1–2, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12.5–6). The sons of darkness follow Belial’s leadership, while the sons of light follows the pathway of God. The community’s members viewed themselves as the community of the sons of light (1QS 2.16, and 3.8). See: Jean

Melchizedek, who serves as a heavenly priest in an angelic sphere, will perform atonement on behalf of all sons of light.<sup>671</sup> Melchizedek performs other duties in the same scroll, including a role in the final judgment, the destruction of Belial's armies in the eschatological battle, and the restoration of peace. Thus, Eric Mason describes Melchizedek in the scroll as being “presented as fulfilling functions consistent with messianic figures.”<sup>672</sup> Moreover, Melchizedek is depicted as performing eschatological cultic atonement in the heavenly temple, indicating that the concept of sacrificial atonement in the heavenly temple is not unique to Luke. This suggests that Luke's portrayal is part of a broader theological tradition rather than an original creation.

The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a text we examined earlier that heavily focuses on the heavenly temple, depicts Melchizedek as a celestial priest ministering in God's heavenly assembly (11Q401 11.3).<sup>673</sup> In Hebrews 7, the author seems aware of a tradition depicting Melchizedek as an immortal celestial high priest. While the chapter connects Melchizedek to Jesus, the primary argument is that Jesus is the true celestial high priest, not Melchizedek.<sup>674</sup> Notably, this suggests that at least some of Jesus's followers were invoking Melchizedek's celestial and eternal priesthood to articulate

---

Duhaime, “Light and Darkness,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 Volumes, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:495–96.

<sup>671</sup> Melchizedek appears as a priest in Gen 14; Ps. 110.4, and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

<sup>672</sup> Mason, ‘You Are a Priest Forever,’ 172. Mason later confirms: “The author of 11QMelchizedek envisions him as the high priest conducting this eschatological Day of Atonement sacrifice” (p. 184). Fred Horton similarly comments: “The functions assigned to Melchizedek in the 11QMelchizedek are elsewhere either assigned to God or to other figures such as Michael.” See Fred L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 81.

<sup>673</sup> The text does not include the full name of Melchizedek, only צדק, but Newsom's construction includes the full name of Melchizedek “[מלכין] צדק כוהן בעד[ת אל]” which is a reasonable construction. Davilla comments: “The name is probable, given the singular “priest” in this line (elsewhere only in VIII 4Q403 111:24).” Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 133; James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, ECDSS 6 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 162.

<sup>674</sup> A later Coptic Gnostic text from Nag Hammadi about Melchizedek, *The Melchizedek Tractate* (NHC IX, 1), identifies him and Jesus as one person to solve this problem. See Søren Giversen and Birger A. Pearson, “Melchizedek,” in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, ed. James M. Robinson, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), 439.

and understand Jesus's priestly role.<sup>675</sup> Another text from Qumran, the *Apocryphon of Levi*, points to the eschatological atonement that an unnamed eschatological priest will perform on behalf of his people:

And he will atone for all the children of his generation, and he will be sent to all the children of his [people]. His word is like the word of the heavens, and his teaching, according to the will of God. His eternal sun will shine, and its fire will burn in all the ends of the earth; above the darkness it will shine. Then, darkness will vanish [fr]om the earth, and gloom from the dry land. (4Q541 9.I.2–5).

This passage does not only attest to eschatological priestly cultic atonement, but connects the themes of sunshine, and darkness that turns into shine, to eschatological atonement. I have shown that Luke points to the prevailing of darkness on earth during Jesus's crucifixion while implying that the sun shines again in the heavenly temple. Regardless, it seems that at least in Qumran there was an expectation for an eschatological atonement. The Damascus Document attests to this expectation, which was associated with the arrival of the future Israel/Aaron Messiah:

And this is the exact nature of the laws by which they shall rule in the period of evil until there arises the Messiah of Aaron and Israel who will atone for their iniquity. (CD 14.19)<sup>676</sup>

The recipients of this eschatological atonement in the passage are the members of the Yahad, who follow the instructions of the Teacher of Righteousness as can be gleaned from the following passage:

---

<sup>675</sup> John might also be another New Testament author who has been influenced by Melchizedek's traditions, especially in his portrayal of Jesus as the Logos. Philo interprets Melchizedek allegorically as a high priest symbolizing the Logos, or Reason. He portrays Melchizedek as a righteous king, contrasting him with the Mind, characterized as the Ruler of War, which drives the individual towards wickedness and the excessive indulgence of passions (*Leg. All.* III 79-82; cf. *Congr.* 99; *Abr.* 235). Cf. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 165.

<sup>676</sup> Steven Fraade comments: "There is renewed anticipation of the atoning power of the expected Messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel." Steven Fraade, *The Damascus Document*, OCDSS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 121.

But all those who remain steadfast in these regulations, [co]ming and going in accordance with the law, and listen to the Teacher's voice, and confess before God: "Assuredly have we sinned, both we and our fathers, walking contrary to the ordinances of the covenant; just[ice] and truth are your judgments against us;" and they do not raise their hand against his holy regulations and his just judgment[s]and his truthful stipulations; and they are instructed in the first ordinances, in conformity with which the men of the Unique One were judged; and they lend their ears to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness; and do not reject the just regulations when they hear them; these shall exult and rejoice and their heart will be strong, and they shall prevail over all the sons of the world. And God will atone for them, and they shall see his salvation, for they have taken refuge in his holy name. (CD-B 20.27–33).

The Messiah is expected to be a priestly Messiah, who will perform cultic atonement for the forgiveness of sins for the community. Until then, there will be sins and punishments within the community to regulate its own members according to the commandments. Similarly, in 4QGrace after Meals (4Q434<sup>a</sup>), the worshipper prays: "He will eliminate nations and the wicked [...] renew the works of the heavens and of the earth, and they will rejoice and (with) his glory will be filled [all the earth. For] their [guil]t he will atone, and the one who is great in goodness will console them" (4Q43<sup>a</sup> 1+2.2–4).

These passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls show that there was an expectation among some segments of the early Jews for an eschatological atonement. 11QMelchizedek, however, is particularly significant for our investigation of cultic atonement in Luke-Acts, as the parallels between both works



have been noted.<sup>677</sup> Both the scroll and Luke 4 make use of Isa 61.1–2,<sup>678</sup> as they focus on the realization of the eschatological Jubilee. The author of 11QMelchizedek uses Isa 61.1–2 in an apocalyptic framework that utilizes quotations from Lev 25, Deut 15, Ps 82, and Dan 7, while Luke 4 joins the same passage with Isa 58.6 as a programmatic statement of Jesus’s ministry which also aims at the eschatological realization of the Jubilee. The connection between 11QMelchizedek and Luke-Acts is important because it helps us understand the role of cultic atonement in the realization of the eschatological Jubilee. Melchizedek liberates the captives (Lines 2–9), called his inheritance (Line 5). He frees them “from the debt of all their iniquities” (Line 6), during “the year of grace of Melchizedek” (Line 9), to bring about “the administration of Justice.” Immediately after these statements, the author of the scroll depicts Melchizedek performing cultic atonement in an eschatological Yom Kippur setting. Hence, cultic atonement and the Jubilee come hand in hand within the scroll.

In Luke 4, Jesus speaks in a strikingly similar way to Melchizedek. Jesus says: “He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives” (v. 18), and “to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (v. 19).<sup>679</sup> Jesus also speaks about the liberation of the oppressed in the context of effective justice. While Melchizedek is clearly opposed to Belial, Luke crafts Jesus’s speech at the synagogue in the middle of

---

<sup>677</sup> James A. Sanders, “From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4,” in *Luke and Scripture*, 49–69; Mary Ann Beavis, “The Kingdom of God, ‘Utopia’ and Theocracy,” *JSHJ* 2 (2004): 91–106; Bovon, *Luke* 1, 153; Christopher R. Bruno, “‘Jesus is our jubilee’...but how?: The OT Background and Lukan Fulfillment of the Ethics of Jubilee,” *JETS* 53 (2010): 81–101; Marinus de Jonge and Adam S. van der Woude, “11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–26; Timothy H. Lim, “11QMelch, Luke 4 and the Dying Messiah,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 90–92; R. Steven Notley, “Jesus’ Jewish Hermeneutical Method in the Nazareth Synagogue,” in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*, Vol. 2: Exegetical Studies, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, LNTS 392 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 46–59.

<sup>678</sup> On the role of Isa 61:1–2 in 11QMelchizedek, see the discussion in Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “11QMelchizedek,” in *Qumran Cave 11 II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 221–41; Merrill P. Miller, “The Function of Isa 61:1–2 in 11Q Melchizedek,” *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–69; D. F. Miner, “A Suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17,” *JSJ* 2 (1971): 144–48. Fitzmyer does not mention the citation of Isa 61:1–2 in the scroll: Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41.

<sup>679</sup> For a full list of parallels between 11QMelchizedek and Luke 4, see: Jonathan Kaplan, “Luke 4:16–30, The Melchizedek Document (11Q13), and the Eschatological Interpretation of Isaiah 61,” in *Luke and Acts with(in) Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Isaac W. Oliver, Jocelyn McWhirter, Joshua Scott, BZNW 256 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2025) (forthcoming).

two confrontations with demonic, unclean spirits (Lk 4.1–14; 31–37). These similarities suggest that Luke might be operating with the same thought sequence: *cultic atonement and the Jubilee come hand in hand*. Just like Melchizedek achieves the liberation of the sons of the light in the eschaton in conjunction with cultic atonement that Melchizedek practices in heaven, I suggest that Luke perceives Jesus practicing the cultic atonement in heaven in order to purify his followers and bring the eschatological Jubilee. That is, cultic atonement is an *assumed component* in Luke’s soteriological theology. It comes before the realization of the eschatological Jubilee with all what it brings for human liberation, whether on the socio-political level or the spiritual realm.<sup>680</sup> When Luke portrays Jesus as offering himself as an atoning sacrifice, then, he is thinking along those Jewish authors who were expecting an eschatological atonement for purification.

### **Jesus. The Gentile’s Sacrifice**

A final question needs to be addressed. There is no mention of the purification of the Gentiles through sacrificial offerings in Leviticus or any other ancient Jewish sources, which raises the question about the purification of the Gentiles in Acts 10. I do admit that Leviticus and other Jewish writings pertaining to the purification rituals do not address the purification of the Gentiles in sacrificial terms. However, there is evidence for eschatological joining of the Gentiles with the Jews offering sacrifices that leads to *acceptance* before YHWH. Isaiah, which I have shown has shaped the narrative perspective of Luke, shows that the strangers (גֵּר) or nations (גוֹיִם), will join Israel in the future as the eschatological elect of YHWH. The author of First Isaiah says. “But YHWH will have compassion on Jacob and will again choose Israel and will set them in their own land; and aliens (גֵּר) will join them and attach themselves to the house of Jacob” (Isa 14.1). Zechariah shares the same eschatological perspective where the Gentiles will join the Jews: “Many nations (גוֹיִם) shall join themselves to YHWH

---

<sup>680</sup> Hence, in my treatment of Reardon’s *The Politics of Salvation* in the introduction, I did not fully disagree with his conclusion, but only hinted at the lack of cultic atonement in his soteriological model of Luke’s writings.

on that day and shall be my people; and I will dwell in your midst” (Zech 2.11; cf. 8.22).<sup>681</sup> But how can YHWH dwell among the amalgamated community of the Jews and the Gentiles? I have shown in the second chapter that YHWH’s presiding within the Dwelling Place was based on the condition of purifying the altar from the impurities that the Jews commit. We see a similar perspective in Third Isaiah where the author envisions the Gentiles offering sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple:

And the foreigners who join themselves to YHWH, to minister to him, to love the name of YHWH, and to be his servants, all who keep the sabbath, and do not profane it, and hold fast my covenant, these I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; *their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my altar* (עולתיהם וזבחייהם) (לרצון על-מזבחי); for my house shall be called a house of prayer (ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται) for all peoples. (Isa 56.7)

Note how the ultimate goal of the Gentile’s sacrifice is to have *acceptability* with YHWH, which is a key term that assumes the purification of the offerer as I have shown in the second chapter (see above).<sup>682</sup> Again, this is the same language of the Tamid offering in Leviticus: “If the offering is a burnt offering from the herd, you shall offer a male without blemish; you shall bring it to the entrance of the Dwelling Place, for *acceptance* in your behalf before YHWH (לרצנו לפני יהוה)” (Lev 1.3).

---

<sup>681</sup> Haggai also attests that the Gentiles will offer all their treasures to support the temple: “I will shake all the nations, so that the treasure of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with splendor, says YHWH of hosts” (Hag 2:7).

<sup>682</sup> The wider context of the passage, especially chapters 56-57, addresses a theological crisis that took place following the restoration of Judah after the return from the Babylonian exile. Walter Brueggemann argues that the theological problem is rooted in what he calls a “social construction,” which raises the question of who can participate in the cultic worship of the rebuilt temple in Jerusalem. The author of Third Isaiah opens the door for non-Jews to join in the cultic worship. Paul Hanson identifies two main themes in Third Isaiah, first, that it pictures an eschatological ideal of the community in their internal relationships, and their relationship with YHWH. Second, a furious defense of that eschatological ideal. Within this eschatological ideal reality, the foreigners who join the Jews and embrace the cult of YHWH, can offer sacrifices, which, presumably, the same sacrifices that the Jews offer. See: Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40–66* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 164; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 41–42; idem, *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 287–90.

In fact, Luke is familiar with this passage, as evidenced by his depiction of Jesus quoting it during a confrontation with the merchants of sacrificial animals in the Court of the Gentiles: “He said, ‘It is written (γέγραπται), ‘My house shall be a house of prayer’ (καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς); but you have made it a den of robbers’” (Lk 19.46). Throughout both the Gospel and Acts, Luke consistently portrays the temple as a place of worship and prayer (Lk 1.10-13; 2.29-32; 18.9-14; 24.53; Acts 3.1; 22.17).<sup>683</sup> However, the critical point for my argument is that Luke’s citation of this passage from Isaiah reflects a shared conviction with the Isaianic tradition: *There existed a Jewish expectation of an eschatological temple where the offerings of Gentiles would be accepted by God.*<sup>684</sup> This same conviction is further emphasized later in Isaiah, where the author predicts, “And *acceptable* sacrifice will be offered upon my altar, and my house of prayer will be glorified (καὶ ἀνενεχθήσεται δεκτὰ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριόν μου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τῆς προσευχῆς μου δοξασθήσεται)” (Isa 60.7 LXX).<sup>685</sup> The passage employs the same “house of prayer” terminology to refer to the eschatological sacrifice and its acceptability.

But this is not the only indicator that Luke knows this passage well. Few verses earlier in Isaiah 56, the author predicts:

For thus says YHWH. To the *eunuchs* who keep my sabbaths, who choose the things that please me and hold fast my covenant, I will give, in my house and within my walls, a monument and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off. (Isa 56.4–5)

---

<sup>683</sup> Green, *Luke*, 693.

<sup>684</sup> Luke (and Matthew) omits πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν which Mark has from Isa 56:7b. Why does Luke omit it? Bovon thinks that both evangelists omitted the words because, writing post 70 C.E., they no longer viewed the Jerusalem temple “can no longer serve ‘all peoples’ as a place of prayer” (*Luke* 3, 20). I think there is a simpler solution. Luke might want to make a sharp contrast between corrupted commerce (hence, “den of robbers”) and prayer.

<sup>685</sup> Wolter, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:376.

The author has a specific prediction about the future salvation of eunuchs (LXX. ὁ εὐνοῦχος). It is not clear from the passage whether those eunuchs are Jews who were excluded from the cultic worship in the author's community, or if they were Gentiles who, like the foreigners, decided to join themselves to the Jews in the author's community.<sup>686</sup> The specific ethnic identity of the eunuchs in Isaiah is not essential for my argument. Although Luke does not directly cite these two verses, he constructs a narrative in Acts 8 in which a eunuch who is "an important official in charge of all the treasury of the Kandake... had gone to Jerusalem to worship," (Acts 8.27) and becomes a follower of the Way.<sup>687</sup> Without delving into the particulars of the story, it is important to highlight that Luke deliberately chooses an eunuch to symbolize inclusion in the Jesus movement. This narrative alludes to Isaiah 56, which foretells the acceptance of offerings from Gentiles. Furthermore, Luke portrays the eunuch as reading from the book of Isaiah (Acts 8.28). Although it is not possible to determine with certainty which specific passage from Isaiah the eunuch was reading within the narrative framework of Luke-Acts, the choice of Isaiah is likely intentional, possibly alluding to Isaiah 56. This connection is unlikely to be coincidental.

On another occasion, Third Isaiah portrays the Gentiles themselves as being offered as a sacrifice akin to Israel's offerings: "They shall bring all your kindred from all the nations as an offering to YHWH, on horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and on mules, and on dromedaries, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, says YHWH, just as the Israelites bring a grain offering in a clean vessel to the

---

<sup>686</sup> Blenkinsopp argues that castration was not a common practice in ancient Israel based on the rarity of the notion in Jewish texts, hence he concludes that the eunuchs represent Gentiles in the passage. There are other reasons in the passage that supports that the eunuchs in the passage are Gentiles, chief among them, in my opinion, is the parallelism with the foreigners in the same passage. See Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 137.

<sup>687</sup> On the relationship between the eunuch passage in Isaiah among other passages, and Acts 8, see: Andrew M. Mbuvi, "Revisiting Translation and Interpretation Issues in the Story of the African Royal Official ("Ethiopian Eunuch") in Acts 8:26–40: The Hebrew Bible (LXX) Background," *OTE* 34 (2021):1–11. Cf. Anna Rebecca Solevåg, "No Nuts? No Problem!: Disability, Stigma, and the Baptized Eunuch in Acts 8:26–40," *Bib. Int.* 24, (2016): 81–99; Sarah J. Melcher, "A Tale of Two Eunuchs: Isaiah 56:1–8 and Acts 8:26–40," in *Disability Studies and Biblical Literature*, ed. Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 117–28; Scott Shauf, "Locating the Eunuch: Characterization and Narrative Context in Acts 8:26–40," *CBQ* 71 (2009): 762–75.

house of YHWH. And I will also take some of them as priests and as Levites, says YHWH” (Isa 66.20-21).<sup>688</sup> In this passage, not only are the Gentiles envisioned as becoming a sacrifice themselves, but YHWH also declares that some of them will be appointed as priests who will offer sacrifices alongside the Jews.

In the Second Temple period, there was an expectation that Gentiles will offer an eschatological sacrifice to YHWH.<sup>689</sup> The author of Tobit, for instance, says:

O Jerusalem, the holy city, he will afflict you for the deeds of your sons, but again he will show mercy to the sons of the righteous. Give thanks worthily to the Lord, and praise the King of the

---

<sup>688</sup> Paul seems to think similarly about his mission to the Gentiles where the Gentiles are pictured as an offering and he is the priest: “To be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the priestly service of the gospel of God, so that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit” (Rom 15:16).

<sup>689</sup> There is no notion in early Judaism that the Gentiles participated in the sacrificial offerings in the Jerusalem temple. However, there is one potential exception that deserves a word here. Josephus indicates that the Jews offered a sacrifice twice a day on behalf of Gaius Ceasar and the Roman empire: “The Judeans declared that they offered sacrifice twice a day for Caesar and the Roman people” (*J.W.* 2.197). This incident should be understood carefully. First, this is an exceptional offering. Not every Gentile could offer a sacrifice in the Jerusalem temple. Second, this sacrifice offering is politically loaded. The context that Josephus explains shows that Petronius, a Roman commander, arrived in Jerusalem and wanted to erect a statue of Gaius in the Jerusalem temple. The Jews rejected the request to erect an image of their God in the temple, to which Petronius responded: “Will you then make war on Ceasar?” (*J.W.* 2.196). Petronius’s response indicates that if the Jews did not follow his request the Romans would have seen them as enemies to the empire and Ceasar. Hence, the Jews decided to offer the sacrifice on his behalf to avoid any political conflicts and said: “But if he wants to set up the images, he will need first to offer up as a sacrifice the entire nation of Judeans” (*J.W.* 2.197). Josephus comments: “Amazement and compassion went into Petronius at these [words], both for the insuperable devotion of the men and for their ready, ecstatic disposition toward death. Unsuccessful for the time being, they were dismissed” (*J.W.* 2.198). Later on, Josephus tells how Eleazar son of Ananias persuaded the priests to stop accepting these sacrifices on behalf of Rome, which led to a subsequent war: “Meanwhile, in the temple, Eleazar son of the high priest Ananias, a very young man serving as commandant at the time, induced those performing the services of worship to accept no gift or sacrifice from any outsider. This was a foundation of war against the Romans, for they cast aside the sacrifice on behalf of these [the Romans] and Caesar” (*J.W.* 2.408–10). Eleazar’s desire to stop the sacrifices was driven by political goals too. Philo attests to a similar fact where Augustus asked the Jews to offer two sacrifices daily on his behalf at his own expense (Philo, *Legat.* 157, 317, 357). Josephus, however, claims that it was the Jews who covered the expenses for the sacrifices (*Against Apion*, 2.77). It is possible that these sacrifices were the results of negotiating the imperial cult, hence instead of worshipping the emperor, the Jews were offering these sacrifices as a sign of their loyalty to Rome. Regardless, these sacrifices were not regular ones that any Gentile can offer. The Jews were the ones who performed the offering, and, if Josephus was correct, the Jews also paid for them. *The fact that Luke has Paul not allowing Gentiles to enter the Jerusalem temple in Acts 21.29 shows that Luke did not envision the Gentiles’ eschatological offering as taking place in the Jerusalem temple.* See: Steve Mason, *Judean War 2: Translation and Commentary*, Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Vol. 1B (Brill: Leiden, 2008), 164; David J. Downs, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul’s Collection for Jerusalem in Its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*, WUNT 2/248 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 8. For a critique of the imperial cult theory, see: Monika Bernett, *Der Kaiserkult in Judäa unter den Herodiern und Römern* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 194–97.

ages, that his tent may be raised for you again with joy. May he cheer those within you who are captives, and love those within you who are distressed, to all generations forever. Many nations will come from afar to the name of the Lord God, bearing gifts in their hands, gifts for the King of heaven. (*Tob* 13.9–11)<sup>690</sup>

While the passage does not speak clearly of a purifying sacrifice, it refers to certain gifts that the Gentiles will bring to YHWH in the temple.<sup>691</sup> The Jewish Hellenistic author of the Sibylline Oracles phrases the notion more explicitly:

And then all the islands and cities will say... ‘Come, let us fall on the ground and entreat the immortal king, the great eternal God. Let us send to the temple, since he alone is sovereign, and let us all ponder the law of the Most High God’... From every land they will bring incense and gifts to the house of the great God. There will be no other house among men, even for future generations to know, except the one which God gave to faithful men to honour (*Sib. Or.* 3.715–719, 772–775).<sup>692</sup>

When we situate Acts 10 within these ancient Jewish works about the eschatological sacrifice of the Gentiles, we begin to unpack what Luke says about Jesus’s sacrifice in the heavenly temple.<sup>693</sup> It is certainly to Luke’s mind an eschatological sacrifice which pertains to *the age to come*, hence it does not fit entirely into one of Israel’s cultic sacrifices which pertains to *this age*. That is, Luke is thinking

---

<sup>690</sup> The Animal Apocalypse also maintains that the Gentiles will gather in the Jerusalem temple, though it does not mention the sacrifice: “The Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than the first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one... And all the sheep were within it. And I saw all the sheep that remained. And all the animals on the earth and all the birds of heaven were falling down and worshiping those sheep and making petition to them and obeying them in everything” (1 En. 90:29–31). See Devorah Dimant, “Jerusalem and the Temple in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90) in Light of the Qumran Community Worldview,” in *From Enoch to Tobit*, ed. Devorah Dimant, FAT 114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 119–37.

<sup>691</sup> See Jill Hicks-Keeton, “Already/Not Yet: Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit,” *JBL* 132 (2013): 97–117.

<sup>692</sup> Andrew Chester, “The Sibyl and the Temple,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*, ed. William Horbury, JSNTSup 48 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 37–69.

<sup>693</sup> Num 15.14 instructs the foreigner (גר) to offer the sacrifice in the same way the Jew would offer it: “A foreigner who lives with you, or who takes up permanent residence among you, and wishes to offer an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to YHWH, shall do as you do.”

through sacrificial lenses, yet he is offering a new way to think through those lenses. Jesus is a new sacrifice that purifies the Jews and Gentiles.

Luke seems to underline the purification result of Jesus's offering to the Gentiles. As demonstrated, one of the central objectives of the sacrificial system was to produce and uphold the states of forgiveness and purity required for YHWH's presence to persist among the people by residing in the Holy of Holies. The presence of YHWH at the temple and the people's ability to approach him were contingent on the observance of the sacrificial rites prescribed by the Law. From this perspective, Luke's language of repentance and purification, and particularly the connection between these concepts and the outpouring of the Spirit, along with Luke's consistent connection between Jesus's ascension into the heavenly temple and the outpouring of the Spirit, all suggest that Luke perceives Jesus as effecting atonement in the heavenly temple. This atonement purified the Jews and the Gentiles, which enabled repentance, forgiveness of sins, and the pouring of the Spirit. The pouring of the Spirit represents the ultimate goal of the sacrificial system. to maintain YHWH's presence among his people.

## **Conclusion**

Luke crafts the ascension narratives in cultic terminology. He shows that Jesus ascends to heaven as a sacrifice, using the same wording that is used about the sacrifices in the Torah. Not only that, but Luke also explains the significance of the ascension through the lenses of sacrificial offering and purification. Jesus offers his blood as a cosmic sacrifice that has been predicted by Joel, and Peter highlights it in his Pentecost speech. Through this cosmic sacrifice, Jesus granted repentance and forgiveness of sins to his people. Beneficiaries from the resultant purification are Jews and the Gentiles. Cornelius specifically serves as the paradigmatic Gentile, who is purified as a result of his offerings, and, as I have shown, as a result of Jesus's sacrifice which enabled the pouring of the Spirit.

Luke presents Jesus dying as a sacrifice, which enables salvation as predicted by Zechariah: "To give his people knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of their sins. By the tender mercy of



our God, the dawn from on high will break upon us, to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace” (Lk 1.77–79).

## **Conclusion: Ascension and Atonement**

This dissertation sought to establish the presence of atonement theology within Luke-Acts. Through Luke's narrative, Jesus is portrayed as a sacrificial offering within the heavenly temple, accomplishing purification for both Jews and Gentiles. By situating Luke-Acts within the broader context of Second Temple Judaism, this study has provided a more nuanced understanding of Luke's perspective on cultic atonement, demonstrating that atonement theology is not only present but central to his theological vision.

### **Summary**

Although the centrality of the temple has been widely recognized in Lukan scholarship, its implications for cultic worship in Luke-Acts have not been thoroughly examined. I argued that Luke's depiction of the Jerusalem temple is consistently positive. This argument is supported by a detailed examination of various key scenes throughout Luke's narrative that highlights the temple's significance. In the Gospel of Luke, I analyzed ten specific scenes, which are grouped into three main sections: those within the infancy narrative (Luke 1.1–2.52), those located in the central portion of the Gospel (Luke 3.1–19.27), and those occurring during the final days of Jesus's life and following his resurrection (Luke 19.28–24.53). Moreover, I have shown that the importance of the temple continues into the Acts of the Apostles, underscoring its centrality in two major contexts: 1) the temple in the ministry of the twelve disciples, 2) and the temple in Paul's ministry. I have shown that the temple remains a crucial and central place of worship throughout Luke-Acts.

I then moved to the most significant form of worship conducted within the temple: the offering of sacrifices. I have shown that Luke identifies the Jerusalem temple as the proper place for these ritual

practices. The Levitical sacrificial system represents the foundational sacrificial framework from Luke's perspective as reflected in the Gospel and Acts. Hence, I dissected the Levitical sacrificial system, exploring all five types of sacrifices as described in Leviticus. I gave special attention to four of these offerings—the ascension offering, the well-being offering, the purification offering, and the guilt offering—and their role in achieving *kipper* (atonement). I concluded that the logic of purification within these rituals operates on two interconnected levels: the sanctuary as the direct object of the purification is purified through the application of sacrificial blood, thereby enabling the purification of the worshipper, who is the indirect object of purification. This dual process of purification allows for the worshipper's repentance and the subsequent forgiveness of sins, effectively restoring the relational dynamic between YHWH and the worshipper. The primary goal was to provide a comprehensive understanding of how Luke implicitly applies the same logic of sacrificial purification to Jesus. I also explored the concept of the heavenly temple as articulated in the Jewish scriptures and early Jewish literature. The chapter is organized to move from explicit to implicit evidence, beginning with the Jewish scriptures and then expanding to Second Temple literature. Within the Jewish scriptures, I presented evidence for the heavenly temple in several key passages, including the heavenly pattern of the tabernacle (Exodus 25.9), the heavenly pattern of the temple (1 Chronicles 28.12), and Ezekiel's visions. Regarding early Jewish sources, I draw on evidence from ten texts in addition to the books of Hebrews and Revelation, demonstrating a widespread conceptualization of the heavenly temple in early Jewish thought.

We have seen that Luke shares a similar conceptual vocabulary with other early Jewish authors concerning the heavenly temple. Although Luke does not explicitly reference the heavenly temple, he uses several descriptions that align with how other early Jewish authors depict this idea. The evidence for the heavenly temple in Luke-Acts is derived from three specific scenes: the encounter between Jesus and the Jewish council (Luke 22.69), Jesus's promise of paradise to the penitent thief (Luke

23.43), and various elements within the crucifixion narrative. Following that, I examined the ascension of Jesus as an entrance into the heavenly temple, where he offers himself as a sacrifice for the purification of both Jews and Gentiles. While Luke does not explicitly articulate this concept, he employs sacrificial terminology that is consistent with a broader sacrificial framework. I have shown evidence for Jesus's sacrificial offering in the heavenly temple, drawing on key passages in Luke-Acts. The ascension narratives in Luke-Acts are rich with cultic language and imagery, presenting Jesus in a manner that parallels the priest Simon son of Onias. I also showed that Jesus's ascension in Acts is a salvific event that initiates the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel and the purification of the Gentiles. The restoration of Israel's tribes is closely linked to Jesus's ascension into heaven (Acts 1.10–11). By examining Luke's use of heavenly language in Acts 1.10–11, I elucidated the role of heaven in Luke-Acts, suggesting that Peter's Pentecost speech (Acts 2.16–21), which cites Joel 3.1–5, associates heavenly imagery with sacrificial connotations. I then illustrated how Luke attributes the availability of repentance and forgiveness of sins to Jesus's ascension, following the same purification logic found in the Levitical sacrificial system, as discussed in the third chapter. Finally, I explore how the purification of the Gentiles, achieved through the outpouring of the Spirit, fulfills the prophetic tradition concerning the Gentiles' sacrifice. I argued that Jesus's offering in Luke-Acts represents an eschatological sacrifice that accomplishes the purification of the Gentiles, thereby integrating them into the community of believers in a manner consistent with prophetic expectations.

Although Luke is not explicit in his language, the evidence strongly suggests that he conceptualizes Jesus within a sacrificial framework. The descriptions, vocabulary, and connections that Luke employs are deeply embedded in sacrificial language, indicating a deliberate association between Jesus and sacrificial practices. The question arises as to why Luke chooses not to be explicit in this regard. I propose that Luke's reticence is intentional, stemming from his expectation that his Jewish audience would naturally understand these allusions and recognize the sacrificial undertones in his

portrayal of Jesus. This approach is similar to that found in the Book of Watchers, which, despite never explicitly mentioning the heavenly temple, clearly assumes its presence based on descriptions and the broader Jewish context. When we interpret Luke within the framework of Judaism, we observe a comparable pattern. Luke-Acts is a text deeply rooted in Jewish thought that presupposes certain conceptions and descriptions of the heavenly temple and sacrificial language. Luke applies these concepts to Jesus, expecting his audience to grasp the implicit connections and understand the significance of Jesus's role within the sacrificial paradigm.

### Further Questions

If the conclusion that Luke-Acts has an atonement theology is accurate, it carries several important implications for understanding Luke's broader soteriological framework. Specifically, it suggests that cultic atonement plays a crucial role and precedes socio-political soteriology, which is the model of salvation that has dominated Lukan scholarship.

A question that should be pursued further is Luke's conceptual framework of the heavenly temple. We have seen that Jewish authors resorted to the idea of the heavenly temple for several reasons, including their dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple, or the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. There were different Jewish reactions to the several destructions of the temple. Some Jewish groups founded other temples. For instance, we know of the existence of a Jewish temple in Elephantine in Upper Egypt that was built in the fifth century BCE, close to the time of the destruction of the temple during the Babylonian exile.<sup>694</sup> We also know that Onias, a leader of Alexandria's Jewish community, instated another temple in Alexandria for worship purposes. But that is not the pathway that most of the Jews took or even could take. Exiled Jews developed other techniques of survival, and their main goal remained to build the temple again. This is the very reason for their return to Jerusalem:

---

<sup>694</sup> B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley: University of California, 1968), 109–22.

“Let any of those among you who are of his people—may their God be with them! —go up to Jerusalem in Judah and rebuild the house of the Lord, the God of Israel; he is the God who is in Jerusalem” (Ezra 1.3). Jonathan Smith argues that religious movements have intellectual structures of the cosmos, and for every religious movement, there is a cosmic center point.<sup>695</sup> A rabbinic text describes the significance of the Jerusalem temple as follows: “The Land of Israel sits at the center of the world; Jerusalem is in the center of the Land of Israel; the sanctuary is in the center of Jerusalem; the Temple building is in the center of the sanctuary; the ark is in the center of the Temple building; and the foundation stone, out of which the world was founded, is before the Temple building” (*Midrash Tanchuma, Qedoshim* 10). That is, the point of singularity of the Big Bang out of which all existence came into being for early Jews was the Jerusalem temple. Jacob Neusner argues that the Jerusalem temple *continued* to be the cosmic center of Judaism, *even after its destruction*.<sup>696</sup> 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch represent early Jewish attempts to understand the nature of the relationship between Israel and God after the temple has been destroyed. In 2 Baruch, the earthly temple is not the eschatological temple and does not bear the full weight of being a cosmic center for the Jews (2 *Bar.* 4.1–6). The heavenly temple appears as a solution for the problem of the loss of the Jerusalem temple. Michael Stone explains: “Baruch uses the idea of the heavenly Jerusalem here to handle the problem of the destruction. The proportions the problem had assumed are indicated by the type of solution he sought.”<sup>697</sup> 4 Ezra, however, treats the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in a different way. Jerusalem, with its temple, will be restored when the heavenly city descends on the land in the future (4 *Ezra* 10.55–56).<sup>698</sup> Luke appears to think in a manner consistent with early Jewish writings. He may have conceived of the heavenly temple not as a replacement for the Jerusalem temple, but rather as an

---

<sup>695</sup> Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*, SJLA 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 160.

<sup>696</sup> Jacob Neusner, “Map without Territory: Mishnah's System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary,” *HR* 19 (1979): 103–27.

<sup>697</sup> Michael E. Stone, “Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception, and Conversion,” *JSJPHRP* 12 (1981): 195–205 (200).

<sup>698</sup> Cf. 1 *En* 90.29.

*extension* connected to it. As I have emphasized previously, Luke does not shift the cultic center from the earthly Jerusalem temple to the heavenly temple due to a belief that the Jerusalem temple is inferior or no longer functional. Instead, my argument has always been that Luke *establishes a connection* between the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple. Another possibility is that Luke considered the heavenly temple as the eschatological temple, regardless of the Jerusalem temple's existence. Luke may not have directly associated the heavenly temple with the destruction of the Jerusalem temple; however, it is also possible that Luke viewed the heavenly temple as the eschatological temple because the Jerusalem temple had already been destroyed. Or there could be other reasons, and further research might shed more light on Luke's concepts of sacred spaces and their fluidity.

An additional question that warrants further exploration is the role of cultic atonement within Luke's conception of Israel's national eschatology. Isaac Oliver has persuasively argued in his book, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology*, that while Luke supported the mission to the Gentiles, he also anticipated a future national restoration of Israel. When the disciples asked Jesus, "Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1.6), they were not misguided in their inquiry; rather, they were articulating precisely the expectation that Luke sought to convey—that a future restoration of Israel is anticipated. In this regard, Luke aligns with the prophets of Israel in maintaining nationalistic eschatological expectations.<sup>699</sup> Oliver effectively illustrates that, in Luke's theology, salvation encompasses Israel's national liberation from exile and various forms of oppression. This understanding of salvation extends beyond the spiritual realm to include deliverance from physical, political, social, and economic constraints as well.<sup>700</sup> Where does cultic atonement fit into this soteriological program? I refer here to two different potential directions.

---

<sup>699</sup> Oliver, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology*, 22.

<sup>700</sup> Oliver develops this thought in his treatment of the nationalistic motifs in the infancy narratives (Lk 1–2), in his second chapter.

First, Luke's conception of the heavenly temple fits into Luke's nationalistic eschatology of Israel. In his review of Oliver's book, Eyal Regev notes: "One theme that is neglected in this book is Luke's attitude to the temple. Given Luke's interest in the temple... one might ask whether or not Luke anticipates or hopes for its rebuilding."<sup>701</sup> Could my proposal that Luke envisions the existence of a heavenly temple provide a response to Regev's inquiry? In this case, the eschatological temple would be understood as the heavenly temple. This interpretation would align Luke's thinking with that of the author of *2 Baruch*, who, despite deeply admiring the Jerusalem temple and mourning its destruction, regarded the heavenly temple as the true eschatological temple and held no expectation for the rebuilding of the earthly Jerusalem temple.

Second, considering Jason Staples' research on the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel, which I discussed in the fifth chapter, I have demonstrated that Luke emphasizes this same theme of restoration focusing on the twelve tribes collectively. This focus aligns with a nationalistic eschatology, which Oliver suggested, wherein all the tribes of Israel, are to be restored. Oliver further illustrates how Luke portrays the mission to the Samaritans as integral to the restoration of the twelve tribes. Could it be that my proposal for eschatological atonement represents a significant cultic component in this program of restoration?

A final question arises concerning the broader study of the New Testament: what role does the heavenly temple play in other New Testament writings? For example, does the concept of the heavenly temple appear in the other Gospels? As demonstrated earlier, it is present in Mark 14.58. What function does the heavenly temple serve within Mark's narrative? Given that Mark is one of Luke's sources, could Luke have drawn upon this idea from Mark? Additionally, consider Paul's claim in 2 Corinthians

---

<sup>701</sup> Eyal Regev, review of *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts*, by Isaac W. Oliver, *AJS Review* 48 (2024): 217–18 (218).



12.2–4 that he visited paradise. Could this suggest, akin to the experience of Enoch in Jubilees, that Paul also visited the heavenly temple?

### **Theological Contribution**

In conclusion, and contrary to the consensus of Lukan scholarship during the twentieth century, Luke's theology is deeply rooted in the cultic language of the priestly writings and early Judaism. Once we understand the nature of sacrifice and the diverse fluidity of sacred spaces in early Judaism, we begin to realize Luke's distinctive understanding of the sacrifice of Jesus. Not only that Luke emphasizes Jesus's sacrificial death, but the sacrifice of Jesus represents the reason behind the gentile mission in Luke-Acts. Luke highlights different journeys in his two-volumes work, chief among them is Jesus's journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9.56–19.28). However, Jesus's journey to heaven in Luke-Acts has not been fully investigated yet.

We must not forget that Luke-Acts is perceived as an authoritative text in different and widely spread communities of faith around the world today. If there is one thing that this dissertation shows, it is that situating Luke-Acts within *Judaism* helps solve a *Christian* problem that prevailed the last two centuries, namely, that there is no atonement theology in Luke-Acts. Jesus dies as a sacrifice, and offers his blood in the heavenly temple, but what does this notion mean? It is only when we understand the Levitical sacrificial system in a proper way that we gain more insight into the meaning of Jesus's atoning sacrifice. By situating Luke-Acts within the framework of the Levitical sacrificial system, the dissertation offers a nuanced understanding of Jesus' atoning sacrifice. This interpretation not only enriches theological discourse about atonement, but also provides a foundation for fostering greater dialogue and mutual understanding between Jewish and Christian communities, particularly as both traditions recognize the authoritative status of Leviticus.

## Bibliography

- Adams, Edward. “The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 39–61.
- Adler, W. “Imposición de Manos.” Pages 131–34 of Volume 4 in *Enciclopedia de La Biblia*. Edited by Ediciones Garriga. Barcelona: Ediciones Garriga, 1963.
- Adler, Yonatan. *The Origins of Judaism: An Archaeological-Historical Reappraisal*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2022.
- Ahlström, Gösta. *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 21. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Albert, Vanhoye. *A Perfect Priest: Studies in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Translated by Nicholas J. Moore and Richard J. Ounsworth. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 477. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Albright, William F. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel: The Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1942.
- Alexander, Philip. *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*. Library of Second Temple Studies 61. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981; reprinted 2011.
- Anderson, Charles A. *Philo of Alexandria’s Views of the Physical World*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/309. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Anderson, Gary A. “The Interpretation of the Purification Offering *ḥaṭṭāṭ* in the Temple Scroll (11QT<sup>a</sup>) and Rabbinic Literature.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 17–35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Blood Rituals in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in the Social and Political Importance*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Angel, Andrew R. *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaokampf Tradition in the Period 515 BCE to 200 CE*. Library of Second Temple Studies 60. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Antin, Katri. “Transmission of Divine Knowledge in the Sapiential Thanksgiving Psalms from Qumran.” PhD Dissertation, University of Helsinki, 2019.

Aptowitzer, V. “The Celestial Temple as Viewed in the Aggadah.” Pages 1–29 in *Binah: Studies in Jewish Thought*. Edited by J. Dan. Binah: Studies in Jewish History, Thought, and Culture 2. New York: Praeger, 1989.

Aschim, Anders. “Melchizedek and Levi.” Pages 773–88 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

Ashbrook Harvey, Susan. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination. Transformation of the Classical Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Assis, Elie. *The Book of Joel: A Prophet between Calamity and Hope*. Library of the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 581. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Atkins, Peter. “Luke’s Ascension Location: A Note on Luke 24.50.” *Expository Times* 109 (1998): 205–6.

Attridge, Harold W. *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Aune, David E. *Revelation 1–5*. Word Biblical Commentary 52A. Dallas: Word Books, 2017.

Averbeck, Richard E. “Ritual Formula, Textual Frame, and Thematic Echoes in the Cylinders of Gudea.” Pages 39–93 in *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*. Edited by Mark W. Chavalas, Gordon D. Young, and Richard Averbeck. Bethesda, MD: CDL, 1997.

Bachmann, Michael. *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums*. Beihefte zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Folge, Heft 109. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kolhammer, 1980.

Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing The Documentary Hypothesis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Purpose of Purification in Leviticus 16: A Proposition Pertaining to Priestly Prepositions.” *Vetus Testamentum* 71 (2020): 19–26.

Bailey, Kenneth E. *Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*. 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Balch, L., and A. Weissenrieder. *Contested Spaces: Houses and Temples in Roman Antiquity and the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 285. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Baltzer, Klaus. “The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings.” *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965): 263–77.

Barber, Michael P. *The Historical Jesus and the Temple: Memory, Methodology, and the Gospel of Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_, and John Sweet, eds. *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_, and John Sweet. “Revelation.” Pages 160–73 in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and John Sweet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*. Studia Philonica Annual 5. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Barclay, John W. *Parables of War: Reading John’s Jewish Apocalypse*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001.

Barker, Joel. *From the Depths of Despair to the Promise of Presence: A Rhetorical Reading of the Book of Joel*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

Barnett, Paul. *Jesus and the Rise of Early Christianity: A History of New Testament Times*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002.

Barreto, Eric D. *Ethnic Negotiations: The Function of Race and Ethnicity in Acts 16*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/294. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Barrett, C. K. “Attitudes to the Temple in Acts.” Pages 345–67 in *Templum Amicitiae*. Edited by W. Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles.” Pages 64–75 in *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 48. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 2002.

Barton, John. *Joel and Obadiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Baruch J. Schwartz. “The Prohibitions Concerning ‘Eating’ the Blood in Leviticus 17.” Pages 34–66 in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 125. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Bauckham, Richard. “Anna of The Tribe of Asher (Luke 2.36–38).” *Revue Biblique* 104 (1997): 161–91.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Kerygmatic Summary in the Speeches of Acts.” Pages 213– in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “James and the Jerusalem Church.” Pages 415–80 in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Final Meeting of James and Paul. Narrative and History in Acts 21, 18–26.” Pages 250–59 in *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer : Parcours de Nouveau Testament. Mélanges offerts à Daniel Marguerat pour son 60e anniversaire*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2003.
- Baumgarten, J. M. “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees.” Pages 3–10 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino Garcia Martinez. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Bauspieß, Martin. “Die Gegenwart des Heils und das Ende der Zeit. Überlegungen zur lukanischen Eschatologie im Anschluss an Lk 22,66–71 und Apg 7,54–60.” Pages 125–48 in *Eschatologie – Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 272. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Bautch, Kelley Coblentz. “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void and the Uninhabited Paradise: Otherworldly Sites in *The Book of the Watchers*.” Pages 48–73 in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World. Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, Erik M. M. Eynikel, and Florentino García Martínez. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 143. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: No One Has Seen What I Have Seen*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 81. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Beale, Gregory K. *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Leicester. Apollos, 2004.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. “The Kingdom of God, ‘Utopia’ and Theocracy.” *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2 (2004): 91–106.
- Becker, Adam H., and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 8. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Wilson, Benjamin R. *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ: The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 223. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

- Bergen, Wesley J. *Reading Ritual: Leviticus in Postmodern Culture*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 417. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Bergren, Theodore A. “Christian Influence on the Transmission History of 4, 5, and 6 Ezra.” Pages 102–27 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 3/4. Assen. Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Berman, Joshua. “Measuring Style in Isaiah: Isaiah 34–35 and the Tiberias Stylistic Classifier for the Hebrew Bible.” *Vetus Testamentum* 71 (2021): 303–16.
- Bernett, Monika. *Der Kaiserkult in Judäa unter den Herodiern und Römern: Untersuchungen zur politischen und religiösen Geschichte Judäas von 30 v. bis 66 n. Chr.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 203. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Bernier, Jonathan. *Rethinking the Dates of the New Testament: The Evidence for Early Composition*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2022.
- Berquist, Jon L., and Claudia V. Camp, eds. *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Betz, Hans D. “The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17.11–19).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 314–28.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Bibbs, Bryan D. *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 480. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Billings, Bradley S. “‘At the Age of 12’: The Boy Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2.41–52), The Emperor Augustus, and the Social Setting of the Third Gospel.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 60 (2009): 70–89.
- Black, C. Clifton. “An Oration at Olivet: Some Rhetorical Dimensions of Mark 13.” Pages 66–92 in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric, FS to G. A. Kennedy*. Edited by D. F. Watson. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Blackwell, Ben C., John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston, eds. *Reading Revelation in Context: John’s Apocalypse and Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Annelies Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 19. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Block, Daniel I. “Eden: A Temple? A Reassessment of the Biblical Evidence.” Pages 21–27 in *From Creation to New Creation: Biblical Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by D. M. Gurtner and B. L. Gladd. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Blome, Friedrich. *Die Opfermaterie in Babylonien und Israel*. Rome: Pontificia Institutum Biblicum, 1934.

Bloor, Joshua D. A. *Purifying the Consciousness in Hebrews: Cult, Defilement and the Perpetual Heavenly Blood of Jesus*. Library of New Testament Studies 675. London: T&T Clark, 2023.

Bogaert, Pierre. *Apocalypse de Baruch : Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. 2 Vols. Sources Chrétiennes 145. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1960, 1969.

Böhtrich, Christfried. “Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 9 (1991): 35–42.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Das Lukanische Doppelwerk im Kontext Frühjüdischer Literatur.” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106 (2015): 151–83.

Botner, Max. “A Sanctuary in the Heavens and the Ascension of the Son of Man: Reassessing the Logic of Jesus’ Trial in Mark 14.53–65.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (2019): 310–34.

Bovon, François. “L’importance des mediations dans le projet théologique de Luc.” *New Testament Studies* 21 (1975): 23–39.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Tradition and Redaction in Acts 10.1–11.18.” Pages 110–28 in *New Testament and Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II*. Edited by François Bovon and Glenn E. Snyder. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 237. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1.1–9.50*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research*. 2nd edition. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Box, G. H. *The Ezra-Apocalypse*. London: Pitman and Sons, 1912.

Boyarín, Daniel. “Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to which is Appended a Correction of my *Border Lines*).” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 99 (2009): 7–36.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations: Reading Late Ancient Religions Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Brawley, Robert L. *Luke–Acts and the Jews. Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke–Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. Farrow, Douglas. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke–Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 84. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Brehm, H. Alan. “Vindicating the Rejected One. Stephen’s Speech as a Critique of Jewish Leaders.” Pages 148 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Briggs, Robert A. *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*. Society of Biblical Literature 10. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Brooke, George J. “Comparing Matthew and Luke in the Light of Second Temple Jewish Literature.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41 (2018): 44–57.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community.” Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultes im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre.” *Revue Qumran* 10 (1981): 483–503.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 417–34 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of The Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Bruce N. Fisk. “See My Tears. A Lament for Jerusalem (Luke 13.31–35; 19.41–44).” Pages 150–178 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans, 1960.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40–66*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Bruno, Christopher R. “‘Jesus Is Our Jubilee’... but How? The OT Background and Lukan Fulfillment of the Ethics of Jubilee.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53 (2010): 81–101.

Bryan, David K. “The Center of Luke’s Temptation Narrative.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 82 (2020): 407–23.



\_\_\_\_\_. “The Heavenly Lord Over All: A Comparison of Second Temple Jewish Ascents Into Heaven and Acts 1.9–14.” Unpublished Paper Presented to the Book of Acts Section, Chicago, IL, SBL Annual Meeting 2012.

Bud, Phillip J. *Numbers*. WBC 5. Dallas: Word Books, 2002.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Burrows, Eric. “Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion.” Pages 60 in *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation Between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. London: SPCK, 1935.

Buzzard, Anthony. “Acts 1.6 and The Eclipse of the Biblical Kingdom.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 66 (1994): 197–215.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Calabro, David. “A Reexamination of the Ancient Israelite Gesture of Hand Placement.” Pages 99–124 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Calaway, Jared. *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and Its Priestly Context*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Campbell, Anthony F., and Mark A. O'Brien. *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Carr, G. P. “Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts.” Pages 693–708 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Carroll, John T. *Luke. A Commentary*: New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 92. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Catchpole, D. “The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. XXVI. 64).” *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 213–26.

Chalmers, Matthew. “Rethinking Luke 10: The Parable of the Good Samaritan Israelite.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 139 (2020): 543–66.

Chalmers, Matthew. *Representations of Samaritans in Late Antique Jewish and Christian Texts*. University of Pennsylvania PhD Dissertation, 2019.

Chance, J. Bradley. “The Cursing of the Temple and The Tearing of the Veil in the Gospel of Mark.” *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007): 268–91.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jerusalem, Temple and the New Age in Luke–Acts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.

Charette, Blaine. “‘Tongues as of Fire’: Judgment as a Function of Glossolalia in Luke’s Thought.” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (2005): 173–86.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

Chepey, Stuart D. “Is the Timing Respecting Paul and the Four Men Under a Vow in Acts 21.23–27 Plausible? Possible Implications from Josephus and Philo on the Nazirite Vow and First-Fruits.” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 9 (2012): 69–75.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Nazirites in Late Second Temple Judaism: A Survey of Ancient Jewish Writings, the New Testament, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Writings from Late Antiquity*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 60. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Chester, Andrew. “The Sibyl and the Temple.” Pages 37–69 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Chronis, Harry L. “The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15.37–39.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 97–114.

Church, Philip. *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 171. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Clemens, David M. *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice, Vol. I: Ugaritic and Ugarit Akkadian Texts*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 284/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.

Clements, Ashley. “Divine Scents and Presence.” Pages 46–59 in *Smell and the Ancient Senses*. Edited by Mark Bradley. Senses in Antiquity. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Clements, Ronald E. *God and Temple*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.

Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Cobb, Christy. “Entangled Tongues: A Poststructuralist and Postcolonial Reading of Acts 2.1–13.” *Journal of Intercultural Biblical Studies* 4 (2022): 1–16.

Cohen, Mark E., ed. *Sumerian Hymnology: The Eršemma*. Hebrew Union College Annual Supplements 2. Cincinnati: Hebrew College Press, 1981.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Cohn, Naftali S. “Tractate Tamid.” Pages 331–60 in *The Oxford Annotated Mishnah: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes*. 3 Vols. Edited by Shaye J. D. Cohen, Robert Goldenberg, and Hayim Lapin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Conzelmann, Hans. “Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity.” Pages 13–29 in *Studies in Luke–Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Outline of the New Testament Theology*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1969.

Cook, Stephen L. *Ezekiel 38–48: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22B. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018.

Cowton, C. J. “The Alms Trader: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3.2.” *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 475–76.

Crabbe, Kyle. *Luke/Acts and the End of History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 238. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019.

Cranz, Isabel. *Atonement and Purification: Priestly and Assyro-Babylonian Perspectives on Sin and its Consequences*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments II/92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Crawford, White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Creed, J. M. *The Gospel According to St Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Crenshaw, James L. *Joel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24C. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Cromhout, Markus. *Walking in Their Sandals: A Guide to First-Century Israelite Ethnic Identity*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2010.

Cross, Frank M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Crowe, Brandon D. *The Last Adam: A Theology of the Obedient Life of Jesus in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017.

Dahl, Nils A. “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts.” Pages 84–100 in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church: Essays*. Edited by Nils A. Dahl. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms II. 51–100: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 16. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Psalms III. 101–150: Introduction, Translation, and Notes with an Appendix: The Grammar of the Psalter*. Anchor Bible 17. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Danker, Frederick W. *Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke: A Commentary on the Third Gospel*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1972.

Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone Press, 1956.

Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Davila, James R. “The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9 (2002): 1–19.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Dawsey, James. “The Origin of Luke’s Positive Perception of the Temple.” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 18 (1991): 5–22.

Dawson, Zachary K. *The Message of the Jerusalem Council in the Acts of the Apostles: A Linguistic Stylistic Analysis*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 22. Leiden: Brill, 2022.

de Jonge, H. J. “The Chronology of the Ascension in Luke and Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 59 (2013): 151–71.

de Jonge, Marinus. “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi.” Pages 71–89 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII.” Pages 259 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin*. Van Gorcum's Theologische Bibliotheek 25. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Adam S. van der Woude. "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966): 301–26.

de Vaux, Roland. *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.

Dean, Rebecca. "'What if a Spirit or an Angel has Spoken?' Narrative Modelling of the Treatment of Dreams and Visions in The Acts of the Apostles." PhD Diss., Oxford University, 2018.

DeRouchie, Jason S., Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner, eds. *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

DesCamp, Mary Therese. *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods through a Cognitive Lens*. Biblical Interpretation Series 87. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Dibelius, Martin. "The Conversion of Cornelius." Pages 96–107 in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by H. Greeven. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.

Dillmann, A. *Die Bucher Exodus und Leviticus*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1880.

Dillon, John. "Philo and Hellenistic Platonism." Pages 223–32 in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy*. Edited by Francesca Alesse. *Studia Philonica Annual* 5. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Dimant, Devorah. "Jerusalem and the Temple in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90) in Light of the Qumran Community Worldview." Pages 119–37 in *From Enoch to Tobit*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 114. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Docherty, Susan. *The Jewish Pseudepigrapha: An Introduction to the Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Dodd, C. H. "The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of the Desolation." *Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947): 47–54.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums. Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Downs, David J. *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in Its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* II/248. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Drawnel, Hendryk. “The Punishment of Asael (1 En. 10.4–8) and Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Literature.” *Revue Biblique* 99 (2012): 369–94.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Initial Narrative of the ‘Visions of Amram’ and Its Literary Characteristics.” *Revue Qumran* 96 (2010): 517–54.

Drexler, Josef. *Die Illusion des Opfers: Ein wissenschaftlicher Überblick über die wichtigsten Opfertheorien ausgehend vom delezianischen Polyperspektivismusmodell*. Münchener Ethnologische Abhandlungen 12. Munich: Anacon-Verlag, 1993.

Dschulnigg, Peter. “Die Rede des Stephanus im Rahmen des Berichtes Über sein Martyrium (Apg 6,8–8,3).” *Judaica* 44 (1988): 195–96.

du Plessis, I. J. “The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke’s Gospel—Focusing on Luke 22.19b-20.” *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994): 523–40.

Duhaime, Jean. “Light and Darkness.” Pages 495–96 of Volume 1, in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 Volumes. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Duke, Robert R. *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 135. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM, 2006.

Dunnil, John. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Dupont, Jacques. *Les tentations de Jesus au desert*. Studia Neotestamentica 4. Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Paulist, 1988.

Eberhart, Christian A. *Studien zur Bedeutung der Opfer im Alten Testament: Verbrennungsriten im kultischen Rahmen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 94. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Sacrifice of Jesus: Understanding Atonement Biblically*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. London: Macmillan Press, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Edzard, Dietz Otto. *Gudea and His Dynasty*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods 3 no. 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Ehrman, Bart D. “The Cup, The Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus’ Death in Luke-Acts.” Pages 156–77 in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 33. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Elliott, J. H. “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts. A Contrast in Social Institutions.” Pages 211–40 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by J. H. Neyrey. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Ellis, E. Earle. “The End of the Earth (Acts 1.8).” Pages 53–63 in *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis. Biblical Interpretation 54. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. New Commentary on the Bible and the Church. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.

Elvey, Anne F. *The Matter of the Text: Material Engagements between Luke and the Five Senses*. Bible in the Modern World 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011.

Epp, Eldon J. “The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts.” Pages 212–25 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea. *Body, Gender and Purity in Leviticus 12 and 15*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 539. London: T&T Clark, 2017.

Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Estrada, Nelson P. *From Followers to Leaders: The Apostles in the Ritual of Status Transformation in Acts 1–2*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 255. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004.

Evans, Craig A. “The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon.” Pages 210–12 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_, and James A. Sanders, eds. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2001.

Faulkner, Raymond O. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1993.

Fearghail, Fearghas O. “Sir 50.5–21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole-Offering?” *Biblica* 59 (1978): 301–16.

Feder, Yitzhaq. “On kuppuru, kippèr and Etymological Sins that Cannot be Wiped.” *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 535–45.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Textualization of Priestly Ritual in Light of Hittite Sources.” Pages 121–150 in *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch: A Systematic and Comparative Approach*. Edited by Christophe Nihan and Julia Rhyder. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual: Origins, Context, and Meaning*. The Writings of the Ancient World Series 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Purity and Pollution in the Hebrew Bible: From Embodied Experience to Moral Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Feldman, Ariel. “1Q22 (Words of Moses).” Pages 225–261 in *Scripture and Interpretation Qumran Texts that Rework the Bible*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 449. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Feldman, Liane M. “The Idea and Study of Sacrifice in Ancient Israel.” *Religionsgeschichtliche Container* 14 (2020): 1–14.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Consuming Fire: The Complete Priestly Source, from Creation to the Promised Land*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Story of Sacrifice: Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Source*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 141. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 25–41.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost.” *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 385–401.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation, Notes and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28A. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Jesus in the Early Church through the Eyes of Luke–Acts.” Pages 297–316 in *To Advance the Gospel. New Testament Studies*. Edited by Joseph Fitzmyer. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Flessen, Bonnie J. *An Exemplary Man: Cornelius and Characterization in Acts 10*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. “Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah. Part 2.” *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5 (2007): 57–79.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Fleeter Tipei, John. *The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament: Its Significance, Techniques, and Effects*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009.

Flusser, David. ““At the Right Hand of Power.”” *Immanuel* 14 (1982): 42–46.

Fraade, Steven D. “The Temple Scroll as Rewritten Bible. When Genres Bend.” Pages 136–155 in *Hā-’ī sh Mōsheh: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. Edited by Binyamin Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George J. Brooke. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 122. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Damascus Document*. Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Franklin, Eric. “The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23 (1970): 191–200.

Fredriksen, Paula. “Paul, The Perfectly Righteous Pharisee.” Pages 112–35 in *The Pharisees*. Edited by Joseph Sievers and Amy-Jill Levine. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021.

Freedman, David N. “Temple Without Hands.” Pages 21–30 in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977*. Edited by A. Biran. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981.

Freedman, David Noel. *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by C. L. Meyers and M. O’Connor. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Friedman, Richard E. *Who Wrote the Bible?* New York: Summit, 1987; reprinted New York: HarperOne, 1997.

Fröhlich, Ida. “Peshet, Apocalyptic Literature and Qumran.” Pages 295–305 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991 Vol. I & II*. Edited by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Gaines, Jason M. H. *The Poetic Priestly Source*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Gane, Roy E. “Didactic Logic and the Authorship of Leviticus.” Pages 197–221 in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. Edited by Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen. Rabbinical Biblical Series 82. Atlanta: SBL, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Function of the Nazirite’s Concluding Purification Offering.” Pages 9–17 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Naphtali S. Meshel, Jeffrey Stackert, Baruch J. Schwartz, and David P. Wright. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Was Leviticus Composed by Aaronide Priests to Justify their Cultic Monopoly?” Pages 195–212 in *Exploring the Composition of the Pentateuch*. Edited by L. S. Baker Jr., Kenneth Bergland, Felipe A. Masotti, and A. Rahel Wells. Biblical and Beyond Research Supplement Series 27. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Ada Taggar-Cohen, eds. *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. Resources for Biblical Study 82. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010.

Ganser-Kerperin, H. *Das Zeugnis des Tempels. Studien zur Bedeutung des Tempelsmotivs im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Novum Testamentum et Antiquitas 36. Munster: Aschendorff, 2000.

Ganzel, Tova. “First-Month Rituals in Ezekiel’s Temple Vision: A Pentateuchal and Babylonian Comparison.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 83 (2021): 390–406.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.

García Serrano, Andrés. “Anna’s Characterization in Luke 2.36–38: A Case of Conceptual Allusion?” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 76 (2014): 464–80.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Presentation in the Temple: The Narrative Function of Lk 2.22–39 in Luke–Acts*. Ancient Biblical 197. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2012.

García Ureña, Lourdes. “Darkness or Blackness? A Semantic Study of חָשֶׁךְ (Joel 3.4).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 142 (2023): 111–27.

Garlington, Don B. “Jesus, the Unique Son of God. Tested and Faithful.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1994): 284–308.

Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *Acts*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.

Geldenhuis, Norval. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Testing of God’s Son: Matthew 4.1–11 and PAR, An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966.

Gese, Hartmut. “The Atonement.” Pages 93–116 in *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Edited by Hartmut Gese. Translated by K. Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Gibbs, Jeffrey A. *Jerusalem and Parousia*. Saint Louis: Concordia Academic, 2000.

Gilders, William K. “Jewish Sacrifices. Its Nature and Function (According to Philo).” Pages 94–105 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer W. Knust and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Gill, David. “Observations on the Lukan Travel Narrative and Some Related Passages.” *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 199–221.

Girard, René. “Generative Scapegoating.” Pages 73–105 in *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*. Edited by R. G. Hamerton-Kelly. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Violence and the Sacred*. Translated by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Giversen, Søren, and Birger A. Pearson. “Melchizedek.” Pages 353–56 in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Edited by James M. Robinson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.

Glasson, T. F. “The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark XIV.62).” *New Testament Studies* 7 (1961): 88–93.

Glonner, Georg. *Zur Bildersprache des Johannes von Patmos: Untersuchung der Johannes-apokalypse anhand einer um Elemente der Bildinterpretation erweiterten historisch-kritischen Methode*. Nova Tellus Antiqua 34. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1999.

Goldman, Liora. “Dualism in the Visions of Amram.” *Revue Qumran* 95 (2010): 421–32.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Rewritten Scripture: Law and Liturgy.” Pages 263–358 in *Scripture and Interpretation Qumran Texts that Rework the Bible*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 449. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Goldstein, Elizabeth W. *Gender and Impurity in the Hebrew Bible*. Lanham: Lexington, 2015.

Gordon, Robert P. “Standing in the Council: When Prophets Encounter God.” Pages 190–204 in *The God of Israel*. Edited by Robert P. Gordon. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Gore-Jones, Lydia. *When Judaism Lost the Temple: Crisis and Response in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch*. Studies in Apocalypticism and Apocryphal Literature 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 2020.

Gorman, Frank H. *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time, and Status in the Priestly Theology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 91. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

- Grabbe, Lester L. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987): 152–67.
- Grabiner, Steven. *Revelation's Hymns: Commentary on the Cosmic Conflict*. Library of New Testament Studies 511. London: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Gräßer, Erich. *Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 137. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001, 305–10.
- Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence From Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Gray, Timothy C. *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in its Narrative Role*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/242. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Green, Joel B. "Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 188–201 in *Into God's Presence. Prayer in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Demise of the Temple as 'Culture Center' in Luke–Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23.44–49)." *Revue Biblique* 101 (1994): 495–515.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/33. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Salvation to the End of the Earth (Acts 13.47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 83–106 in *Witness to the Gospel. The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and D. Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Greenberg, James A. *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus: The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited*. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2019.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*. Biblical Research Library. Jerusalem 10. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. "The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology: Unveiling the 'ΥΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ.'" *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007): 292–306.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text, With Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hadas-Lebel, Mirelle. *Philo of Alexandria: A Thinker in the Jewish Diaspora*. Translated by Robyn Fréchet. Studia Philonica Annual 7. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Hamm, Dennis, S.J. "What the Samaritan Leper Sees: The Narrative Christology of Luke 17.11–19." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994): 273–87.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Acts 3,1–10: The Healing of the Temple Beggar and Lucan Theology." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 305–19.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Acts 3.12–26: Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 199–217.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Tamid Service in Luke-Acts: The Cultic Background behind Luke's Theology of Worship (Luke 1.5–25; 18.9–14; 24.50–53; Acts 3.1; 10.3, 30)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003): 215–31.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.

Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple Services in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Harper, G. Geoffrey. "*I Will Walk Among You*": *The Rhetorical Function of Allusion to Genesis 1–3 in the Book of Leviticus*. Philadelphia: Penn State University, 2018.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra." Pages 343–55 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 3. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.

Harris, Sarah. *The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative*. Library of New Testament Studies 558. London: T&T Clark, 2016.

Hartenstein, Friedhelm, and Konrad Schmid, eds. *Farewell to the Priestly Writing? The Current State of the Debate*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Hay, D. M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 18. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973.

Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Head, Peter. “The Temple in Luke’s Gospel.” Pages 101–20 in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole. Carlisle. Paternoster, 2004.

Heffelfinger, Katie M. “Isaiah 40–55.” Pages 111–27 in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*. Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Heimbichner, Andreas. “Missionary Flexibility or Continuity: Paul’s Purity Ritual in Acts 21.18–26 in Light of a Jewish Second Temple Period Background.” PhD Diss., North-West University, 2020.

Hengel, Martin. “The Geography of Palestine in Acts.” Pages 1–50 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

Henze, Matthias. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hicks-Keeton, Jill. “Already/Not Yet. Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132 (2013): 97–117.

Hilhorst, A. “A Visit to Paradise. Apocalypse of Paul 45 and Its Background.” Pages 128–39 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 25D. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Himes, Paul A. “Peter and the Prophetic Word: The Theology of Prophecy Traced through Peter’s Sermons and Epistles.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21 (2011): 227–43.

Himmelfarb, Martha. “‘A Kingdom of Priests’: The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism.” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997): 89–104.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira.” Pages 63–78 in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics*

*of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housleh. Contributions to the Study of Religion 30. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. “What Goes On in the Heavenly Temple?” Pages 189–190 in *Atonement. Jewish and Christian Origins*. Edited by Max Botner, Justin Harrison Duff, and Simon Dürr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hoffmann, Matthias Reinhard. *The Destroyer and the Lamb: The Relationship between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/203. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Hoffner Jr., Harry A. *Hittite Myths*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Hogan, Karina Martin. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 130. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Hollander, H. W., and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden. Brill, 1985.

Holmås, Geir O. “‘My House Shall Be a House of Prayer’: Regarding the Temple as a Place of Prayer in Acts within the Context of Luke’s Apologetical Objective.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (2005): 393–416.

Holmes, Stephen R. “Penal Substitution.” Pages 295–314 in *T&T Clark Companion to Atonement*. Edited by Adam J. Johnson. London: T&T Clark, 2017.

Horowitz, Wayne. *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 8. Winona Lake, IL: Eisenbrauns, 1998.

Horton, Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Houtman, C. *Der Himmel im Alten Testament: Israels Weltbild und Weltanschauung*. Oudtestamentische Studiën. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Hubert, Henri, and Marcel Mauss. “Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice.” *Année Sociologique* 2 (1899): 29–138.

Humphrey, Edith McEwan. *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse, and The Shepherd of Hermas*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Hundley, Michael B. “Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132 (2013): 749–67.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hurvitz, Avi. “Dating the Priestly Source in Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew: A Century after Wellhausen.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100 (1988): 88–100.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of The Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age—A Response to J. Blenkinsopp.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000): 180–191.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology.” *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 24–56.

Hurwitz, Victor A. “*I have Built You an Exalted Temple*”: *Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 115. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Hutcheon, C. R. “‘God Is with Us’. The Temple in Luke–Acts.” *Studia Theologica* 44 (2000): 3–33.

Hutzli, Jürg. *The Origins of P: Literary Profiles and Strata of the Priestly Texts in Genesis 1 – Exodus 40*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 164. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023.

Ibrahim, Mohiy el-Din. “The God of the Great Temple of Edfu.” Pages 170–74 in *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt. Studies in Honour of H. W. Fairman*. Edited by John Ruffle, G. A. Gaballa, and Kenneth A. Kitchen. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1979.

Jackson, Howard M. “The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross.” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 23–31.

Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Janenzi, David. *The Social Meanings of Sacrifices in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 344. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

Janowski, Bernard. *Stellvertretung: Alttestamentliche Studien zu einem theologischen Grundbegriff*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 165. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. ‘Azazel’. Pages 128–31 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt: Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10.21f.” Pages 106–169 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament. Internationale Simposion, Hamburg 17–20 März 1990*. Edited by Bernard Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm. Freiburg-Göttingen, 1993.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur priesterschriftlichen Sühnetheologie. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 55. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Jennings, Willie James. *Acts: A Theological Commentary on the Bible*. Belief. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017.

Jeon, Jaeyoung, ed. *The Social Groups Behind the Pentateuch*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.

Jeremias, Alfred. *The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell*. London: D. Nutt, 1902.

Jeremias, Joachim. “Αδάμ.” Pages 141–45 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Jervell, Jacob. “The Law in Luke–Acts.” *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 21–36.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kommentar zu den Einzelbüchern des Neuen Testaments* 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Jipp, Joshua W. “The Paul of Acts: Proclaimer of the Hope of Israel or Teacher of Apostasy from Moses?” *Novum Testamentum* 62 (2020): 60–78.

Johns, Loren L. *The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Johnson, Andy. “Resurrection, Ascension and the Developing Portrait of the God of Israel in Acts.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57 (2004): 146–62.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Johnson, M. D. *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Jones, P. M. “The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings.” Pages 128 in *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.

Jones, Robert. “Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 27 (2020): 1–30.

Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 31. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Jung, Deok H. “Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke–Acts.” *Expository Times* 128 (2017): 529–37.

Jurgens, Blake. “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547).” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 24 (2014): 3–42.

Kabisch, R. *Das vierte Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprechts Verlag, 1889.

Kapelrud, Arvid. *Joel Studies*. Uppsala Universitets Absskrift 1948. 4. Uppsala. A-B: Lundequistska Bokhandeln.

Kapic, Kelly M. “Receiving Christ’s Priestly Benediction: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Exploration of Luke 24.50–53.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005): 247–60.

Kaplan, Jonathan. “Leviticus and the Rewriting of the Torah in 1QWords of Moses (1Q22).” Pages 111–124 in *Torah in Early Jewish Imaginations*. Edited by Ariel Feldman and Timothy J. Sandoval. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 171. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Luke 4.16-30, The Melchizedek Document (11Q13), and the Eschatological Interpretation of Isaiah 61.” In *Luke and Acts with(in) Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Isaac W. Oliver, Jocelyn McWhirter, and Joshua Scott. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 256. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2025 (forthcoming).

Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Edited by Ernst Käsemann. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kearney, P. J. “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exod. 25–40.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 375–87.

Keathley, Naymond H. “The Temple in Luke–Acts: Implications for the Synoptic Problem and Proto-Luke.” Pages 81–97 in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.* Edited by Naymond H. Keathley. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 1990.

Keck, Leander E. “The Spirit and the Dove.” *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 41–67.

Kee, Howard C. “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” Pages 789 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Volume 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

- Kee, Min Suc. “A Study of the Heavenly Council in the Ancient Near Eastern Texts, and Its Employment as a Type-scene in the Hebrew Bible.” PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2003.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. Vol. 1: Introduction and 1.1–2.47. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Kemphorne, R. “The Marcan Text of Jesus’ Answer to the High Priest (Mark xiv 62).” *Novum Testamentum* 19 (1977): 197–208.
- Kibbe, Michael. “Is It Finished? When Did It Start? Hebrews, Priesthood, and Atonement in Biblical, Systematic, and Historical Perspective.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 65 (2014): 25–61.
- Kiel, Micah D. “The Open Horizon of Mark 13.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 136 (2017): 145–62.
- Kilgallen, John J. “Luke 2.41–52. Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher.” *Biblica* 66 (1985): 553–59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7.2–53*. Analecta Biblica 67. Rome. Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Kim, Kyoung-Jin. *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke’s Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 155. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Kimbell, John. “Jesus’ Death in Luke-Acts: The New Covenant Sacrifice.” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 16 (2012): 28–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2014.
- Kinzer, Mark S. “Sacrifice, Prayer, and the Holy Spirit: The Tamid Offering in Luke-Acts.” Pages 471 in *Wisdom Poured Out Like Water. Studies on Jewish and Christian Antiquity in Honor of Gabriele Boccaccini*. Edited by J. Harold Ellens, Isaac W. Oliver, Jason von Ehrenkrook, James Waddell, and Jason M. Zurawski. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 38. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People, and the Identity of the Church*. Eugene, OR. Cascade, 2015.
- Kish, Guido. *Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Publications in Mediaeval Studies 10. Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1949.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. *Revelation*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. “Living like the Azazel-Goat in Romans 12.1B.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 57 (2006): 55–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Study of Hata’ and Hatta’t in Leviticus 4-5. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/2*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function*. Sheffield. JSOT Press, 1987.

Klawans, Jonathan. “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism.” *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 20 (1995): 285–312.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Klijn, A. F. J. “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch.” Pages 616 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.

Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Koch, D.-A. “The God-Fearers between Facts and Fiction: Two Theosebeis Inscriptions from Aphrodisias and their Bearing for the New Testament.” *Studia Theologica* 60 (2006): 62–90.

Koch, Klaus. “Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit.” *Evangelische Theologie* 26 (1966): 217–39.

Kochenash, Michael. “‘Adam, Son of God’ (Luke 3.38): Another Jesus–Augustus Parallel in Luke's Gospel.” *New Testament Studies* 64 (2018): 307–25.

Kodell, J. “Luke's Theology of the Death of Jesus.” Pages 140–52 in *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit. Commemorating the Fiftieth Year of The Liturgical Press*. Edited by Daniel Durken. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1979.

Koester, Craig R. *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 38A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Koet, Bart J. “Purity and Impurity of the Body in Luke-Acts.” Pages 93–106 in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*. Edited by Joshua J. Schwartz and Marcel Poorthuis. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29–32.34c–35) und Israels Geschick.” Pages 99–122 in *Dreams and Scripture in Luke-Acts: Collected Essays*. Edited by Bart J. Koet. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 42. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Why did Paul shave his hair (Acts 18.18)? Nazirite and Temple in the Book of Acts.” Pages 129–42 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 14. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

Korner, Ralph J. *Reading Revelation After Supersessionism: An Apocalyptic Journey of Socially Identifying John's Multi-ethnic Ekklesiāi with the Ekklesiā of Israel*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2020.

Korpel, Marjo Christina Annete. *Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990.

Kraabel, A. Thomas. “Immigrants, Exiles, Expatriates, and Missionaries.” Pages 71–88 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Edited by Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger. Novum Testamentum Supplements 74. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Synagoga Caeca: Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretation of Evidence for Judaism in the Early Christian Period.” Pages 219–46 in “*To See Ourselves as Others See Us*”. *Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Kraabel, A. Thomas. “The Disappearance of the ‘God-Fearers.’” *Numen* 28 (1981): 113–26.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The God-fearers Meet the Beloved Disciple.” Pages 276–84 in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson, A. Thomas Kraabel, George W. E. Nickelsburg, and Norman R. Petersen. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The God-Fearers—a Literary and Theological Invention.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* (1986): 47–53.

Kramer, Samuel Noah. *Sumerian Mythology: A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1944.

Kriehoff Mattingly, Keith Edward. “The Laying of Hands on Joshua. An Exegetical Study of Numbers 27.12–23 and Deuteronomy 34.9.” PhD diss., Andrews University, 1997.

Kucicki, Janusz. *The Function of the Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles: A Key to Interpretation of Luke’s Use of Speeches in Acts*. Biblical Interpretation Series 158. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Kugler, Robert A. “Rethinking the Notion of ‘Scripture’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Leviticus as A Test Case.” Pages 342–357 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, and Sarah S. Bartel. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 93. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *Leviticus at Qumran: Text and Interpretation*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 173. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Kümmel, W. G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 17th rev. ed. Translated by Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

Kurz, W. S. “Luke 3.23–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies.” Pages 169–87 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

- Kyrychenko, Alexander. *The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel: The Role of the Centurion in Luke-Acts*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 203. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 9–13*. Word Biblical Commentary 47B. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991.
- Lanier, Gregory R. “Luke’s Distinctive Use of the Temple. Portraying the Divine Visitation.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 65 (2014): 433–62.
- Larsson, E. “Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflections on Acts 6–7.” *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 379–95.
- Laurentin, René. *Jésus au temple: Mystère de Pâques et foi de Marie en Luc 2,48–50*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1966.
- Leemhuis, Fred, A.F.J. Klijn, and G.J.H. van Gelder. *The Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch: Edited and Translated with a Parallel Translation of the Syriac Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Leemhuis, Fred. “The Arabic Version of the Apocalypse of Baruch: A Christian Text?” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989): 19–26.
- Lefebvre, Henri. “La production de l’espace.” *L’Homme et la société* 31–32 (1974): 15–32.
- Lehmann, M. R. “‘Yom Kippur’ in Qumran.” *Revue Qumran* 9 (1961): 117–22.
- Lentz, John Clayton. *Luke’s Portrait of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Levenson, John D. “The Temple and the World.” *Journal of Religion* 64 (1984): 275–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Creation and The Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. San Francisco: Harper San-Francisco, 1985.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. “Luke and the Jewish Religion.” *Interpretation* 68 (2014): 389–402.
- Levine, Baruch A. “Leviticus: Its Literary History and Location in Biblical Literature.” Pages 11–23 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, and Sarah Smith Bartlet. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Descriptive Ritual Texts from Ugarit: Some Formal and Functional Features of the Genre.” Pages 467–475 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by C. L. Meyers and M. O’Connor. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85 (1965): 307–318.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Ugaritic Descriptive Rituals.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 17 (1963): 105–111.

\_\_\_\_\_. *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 5. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Lied, Lev Ingeborg. “Recent Scholarship on 2 Baruch 2000–2009.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2011): 238–76.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Lim, Timothy H. “11QMelch, Luke 4 and the Dying Messiah.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 90–92.

Lincoln, A. T. “Paul the Visionary: The Setting and Significance of the Rapture to Paradise in 2 Corinthians 12.1–10.” *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 204–20.

Litwak, Kenneth D. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People*. Library of New Testament Studies 282. Edinburgh: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2005.

Lohfink, G. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu. Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. Studien zur Alten und Neuen Testament 26. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1971.

Longenecker, Bruce W. *2 Esdras*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Lowe, Matthew Forrest. “Cash and Release. Atonement and Release from Oppression in the Imperial Context of Luke’s Gospel.” Pages 145–63 in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew Pitts. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 9. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Lührmann, Dieter. “Markus 14.55–64: Christologie und Zerstörung des Tempels im Markusevangelium.” *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 457–74.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (1989): 75–94.

Lundquist, John M. “The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East.” Pages 53–76 in *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives*. Edited by Truman G. Madsen. Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1984.

Lust, Johan. “Isaiah 34 and the Herem.” Pages 275–86 in *The Book of Isaiah – Le Livre d’Isaïe: Les Oracles et Leurs Relectures*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

Macaskill, Grant. *The Entangled Enoch: 2 Enoch and the Cultures of Late Antiquity*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 28. Leiden: Brill, 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series* 6. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

MacDonald, Dennis R. “Toward an Intertextual Commentary on Luke 7.” Pages 130–52 in *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden. *Library of New Testament Studies* 493. London: T&T Clark, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Machiela, Daniel A. “Luke 13.10–13. ‘Woman, You Have Been Set Free From Your Ailment’—Illness, Demon Possession, and Laying on Hands in Light of Second Temple Period Jewish Literature.” Pages 122–135 in *The Gospels in First-Century Judaea: Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of Nyack College's Graduate Program in Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins, August 29th, 2013*. Edited by R. Steven Notley and Jeffrey P. García. *Jewish and Christian Perspectives*, 29. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries: Historical Context and Lines of Development.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2012): 313–62.

MacKie, Scott D. “Heavenly Sanctuary Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 62 (2011): 77–117.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Maier, J. “Shire Olat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations on Their Calendric Implications and on Their Style.” Pages 543–60 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*. Edited by J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Maile, John F. “The Ascension in Luke-Acts.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 37 (1986): 29–59.

Malbon, Elizabeth. *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

Marcus, Joel. *Mark 8–16: A New Translation, Notes, and Commentary*. *Anchor Bible* 27A. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Marguerat, Daniel. “Du temple à la maison suivant Luc-Actes.” Pages 285–317 in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* Edited by Camille Focant. *Lectio Divina*, hors série. Paris: Cerf, 2003.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Les Actes des apôtres 1–12*. Collection Nouveau Testament 5a. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007.

Marshall, I. Howard. “Acts.” Pages 1–13 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Place of Acts 20.28 in Luke’s Theology of the Cross.” Pages 154–70 in *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*. Library of New Testament Studies 427. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971.

Marshall, John W. *Parables of War: Reading John’s Jewish Apocalypse*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001.

Martin, Gustavo. “Procedural Register in the Olivet Discourse: A Functional Linguistic Approach to Mark 13.” *Biblica* 90 (2009): 457–83.

Martin, Jonathan A. Moo. *Creation, Nature, and Hope in 4 Ezra*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 237. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Word Biblical Commentary 40. Dallas: Word Books Inc., 2002.

Marx, Alfred. “Sacrifice pour les péchés ou rites de passage? Quelques réflexions sur la fonction du ḥaṭṭā’ t.” Pages 27–48 in *Sacrifice pour les péchés ou rites de passage? Quelques réflexions sur la fonction du ḥaṭṭā’ t*. Edited by Alfred Marx. Paris: Revue Biblique, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l’Ancien Testament. Formes et fonctions du culte sacrificiel à Yhwh*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Mason, Eric F. *‘You Are a Priest Forever’: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Mason, Steve. “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism. Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 457–512.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Judean War 2: Translation and Commentary*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Vol. 1B. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Matera, Frank J. “The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 469–85.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through Their Passion Stories*. Theological Inquiries. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Kingship of Jesus*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 66. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.

- Mathews, Claire R. *Defending Zion: Edom's Desolation and Jacob's Restoration (Isaiah 34-35) in Context*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 236. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Matthes, J. C. "Der Sühnegedanke bei den Sündopfern." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 23 (1903): 97–119.
- Mbuvi, Andrew M. "Revisiting Translation and Interpretation Issues in the Story of the African Royal Official ('Ethiopian Eunuch') in Acts 8.26-40: The Hebrew Bible (LXX) Background." *Old Testament Essays* 34 (2021): 1–11.
- McKnight, Scott. *A New Vision for Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- McLean, Bradley H. "The Interpretation of the Levitical Sin Offering and the Scapegoat." *Semeia* 20 (1991): 345–56.
- Medebielle, Alexis. *L' Expiation dans L' Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*. Rome: Institute Biblique Pontifical, 1923.
- Melcher, Sarah J. "A Tale of Two Eunuchs. Isaiah 56.1–8 and Acts 8.26–40." Pages 117–28 in *Disability Studies and Biblical Literature*. Edited by Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Metso, Sarianna, and Eugene Ulrich. "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus." Pages 256–257 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, and Sarah S. Bartel. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 93. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Fourth Book of Ezra: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 518–19 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002.
- Meyers, Carol L. *The Tabernacle Menorah*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Middleton, Paul. *The Violence of the Lamb: Martyrs as Agents of Divine Judgement in the Book of Revelation*. Library of New Testament Studies 586. London: T&T Clark, 2018.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "Further on the Expiatory Sacrifices." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 511–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray'." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 390–99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance." *Revue Biblique* 82 (1975): 186–205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements 18. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 3A. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 36. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I: The Encroacher and the Levite—The Term ‘aboda*. University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies 14. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Milik, Józef. “4QVisions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène.” *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972): 77–97.

Miller, John B. F. *Convinced that God Had Called Us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God’s Will in Luke-Acts*. Biblical Interpretation Series 84. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Miller, Merrill P. “The Function of Isa 61.1–2 in 11Q Melchizedek.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 467–69.

Miner, D. F. “A Suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2 (1971): 144–48.

Moffit, David M. “Atonement at the Right Hand: The Sacrificial Significance of Jesus’ Exaltation in Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 62 (2016): 549–68.

\_\_\_\_\_. “‘If Another Priest Arises’: Jesus’s Resurrection and the High Priestly Christology.” Pages 68–79 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart, and Nathan MacDonald. Library of New Testament Studies 387. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Serving in the Tabernacle in Heaven: Sacred Space, Jesus’s High-Priestly Sacrifice, and Hebrews’ Analogical Theology.” Pages 259–81 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge. Augmented Jesuit Education Collection 91. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Wilderness Identity and Pentateuchal Narrative: Distinguishing between Jesus’ Inauguration and Maintenance of the New Covenant in Hebrews.” Pages 153–71 in *Muted Voices of the New Testament. Readings in the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*. Edited by Katherine M. Hockey, Madison N. Pierce, and Francis Watson. Library of New Testament Studies 565. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 141. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Moo, Jonathan. “The Sea That Is No More: Rev 21.1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John.” *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009): 148–67.

Moore, Nicholas J. “‘He Saw Heaven Opened’: Heavenly Temple and Universal Mission in Luke-Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 68 (2022): 38–51.

Moore, Stewart. *Jewish Ethnic Identity and Relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With Walls of Iron?* Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series 171. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Moraff, Jason F. *Reading the Way, Paul, and "The Jews" in Acts Within Judaism: "Among my Own Nation."* Library of New Testament Studies 690. London: T&T Clark, 2024.

Moraldi, L. *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'Antico Testamento*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1956.

Morales, L. Michael. *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured: Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus*. Bibliotheca Theologica Studiorum 15. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Moret, Jean-René. “Le rôle du concept de purification dans l’Épître aux Hébreux: une réaction à quelques propositions de David M. Moffitt.” *New Testament Studies* 62 (2016): 289–307.

Morgen, Michèle. “Lc 17.20-37 et Lc 21.8-11, 20-24: ‘Arrière-Fond Scripturaire’.” Pages 307–26 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1997.

Murray-Jones, Christopher R. A. “Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12.1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul’s Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources.” *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 177–217.

Morris, Michael. “Deuteronomy in the Matthean and Lucan Temptation in Light of Early Jewish Antidemonic Tradition.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 78 (2016): 290–301.

Moss, Candida R., and Joel S. Baden. *Reconceiving Infertility: Biblical Perspectives on Procreation and Childlessness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Motyer, S. “The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost.” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 155–57.

Moule, C. F. D. “The Christology of Acts.” Pages 159–85 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Mount, Christopher. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 104. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Moxon, John R. L. *Peter’s Halakhic Nightmare: The ‘Animal’ Vision of Acts 10.9–16 in Jewish and Graeco-Roman Perspective*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/432. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Mulder, Otto. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Father in Ben Sira’s Concept of the History of Israel*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series 78. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Mullen, E. Theodore. *The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 24. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Murphy, Fredrick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Myers, Jacob M. *I and II Esdras: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 42. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.
- Najman, Hindy. *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Nave, G. D. *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*. Academia Biblica 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Ndekha, Louis W. “Zechariah The Model Priest: Luke and The Characterization of Ordinary Priests in Luke–Acts.” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 74 (2018): 1–7.
- Neusner, Jacob. “Map without Territory: Mishnah’s System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary.” *History of Religions* 19 (1979): 103–27.
- Newsom, Carol. “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran.” Pages 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by W. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. Freedman. Biblical and Judaic Studies 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Nguyen, vanThanh. *Peter and Cornelius: A Story of Conversion and Mission*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.
- Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Nielsburg, George W. E. “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 580–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About.” Pages 99–113 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Klaus Baltzer. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37–82*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

Nicklas, Tobias. “Angels in Early Christian Narratives on the Resurrection of Jesus: Canonical and Apocryphal Texts.” Pages 293–311 in *Angels—The Concept of Celestial Beings: Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schopflin. Developments in Christian Literature and Theology. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Nicol, W. “Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21.” *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 61–71.

Nihan, Christophe, and Julia Rhyder, eds. *Text and Ritual in the Pentateuch: A Systematic and Comparative Approach*. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Nir, Rivka. *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 20. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Nolland, John. “‘The Times of the Nations’ and a Prophetic Pattern in Luke 21.” Pages 129–52 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels. Vol. 3, The Gospel of Luke*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. Library of New Testament Studies 376. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 1.1–9.20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Dallas: Word Books, 2002.

Noordtzi, Arie. *The Book of Leviticus*. Translated by Raymond Togtman. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.

Notley, R. Steven. “Jesus’ Jewish Hermeneutical Method in the Nazareth Synagogue.” Pages 46–59 in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality, Vol. 2: Exegetical Studies*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. Library of New Testament Studies 392. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

O’Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1970.

O’Toole, Robert. “Luke’s Understanding of Jesus’ Resurrection-Ascension-Exaltation.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 9 (1979): 111–20.

Oliver, Isaac W. “The ‘Historical Paul’ and the Paul of Acts: Which Is More Jewish?” Pages 51–71 in *Paul the Jew: A Conversation between Pauline and Second Temple Scholars*. Edited by Carlos A. Segovia and Gabriele Boccaccini. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_. “When and How Did the Ekklēsia Split from the Synagogue?” Pages 104–27 in *The Jewish Roots of Christianity*. Edited by Gerald McDermott. Bellingham: Lexham, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke’s Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/355. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Olson, Daniel C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: "All Nations Shall be Blessed," With a New Translation and Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 24. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Orlov, Andrei A. *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series* 8. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Osborne, Grant R. "Testing God's Son. Deuteronomy and Luke 4.1–13." Pages 365–87 in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy in Honor of Daniel I. Block*. Edited by Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth J. Turner. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Otzen, Benedikt. "Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function." Pages 199–215 in *In The Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*. Edited by W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 31. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.

Overman, J. A. "κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος: A Short History of Paul's Pharisaism." Pages 180–93 in *Pauline Conversation in Context: Essays in Honor of Calvin J. Roetzel*. Edited by J. C. Anderson, P. Sellew, and C. Setzer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Pao, David W. "Jesus's Ascension and the Lukan Account of the Restoration of Israel." Pages 137–56 in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*. Edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016.

Parker, D. C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Parker, Simon B. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Translated by Mark S. Smith, Simon B. Parker, Edward L. Greenstein, Theodore J. Lewis, David Marcus. *Writings from the Ancient World Series*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Parry, Donald W. "The Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary." Pages 113–37 in *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*. Edited by Donald W. Parry. Provo, UT: Deseret Books, 1994.

Parsons, Mikeal C. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 21. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Pate, C. Marvin, and Douglas W. Kennard, eds. *Deliverance Now and Not Yet: The New Testament and the Great Tribulation*. Studies in Biblical Literature 54. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

Patrick, A. Tiller. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Peeler, Amy L. B. *'You Are My Son': The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Library of New Testament Studies 486. London: T&T Clark, 2014.

Penner, Todd. *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Pesch, Rudolf. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Vol. 1. Zürich: Benziger, 1986.

Péter, René. "L'imposition des mains dans l'ancien testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 27 (1977): 48–55.

Petersen, David L. *The Prophetic Literature: An Introduction*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Pierce, Madison N. *Divine Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Recontextualization of Spoken Quotations of Scripture*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Pinkner, Aron. "A Goat to Go to Azazel." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 7 (2007): 1–25.  
<https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2007.v7.a8>.

Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, The Tribulation, and the End of Exile*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

Pitta, Antonio. "Paul, The Pharisee, and The Law." Pages 99–122 in *Paul's Jewish Matrix*. Edited by Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011.

Plevnik, J. "Son of Man Seated at the Right Hand of God: Luke 22.69 in Lucan Christology." *Biblica* 72 (1991): 331–47.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.

Pokorny, Petr. "The Temptation Stories and Their Intention." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 115–27.

Pope, Marvin. "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Is 35, 40–66." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952): 235–43.

Porten, B. *Archives from Elephantine*. Berkeley: University of California, 1968.

Powell, Mark Allan. *What Are They Saying about Acts?* New York: The Paulist Press, 1991.



- Price, R. M. “Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12.1–10).” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 7 (1980): 33–40.
- Prinsloo, Willem S. *The Theology of the Book of Joel*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985.
- Puech, Émile. *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie future*. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 31. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Qimron, Elisha and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma‘ase Ha-Torah*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 10. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Ravens, D. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Reardon, Timothy W. “Cleansing through Almsgiving in Luke-Acts: Purity, Cornelius, and the Translation of Acts 15.9.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 78 (2016): 463–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Politics of Salvation: Lukan Soteriology, Atonement, and the Victory of Christ*. Library of New Testament Studies 642. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Enoch, Eden, and the Beginnings of Jewish Cosmography.” Pages 67–94 in *The Cosmography of Paradise: The Other World from Ancient Mesopotamia to Medieval Europe*. Edited by Alessandro Scafi. London: The Warburg Institute, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Mapping the First Book of Enoch: Geographical Issues in George Nickelsburg’s Commentary.” Pages 387–94 in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An On-Going Dialogue of Learning*, 2 Vols. Edited by Jacob Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series 80. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Regev, Eyal. “Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History.” *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 64–89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Temple Prayer as the Origin of the Fixed Prayer (On the Evolution of Prayer During the Period of the Second Temple).” *Zion* 70 (2005): 5–30. (Hebrew).
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Temple in Mark: A Case Study About the Early Christian Attitude Toward the Temple.” Pages 144 in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity: Text and Context*. Edited by Dan Jaffé. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 74. Leiden. Brill, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Luke’s Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts*, by Isaac W. Oliver. *AJS Review* 48 (2024): 217–18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019.

- Rendtorff, R. *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift: Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 62. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten Testament 24. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- Rhyder, Julia. *Centralizing the Cult: The Holiness Legislation in Leviticus 17–26*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Ribbens, Benjamin J. *Levitical Sacrifice and Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 222. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.
- Rice, P. H. *Behold, Your House Is Left to You: The Theological and Narrative Place of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke's Gospel*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016.
- Richter, Sandra L. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: Leshakken Shemo Sham in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 318. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "Liturgy and Cosmogony: The Ritual Use of Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East." Pages 122–23 in *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*. Edited by Donald W. Parry. Provo, UT: Deseret Books, 1994.
- Rillera, Andrew R. *Lamb of the Free: Recovering the Varied Sacrificial Understandings of Jesus's Death*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2023.
- Rius-Camps, Josep, and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition, Vol. 1: Acts 1.1–5.42 – Jerusalem*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 257. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "Priestly Discourse in Luke and Acts." Pages 49–76 in *Jesus and Mary Reimagined in Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins and J. M. Potter. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- Rodriguez, A. M. "Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cultic-Related Texts." PhD diss., Andrews University, 1980.
- Rosenberg, Joel. "The Garden Story Forward and Backward: The Non-Narrative Dimension of Gen 2–3." Pages 47–68 in *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Joel Rosenberg. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Roth, S. John. *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 144. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Rothman, Joel M. *The Cosmic Journey in the Book of Revelation: Apocalyptic Cosmology and the Experience of Story-Space*. Library of New Testament Studies 683. London: T&T Clark, 2023.

Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London. SPCK, 1982.

Rudman, Dominic. “A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 396–401.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Reflections on a Half-Created World: The Sea, Night and Death in the Bible.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 19 (2000): 33–42.

Runia, David T. “The Idea and the Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo of Alexandria.” Pages 217–18 in *Philo of Alexandria: Collected Studies 1997–2021*. Edited by David T. Runia. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 187. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Philo of Alexandria: On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses: Introduction, Translation, and, Commentary*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1992.

Sanders, James T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Sandler, Samuel. *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. New York: Hebrew Union College Press, 1971.

Sarna, Nahum M. *Exodus*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society of America, 1991.

Sayler, Gwendolyn B. *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 72. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

Schäfer, Peter. “New Testament and Hekhalot Literature: The Journey into Heaven in Paul and Merkavah Mysticism.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 35 (1984): 19–35.

Schams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 291. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Schedtler, Justin P. Jeffcoat. “The Hymns in Revelation.” Pages 115–30 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Book of Revelation*. Edited by Craig R. Koester. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Schenck, Kenneth L. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Schipper, Bernd U., and D. Andrew Teeter, eds. *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of ‘Torah’ in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series 163. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Schmid, Konrad. “Textual, Historical, Sociological, and Ideological Cornerstones of the Formation of the Pentateuch.” Pages 29–54 in *The Social Groups Behind the Pentateuch*. Edited by Jaeyoung Jeon. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.

Schniedewind, William M., Jason M. Zurawski, and Gabriele Boccaccini. *Torah: Functions, Meanings, and Diverse Manifestations in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Early Judaism and its Literature 56. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.

Schreiber, Mordecai. “I Will Pour out My Spirit on All Flesh (Joel 3.1).” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 41 (2013): 123–29.

Schreiner, Patrick. “Space, Place, and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends.” *CBR* 14 (2016): 340–71.

Schüle, Andreas. “Isaiah 56–66.” Pages 128–41 in *The Oxford Handbook of Isaiah*. Edited by Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 2 Vols. Revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elisabeth. “Luke 2.41–52.” *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 309–403.

Schwartz, Daniel R. “‘Judaean’ or ‘Jew’? How Should We Translate Ioudaios in Josephus?” Pages 3–27 in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 71. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Schwartz, Glenn M. “Archaeology and Sacrifice.” Pages 1–32 in *Sacred Killing: The Archaeology of Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Anne M. Porter and Glenn M. Schwartz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012.

Schwartz, Seth. “How Many Judaismes Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization.” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 208–38.

Scott, James M. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Segal, Michael. “Narrative and Law in the Book of Jubilees: A New Inquiry into the Story of Entering into the Garden of Eden.” *Megillot* 1 (2003): 111–26 (in Hebrew).

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Selvatici, Monica. “The Most High Does not Dwell in Houses Made with Human Hands: A Study of Possible Hellenistic Jewish Parallels for the Jerusalem Temple as Idolatry in Acts 7.48.” *Antíteses* 10 (2017): 1063–80.

Sharon, Diane M. “A Biblical Parallel to a Sumerian Temple Hymn: Ezekiel 40–48 and Gudea.” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 24 (1996): 99–109.

- Shauf, Scott. "Locating the Eunuch: Characterization and Narrative Context in Acts 8.26-40." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 762–75.
- Shectman, Sarah, and Joel Baden, eds. *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009.
- Shellberg, Pamela. *Cleansed Lepers, Cleansed Hearts: Purity and Healing in Luke–Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Shinall, Myrick C. "The Social Condition of Lepers in the Gospels." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137 (2018): 915–34.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 39. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Sklar, Jay. *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005.
- Sleeman, Matthew. "The Ascension and Heavenly Ministry of Christ." Pages 140–90 in *The Forgotten Christ: Exploring the Majesty and Mystery of God Incarnate*. Edited by Stephen Clark. Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 146. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Sloan, David B. "Interpreting Scripture with Satan? The Devil's Use of Scripture in Luke's Temptation Narrative." *Tyndale Bulletin* 66 (2015): 231–50.
- Sloan, Robert. "'Signs and Wonders': A Rhetorical Clue to the Pentecost Discourse," *Evangelical Quarterly* 63 (1991): 225–40.
- Smith, David A. *Luke and the Jewish Other: Politics of Identity in the Third Gospel*. New York: Routledge, 2024.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 36. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Smith, Joshua P. *Luke Was not a Christian: Reading the Third Gospel and Acts within Judaism*. Biblical Interpretation Series 218. Leiden: Brill, 2024.
- Smith, Mitzi J. *Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles: Charismatics, the Jews, and Women*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 154. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.
- Smuts, Peter Webster. *Luke and the Olivet Discourse: A Redaction-Critical Study of Luke 21.5–36*. PhD Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1996.

Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Solevåg, Anna Rebecca. “No Nuts? No Problem! Disability, Stigma, and the Baptized Eunuch in Acts 8.26–40.” *Biblical Interpretation* 24 (2016): 81–99.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Stanton, Graham N. “Stephen in Lucan Perspective.” Pages 345–60 in *Studia Biblica 1978, III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.

Staples, Jason A. “‘Rise, Kill and Eat’: Animals as Nations in Early Jewish Visionary Literature and Acts 10.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 42 (2019): 3–17.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism: A New Theory of People, Exile, and Israelite Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 55 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 121. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985.

Stephenson, F. R. “The Date of the Book of Joel.” *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 224–29.

Sterling, Gregory E. “‘Opening the Scriptures’: The Legitimation of the Diaspora and the Early Christian Mission.” Pages 217–34 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Legacy*. Edited by David P. Moessner. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 107. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.

Stockhausen, Carol L. “Luke’s Stories of the Ascension: The Background and Function of a Dual Narrative.” *Proceedings* 10 (1990): 259–67.

Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan. “Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21–32.” *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 11 (2000): 27–58.

Stone, Michael E. “Amram.” Pages 23–24 of Volume 1 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 395–406 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception, and Conversion.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 12 (1981): 195–205.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 417–18 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra*. Missoula, MN: Scholars Press, 1979.

Strazicich, John. *Joel’s Use of Scripture and the Scripture’s Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. *Biblical Interpretation* 82. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Strelan, Rick. “The Ascension as a Cultic Experience in Acts.” Pages 213–33 in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts: New Explorations of Luke’s Narrative Hinge*. Edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

Strenski, Ivan. “The Social and Intellectual Origins of Hubert and Mauss’s Theory of Ritual Sacrifice.” Pages 511–37 in *India and Beyond. Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought*. Edited by D. van der Meij. London: Keagan Paul International, 1997.

Stroup, Christopher R. *The Christians Who Became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City*. Synkrisis. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020.

Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea-Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary 31. Dallas: Word, 2002.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. “Ezra’s Vision of the Lady: Form and Function of a Turning Point.” Pages 137–50 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series* 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7.” Pages 211–20 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series* 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Such, W. A. *The Abomination of Desolation in the Gospel of Mark*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1999.

Sulzbach, Carla. “The Fate of Jerusalem in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra: From Earth to Heaven and Back?” Pages 138–52 in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*. Edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini. Library of Second Temple Studies 87. London: T&T Clark, 2014.

Suter, David W. “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 115–35.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Fallen Angels Revisited.” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 137–42.

Svartvik, Jesper. “Rendering the Rending of the Veil: What Difference Does it Make?” Pages 257–76 in *Making a Difference: Essays on the Bible and Judaism in Honor of Tamara Cohn Eskenazi*. Edited by David J. A. Clines, Kent Harold Richards, and Jacob L. Wright. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.

Sweeney, Marvin A. “The Latter Prophets.” Pages 69–94 in *The Hebrew Bible Today: An Introduction to Critical Issues*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Matt Patrick Graham. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Twelve Prophets, Vol. 1: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2000.

Sylva, Dennis D. “The Meaning and Function of Acts 7.46–50.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 261–75.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Temple Curtain and Jesus’ Death in the Gospel of Luke.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 239–50.

Tannehill, Robert C. “‘Cornelius’ and ‘Tabitha’ Encounter Luke’s Jesus.” *Interpretation* 48 (1994): 347–56.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 400–414.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Taylor, Joan E. “Paul’s Significant Other in the ‘We’ Passages.” Pages 125–56 in *Who Created Christianity? Fresh Approaches to the Relationship between Paul and Jesus*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Aaron W. White. Grand Rapids: Hendrickson, 2020.

Taylor, N. H. “Stephen, the Temple, and Early Christian Eschatology.” *Revue Biblique* 110 (2003): 62–85.



- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Jerusalem Temple in Luke–Acts.” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 60 (2004): 459–85.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Thiessen, Matthew. “A Worthy Cornelius and Divine Grace: Complicating John Barclay's *Paul and the Gift*.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 84 (2022): 462–79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luke 2.22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity.” *Novum Testamentum* 54 (2012): 16–29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Paul, the Animal Apocalypse, and Abraham’s Gentile Seed.” Pages 65–78 in *The Ways That Often Parted: Essays in Honor of Joel Marcus*. Edited by Lori Baron, Jill Hicks-Keeton, and Matthew Thiessen. Early Christianity and its Literature. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Forces of Death: The Gospels’ Portrayal of Ritual Impurity within First-Century Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020.
- Thurston, Bonnie Bowman. “Who Was Anna? Luke 2.36–38.” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 28 (2001): 47–56.
- Tiede, David L. “The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1.” *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 278–86.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. “11QMelchizedek.” Pages 221–41 in *Qumran Cave 11 II. 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A Partial Reedition of 4Q26<sup>a</sup> (4QLeviticus<sup>e</sup>): A New Fragment and a Reinterpretation.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 21 (2014): 234–239.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic New Jerusalem.” Pages 117–32 in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by T. Nicklas, J. Verheyden, and E. Eynikel. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements Series 143. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tiller, Patrick A. “The ‘Eternal Planting’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 326–35.
- Toffelmire, Colin M. *A Discourse and Register Analysis of the Prophetic Book of Joel*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 66. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Tov, Emanuel. “4QLev<sup>c,e,g</sup> (4Q25, 26<sup>a</sup>, 26b).” Pages 257–261 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Treier, Daniel. “The Fulfillment of Joel 2.28–32: A Multiple-Lens Approach.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 13–26.

Trull, Gregory V. “Views on Peter’s Use of Psalm 16.8–11 in Acts 2.25–32.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 161 (2004): 194–214.

Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Tyson, Joseph B. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

Ulansey, David. “The Heavenly Veil Torn. Mark’s Cosmic Inclusio.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 123–25.

van der Merwe, B. J. “The Laying on of Hands in the Old Testament.” *Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika* 5 (1962): 34–43.

Van Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. “The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3.1–31.” *Bijdragen* 57 (1996): 305–17.

van Stempvoort, P. A. “Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958): 30–42.

VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jubilees 1–21: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees Chapters 1–21*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 510. Scriptores Aethiopici 87. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jubilees: A Translation*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511, Scriptores Aethiopici 88. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Studia Post-Biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Vis, Joshua M. “The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering.” Pages 33–58 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Research in Biblical Studies. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Wahlen, Clinton. “Peter’s Vision and Conflicting Definitions of Purity.” *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 505–18.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walsh, Matthew L. *Angels Associated with Israel in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Angelology and Sectarian Identity at Qumran*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/509. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Ward, Seth. “The Presentation of Jesus: Jewish Perspectives on Luke 2.22–24.” *Shofar* 21 (2003): 21–39.

Wardle, Timothy. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/291. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Warren, David H. “‘Can Anyone Withhold the Water?’ (Acts 10.47): Toward an Understanding of Luke’s Argument in the Story of Cornelius.” Pages 131–42 in *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and Symbols: Essays in Honor of François Bovon*. Edited by David Warren, Ann Graham Brock, and David Pao. Biblical Interpretation Series 66. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Watts, James W. “‘ōlāh: The Rhetoric of Burnt Offerings.” *Vetus Testamentum* 56 (2006): 125–37.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch*. Biblical Seminar 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Understanding the Pentateuch as a Scripture*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2017.

Watts, Rikki. *Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Wayment, Thomas A. “Peter, Cornelius, and Cultural Boundaries.” Pages 211–26 in *The Ministry of Peter, the Chief Apostle: The 43rd Annual Brigham Young University Sidney B. Sperry Symposium*. Edited by Frank F. Judd Jr., Eric D. Huntsman, and Shon D. Hopkin. Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book, 2014.

Weber, Max. *The Sociology of Religion*. Translated by Ephraim Fischhoff. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Weinert, Francis D. “The Meaning of the Temple in Luke–Acts.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 11 (1981). 85–89.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke.” PhD diss., Fordham University, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Multiple Meanings of Luke 2.49 and their Significance.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 13 (1983): 19–22.

Weinfeld, Moshe. “Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord – the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Gen 1.1–2.3.” Pages 501–12 in *Milanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de Monsieur Henri Cazelles*. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Delcor. Neukirchen: Neukircheneur Verlag, 1981.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Edinburgh. Black, 1885; reprinted, Atlanta. Scholars Press, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin, 1883.

Wenham, Gordon. “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story.” Pages 399 in *I Studied Inscriptions from Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*. Edited by Richard S. Hess and David Toshio Tsumura. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Wenk, Matthias. *Community—Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Westerholm, Stephen. “Whence 'The Torah' of Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 19–44 in *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period: The Debate over Torah and Nomos in Post-biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Peter Richardson and Stephen Westerholm. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.

White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Widengren, Geo. “Temple Building: A Task for Gods and Kings.” *Orientalia* 32 (1963): 56–58.

Wiens, Delbert. *Stephen's Sermon and the Structure of Luke-Acts*. N. Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1995.

Wierciński, Andrzej. “Pyramids and Ziggurats as the Architectonic Representations of the Archetype of the Cosmic Mountain.” *Katunob* 10 (1977): 71–87.

Wilkins, M. J. “Temptation of Jesus.” Pages 952–59 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine Brown, and Nicholas Perrin, 2nd Edition. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013.

Willet, Tom W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 4. London: T&T Clark, 1989.

Wills, Lawrence M. “The Depiction of the Jews in Acts.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 631–54.

Wilson, Alistair I. *When Will These Things Happen? A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21-25*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007.

Wilson, Benjamin R. *The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ. The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 223. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Wilson, Brittany E. “The Smell of Sacrifice. Scenting the Christian Story in Luke–Acts.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 83 (2021): 257–75.

Wilson, E. Jan. *The Cylinders of Gudea: Transliteration, Translation, and Index*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 244. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Wilson, Walter. “Urban Legends. Acts 10.1–11.18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001): 77–99.

Witherington, Ben, III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans, 2001.

Witherup, Ronald D. “Cornelius Over and Over and Over again: ‘Functional Redundancy’ in the Acts of the Apostles.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 15 (1993): 45–66.

Witte, Markus, Jens Schröter, and Verena M. Lepper, eds. *Torah, Temple, Land: Constructions of Judaism in Antiquity*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 184. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos*. Translated by Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow. Edited by S. Dean McBride, Jr. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Woodington, J. David. “Charity and Deliverance from Death in the Accounts of Tabitha and Cornelius.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79 (2017): 634–50.

Woodman, Simon P. “Fire from Heaven. Divine Judgment in the Book of Revelation.” Pages 175–192 in *The Book of Revelation*. Edited by Garrick V. Allen, Ian Paul, and Simon P. Woodman. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/411. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Wright, David P. “The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106 (1986): 433–46.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Wright, J. Edward. *Baruch ben Neriah. From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.

Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Young, Frances. “Typology and Eschatology: The Scriptural Shaping of Imagery in the Book of Revelation.” Pages 11–24 in *The Scriptures in the Book of Revelation and Apocalyptic Literature. Essays in Honour of Steve Moyise*. Edited by Susan E. Docherty and Steve Smith. Library of New Testament Studies 634. London: T&T Clark, 2023.

Zahn, Molly M. *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Period Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Zatelli, Ida. “The Origin of The Biblical Scapegoat Ritual: The Evidence of Two Eblaite Texts.” *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998): 254–63.

Zehnle, Richard F. *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 15. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

Zevi, Ziony. *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches*. London: Bloomsbury, 2001.

Zohar, Noam. “Repentance and Purification: The Significance and Semantics of *ḥaṭṭāṭ* in the Pentateuch.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 609–18.

Zwiep, Arie W. “The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24.50–53; Acts 1.1–2, 9–11).” *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 219–44. Reprinted in Pages 7–37 in *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God. Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Arie W. Zwiep. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/293. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Ascension of The Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 87. Leiden: Brill, 1997.