

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1

THE DEATH OF JESUS AS A HISTORICAL
AND THEOLOGICAL PROBLEM**Why Did Jesus Die?**

Of all the questions regularly asked about Jesus, the question “Why did Jesus die?” must be among the most frequent.

– N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*¹

Why did Jesus die? The traditional *theological* answer to this question, of course, is “for our sins,” but that is not exactly a *historical* explanation of Jesus’ death. Every semester I ask incoming students this seemingly simple, straightforward question. Invariably, most respond, as if on cue, with the same answer, yet I am always struck by how easily a theological answer is assumed to be *the* answer to the question, illustrating how theological interpretations of Jesus’ death often overshadow the causal historical factors. I spend much of the semester problematizing this presupposition by encouraging students to differentiate between historical and theological responses to the data. Typically, students are not sure precisely *why* they think the way they do. Some of them are familiar with the idea that Jesus fulfilled certain “messianic prophecies” or replaced the Temple sacrifices with his own voluntary sacrifice; however, while the idea that it was God’s will for Jesus to die so that He could give us eternal life may be a theologically and emotionally edifying doctrine and belief,² and is certainly part of the historical *tradition*, it is not a historical *explanation* of Jesus’ death.

The present work is a critical investigation into the cultural, political, economic, and religious contexts of the historical Jesus and the politico-religious conflicts that led to his arrest, trial, and

¹ N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God, Vol 2: Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 540.

² Mark 8:31; 10:32–34; 10:38; 10:43–45; 14:22–25; John 10:17–18.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)2 *Jesus and the Temple*

execution.³ Most Jesus specialists agree that the Temple incident led directly to Jesus' execution, but what few scholars seem to agree on is precisely what Jesus *did* during this incident or why he was so upset with the Temple in the first place.⁴ Reexamining the historical sequence of Jesus' Temple incident, arrest, and trial – events which all point to high priestly initiation and participation in Jesus' Roman execution, *Jesus and the Temple* provides a new historical explanation of *why* Jesus died. It is the contention of this study that the traditional theological explanation of Jesus' death does not adequately represent the social, economic, political, and religious contexts within which Jesus lived and died. The historical Jesus was engaged in disagreements over the interpretation of the law, or Torah, the administration of the Temple, and the role of violence in the redemption of Israel, and his death was the end result of his ministry and critique of the Temple's administration.

Since the Enlightenment, traditional views about Jesus' identity, miracles, atoning death, and resurrection have come under constant and increasing scrutiny. The historical Jesus is now routinely constructed within the context of Second Temple Judaism, a sectarian world of diverse Jewish groups and individuals with divergent views of the proper role and interpretation of the Torah and Temple. Yet the greatest challenge still facing critical scholarship on Jesus is identifying what *kind* of Jew Jesus was; simply being “Jewish” does not tell us enough about Jesus' distinctive and particular identity. The dominant paradigm for the historical Jesus – that he was an apocalyptic prophet who predicted and/or threatened the destruction of the Temple – is plausibly based on a surface-level reading of the Gospel narratives, but identifies Jesus as a preacher of doom and judgment, a failed messiah who died an unnecessarily tragic death. Moreover, when it comes to reconstructing what Jesus objected to in the Temple, why Jesus offended the Temple leadership, and why

³ N.A. Dahl, “The Problem of the Historical Jesus,” in C.E. Braaten and R.A. Harrisville (eds.) *Kerygma and History: A Symposium on the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 158: “Historical research must begin with the death of Jesus if it will inquire not only into the preaching but also into the life of Jesus.”

⁴ Adele Reinhartz, “The Temple Cleansing and the Death of Jesus,” in C. S. Ehrlich, A. Runesson, and E. Schuller (eds.), *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber* (WUNT 305; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 110, notes that the Gospels “seem uninterested, uninformed, or both, on ... the event which sparked the process by which Jesus meet (sic) his death.”

The Death of Jesus as a Historical, Theological Problem 3

they in turn orchestrated his execution, most exegetes appeal to the Temple incident but focus on Jesus' critique of its commerce, corruption, or illegitimacy, common enough complaints in this period, but arguably insufficient to warrant crucifixion by political conspiracy. If Jesus was simply a loyal, observant Jew who practiced "common Judaism," then why was he engaged in so many religious controversies? Why did he seem to generate such intense hostility? If Jesus revered the Temple and participated in the Temple cult, then why did he predict, if not threaten, its destruction? What gave Jesus the authority to interpret, let alone correct, the Torah? If Jesus' execution is best explained by positing a conspiratorial alliance initiated by *religious* leaders and authorities, it seems safe to assume that the thrust of Jesus' offense was directed squarely at *them*.

Jesus was executed for sedition but he led no armies and mounted no rebellion.⁵ Nonetheless, if it is reasonable to presume that Jesus was executed for a reason – whatever that reason may be – then we must be willing to reexamine the Gospel narratives for clues, especially as their authors either did not know why Jesus offended the Temple's authorities or they wished to obscure their knowledge by emphasizing other explanations for their Master's death. The reverence in which Jesus was held by his disciples and the horror of his brutal death created an immediate need for an explanation that could reconcile the historical and theological elements of the event and make meaning out of them.⁶ Jesus' followers "remembered" Jesus' conflict with the Temple, his arrest, trial, suffering, and death in Jerusalem during the Passover festival – events ritually commemorated in the sacred meal they "remembered" Jesus instituting – but they did so in different contexts.⁷ Moreover, those

⁵ Dale B. Martin, "Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous," *JSNT*, 37.1 (2014), 3–24, suggests that Jesus attempted to occupy the Temple and take up arms against the Romans, "advocating" for the Temple's destruction (14, 16–17). For critique, see Paula Fredriksen, "Arms and the Man: A Response to Dale Martin's 'Jesus in Jerusalem: Armed and Not Dangerous,'" *JSNT*, 37.3 (2015), 312–25. On the violent revolutionary hypothesis, see Simon J. Joseph, *The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 23–50.

⁶ On early Christian cultic-performative remembrances of Jesus' death, see Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, *Jesus' Death in Early Christian Memory: The Poetics of the Passion* (NTOA/SUNT 53; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2004), esp. 27–54.

⁷ Alan Kirk, "The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q," in A. Kirk and T. Thatcher (eds.), *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (SS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 203, links Jesus'

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *Jesus and the Temple*

“memories” were rapidly transformed into community *traditions* and then came to influence the composition of the Gospels, producing a controlling effect on how the story of Jesus was told and re-told.

The New Testament contains four *different* accounts of the Temple incident and Jesus’ Temple-related sayings. It is not always clear, however, whether the events of Jesus’ last week in Jerusalem were “remembered” by “eyewitnesses,” and, even if they were, whether those “memories” were reliable.⁸ “Memories” can be “manufactured.”⁹ In the case of the Temple incident, each Gospel represents a different literary-theological *interpretation* of a sequence of events infused with scriptural allusions *and* historical reminiscence.¹⁰ In other words, we must still sift through the different “memories” and traditions inscribed and re-inscribed in the Gospels in order to construct persuasive historical accounts of “*wie es eigentlich gewesen war.*” At the same time, we must also attempt to explain the emergence of *different* interpretations of “what happened.”¹¹ Our sources must be critically scrutinized and sorted according to their relative chronological, redactional, and theological fingerprints and

death in Q 11:47-51 to the commemorative and “moral exhortation” of martyrdom, arguing that Q’s view of Jesus cannot be “collapsed into the images emerging in other streams of early Christian tradition.”

⁸ Judith C. S. Redman, “How Accurate are Eyewitnesses? Bauckham and the Eyewitnesses in the Light of Psychological Research,” *JBL*, 129 (2010), 177-97. On the unreliability of memory, see also Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), 1-30. Allison concludes that “our Synoptic writers thought that they were reconfiguring memories of Jesus” (459). See also J. Fried, *Der Schleier der Erinnerung: Grundzüge einer historischen Memorik* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2004).

⁹ Zeba A. Crook, “Collective Memory Distortion and the Quest for the Historical Jesus,” *JSHJ*, 11 (2013), esp. 64-76.

¹⁰ On the role of *interpretation* in “eyewitness” testimony, see Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT 123; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). See also Jens Schröter, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon* (trans. W. Coppins; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013), 25. On memory as “distortion” or “refraction,” see Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco: Baylor, 2009), 13. On the Markan passion narrative as (liturgical) “scripturalization,” see Mark Goodacre, “Scripturalization in Mark’s Crucifixion Narrative,” in G. van Oyen and T. Shepherd (eds.), *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark* (CBET 45; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 33-47.

¹¹ Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus*, 74.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Death of Jesus as a Historical, Theological Problem* 5

tested against the known historical context.¹² In this case, it is the Palestinian Jewish cultural context of the early Jesus movement that can serve as a control to our interpretive and reconstructive efforts related to Jesus' teaching, his relationship to the Temple, conflict with Jewish religious authorities, and political execution.

The present study seeks to shed new light on the historical circumstances which led to Jesus' death by problematizing Jesus' relationship to the Temple and the identification of Jesus and his death as a "sacrifice" in the New Testament. Chapter one reviews the Gospels' accounts of Jesus' death as a politico-religious conspiracy and assassination orchestrated by the high priesthood in collaboration with the Roman prefect. Chapter two explores the role of the Torah in Second Temple Judaism, with special attention given to the theme of eschatological restoration and the different ways that the New Testament authors portrayed the Mosaic Law in relationship to Jesus' teachings, life, and death. Chapter three focuses on contemporary critical discussions on the origins, function, and significance of sacrifice in antiquity, with particular emphasis on how sacrifice is represented in the Torah, the prophetic literature, and the Qumran corpus. Chapter four surveys the New Testament sources on the Temple incident. Chapter five re-examines the hypotheses that the Temple incident represented either a prophetic demonstration of the symbolic destruction of the Temple or an eschatological "cleansing" of its administration and proposes a new hypothesis that attempts to more adequately account for the full range of data. Chapter six further explores and supports this hypothesis by tracing its role and function in "Jewish Christianity." Finally, chapter seven re-examines the identification of Jesus as a sacrifice in the New Testament as interpreted within multiple discourses on sacrifice in Paul's letters, Isaiah's Servant Songs, and the Last Supper narratives.

The early association of Jesus' death with the language and vocabulary of *sacrifice* made meaning out of a tragic event, but it also obscured the original circumstances that led to Jesus' death. The original participants in these events were recast as characters in a divine drama brought to life in the Gospels' passion narratives, which

¹² Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 506: "The question is whether it is trustworthy, and this is open to tests of internal consistency and coherence, and consistency and coherence with what other relevant historical evidence we have and whatever else we know about the historical context."

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *Jesus and the Temple*

downplayed the original tensions, conflicts, and cultural dynamics that led to the cross. Pilate became the reluctant governor and Jesus the willing victim of a divine sacrifice orchestrated by God. The Gospel of Jesus became the Gospel about Jesus. The idea that Jesus died because he offended the religious authorities who conspired against him was supplemented by the idea that it was God who had purposefully orchestrated his death all along. Jesus' death was viewed through the lens of a theological conviction that God intended Jesus to die as a divine sacrifice for sin.¹³ Christianity was soon envisioned as the covenantal replacement of Judaism, with Jesus' sacrifice being the effective replacement of the Temple system. These theological perspectives have overshadowed the historical circumstances of the Temple incident. It is not surprising that some scholars consider the incident itself a fictional account, with the evangelists framing Jesus' last week as a kind of showdown between him and the religious leaders.¹⁴ Such severe scepticism, however, seems unwarranted. The authors of the Gospels certainly *highlight* the conflict between Jesus and the Temple's administration for dramatic tension, but that does not mean that they *invented* the tale.

Today most scholars recognize that it was Jesus' criticism of the Temple's administration, his offense to traditional forms of piety, his contested authority,¹⁵ and his growing popularity that led to his death. Jesus' death was clearly influenced by sociopolitical, economic, and religious conflicts with his contemporaries, particularly the Temple administration.¹⁶ Craig Evans, for example, suggests that this can

¹³ On Jesus' death as remembered "around Passover," see Helen K. Bond, "Dating the Death of Jesus: Memory and the Religious Imagination," *NTS*, 59.4 (2013), 471: "both the Markan and the Johannine chronologies with which we are familiar are based on theological reflections derived from the memory that Jesus died *at around the time of the Passover*."

¹⁴ David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act," *CBQ*, 55 (1993), 263–83, here 274. For criticism, see James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insights from the Law in Earliest Christianity* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 62–71.

¹⁵ Chris Keith, *Jesus Against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014).

¹⁶ James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and Temple: Textual and Archaeological Explorations* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014). On the Temple, see Martin Goodman, "The Temple in First-Century CE Judaism," in John Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 459–68; Moshe David Herr, "Jerusalem, the Temple, and Its Cult – Reality and Concepts in Second Temple Times," in A. Oppenheimer et al. (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1980), 166–77.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Death of Jesus as a Historical, Theological Problem* 7

be understood as a politico-ideological battle between the family of Jesus and the family of the high priest.¹⁷ Alternatively, Bruce Chilton proposes that Jesus' death was the end result of his sacrificial "program" to reform the Temple cult.¹⁸ Our interpretive problem is that the historical and theological aspects of Jesus' death were quickly confused and conflated.¹⁹ The historical realities of first-century Judea were relegated to the status of theological stage-props so that Jesus, Caiaphas, and Pilate became unwitting actors in a literary drama of divine salvation. This historical and theological confusion has resulted in major difficulties of interpretation.

The idea that Jesus died as an atoning blood sacrifice is a theological dogma. It cannot be affirmed or confirmed by historiographical analysis. It is a matter of faith. It has been an enduring source of spiritual comfort for millions of Christians for two thousand years, dramatically illustrating the love, mercy, and forgiveness of God.²⁰ The primary way this concept of atonement has been viewed is that Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection were divine mysteries that reconciled humanity and God. It is an idea embedded in the very earliest recorded Christian commemorative reflections on Jesus' death.²¹ It is a central component of ancient and contemporary Christian faith. It is also a serious historical problem.

Scot McKnight's recent study, *Jesus and His Death*, is illustrative.²² McKnight surveys a spectrum of views on Jesus' death and concludes that Jesus saw himself as "the Passover victim whose blood would protect his followers from the imminent judgment of God."²³ Jesus

¹⁷ Craig A. Evans, *From Jesus to the Church: The First Christian Generation* (Grand Rapids: Westminster John Knox, 2014); Eyal Regev, "Temple Concerns and High-Priestly Prosecutions from Peter to James: Between Narrative and History," *NTS*, 56 (2010), 64–89.

¹⁸ Bruce Chilton, *The Temple of Jesus: His Sacrificial Program within a Cultural History of Sacrifice* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 138.

¹⁹ Frances M. Young, "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity: A Study in the Relationship between Jews and Christians in the Early Centuries," *NTS*, 19 (1972), 335, argues that Jesus was "condemned for criticism of the Jewish Law and the Temple-cult." In *Sacrifice and the Death of Christ* (Cambridge University Press, 1975), 96, Young affirms that Jesus died *as a sacrifice*.

²⁰ Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).

²¹ 1 Cor. 15:3.

²² Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005). See also James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 824.

²³ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 339, also 280–1.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *Jesus and the Temple*

took God's wrath upon himself.²⁴ The New Testament witness, therefore, "goes right back to Jesus."²⁵ It is true, evidently, that the Gospels contain multiple passages in which Jesus foresees his death, predicts his suffering, and proclaims its salvific, atoning power to his disciples, but that is precisely the point: *the Gospels were written to proclaim the Good News of Jesus' saving death and resurrection*. It is not difficult, therefore, to find passages affirming this proclamation. But this "Jesus" both celebrates the Passover by bringing a lamb to the Temple for sacrifice and predicts, even inaugurates, its destruction.²⁶ This Jesus, in other words, affirmed the Temple cult, participated in its sacrificial rites, criticized its administration, *and* predicted its destruction while instituting an alternative cultic meal *as* a blood sacrifice that would be "the sacrifice of all sacrifices."²⁷

The idea that Jesus' death was a sacrifice may conform to traditional *Christian theology*, but this conceptual language originated in and was derived from Second Temple *Jewish* ideology, theology, and ritual practice. The Temple was a powerful center of cultic ritual, meaning, and identity for ancient Jews. There is no doubt that most Jews (at most times) thought highly of the Temple and experienced their participation in it with reverence and piety. On the other hand, the Temple could also be perceived as a political symbol of collaboration, corruption, inequality, oppression, and religious illegitimacy. There were a variety of positions taken on sacrifice, ranging from pro-sacrifice critique of the Temple and its administration to explicitly antisacrificial stances. We will need to respect this ancient Jewish cultural diversity as we attempt to reconstruct how early Christianity – in and through its adoption of Jewish sacrificial logic, efficacy, vocabulary, imagery, ritual, and soteriology – became a "sacrificial" religion.²⁸

The contemporary study of Jesus and the early Jesus movement's relationship to the Temple cult is complicated, however, by religious and cultural biases that continue to inform our understanding of what ancient Jews and early Christians believed about sacrifice.²⁹

²⁴ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 142–3.

²⁵ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 372.

²⁶ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 254–5.

²⁷ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 325, 87.

²⁸ Guy G. Stroumsa, *The End of Sacrifice: Religious Transformations in Late Antiquity* (trans. Susan Emanuel; University of Chicago Press, 2009), 72.

²⁹ Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 75–100. See also Maria Zoe Petropoulo, *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Greek*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Death of Jesus as a Historical, Theological Problem* 9

Christianity has a long and disturbing legacy of theological supersessionism.³⁰ Whether it is a Christian bias that sacrifice was superseded by the death of Jesus, a Jewish bias that prayer and Torah study effectively replaced the Temple, a Reform-Jewish bias that ancient sacrifice was inferior, barbaric, or obsolete, or a scholarly prejudice toward seeing animal sacrifice as a “primitive” rite to be located on an evolutionary spectrum of progress,³¹ these biases are “methodologically unsound,” “inadequate and inaccurate” understandings of the evidence.³² Jonathan Klawans suggests that modern readers misrepresent animal sacrifice because of modern concerns regarding the environment, animal abuse, capitalism, and consumerism, and seeks to go beyond the “current antisacrificial bias” by providing a sympathetic view of the ancient system.³³ Klawans denies that the anti-Temple traditions in the New Testament go back to the earliest Christians. According to Klawans, the fact that Acts 2 reports the earliest (Jewish) Christians as living in Jerusalem and visiting the Temple regularly suggests that they did *not* object to the Temple cult.³⁴ The earliest Christians “chose to be headquartered in Jerusalem” and this is virtually inexplicable if “a radically antitemple program was part of the picture from the earliest stage.”³⁵ Moreover, there are a number of Jesus traditions which “assume his followers worship in the temple, and will continue to do so.”³⁶ After all, Jesus’ disciples visit the Temple to prepare for the Passover immediately after the Temple incident.³⁷ For Klawans, neither Jesus nor his followers nor Paul ever

Religion, Judaism, and Christianity, 100 BC to AD 200 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Christian A. Eberhart (ed.), *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible* (RBS 68; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

³⁰ Jon D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), x.

³¹ See especially William Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (London: Adam and Charles, 1894); René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (trans. P. Gregory; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977); Walter Burkert, *Homeric Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (trans. P. Bing; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

³² Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 3.

³³ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 10.

³⁴ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 217.

³⁵ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 218, citing Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 94–6, 106, 147.

³⁶ Matt 8:4, Mark 1:44, and Luke 5:14, Matt 23:21.

³⁷ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 218.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-12535-3 - Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context

Simon J. Joseph

Excerpt

[More information](#)10 *Jesus and the Temple*

rejected the Temple. Paul simply “borrowed” concepts from the sacrificial lexicon of Judaism and regarded the Temple cult as “proper and effective.”³⁸

Similarly, Daniel Ullucci argues that early Christian “nonparticipation” in sacrifice was “part of a larger argument over what sacrifice ought to be” made by people committed to the practice.³⁹ Early Christians were cultural “producers” and their “positions on sacrifice cannot and should not be construed as critiques . . . Their texts are evidence of their participation.”⁴⁰ In short, “there is nothing antisacrificial in the earliest Christian sources,”⁴¹ Paul “fully supports animal sacrifice in the temple of Jerusalem,” and “Rejections of sacrifice in second- and third-century Christian sources are post-facto rationales for a non-participation that came decades before.” Ullucci proposes that Christians only rejected sacrifice because the destruction of the Temple put an end to their participation; the *earliest* Christians had a *positive* view of the Temple cult.⁴² Nonetheless, the Christian rejection of blood sacrifice was a challenge not only to the social and political structures of Roman society but to a widely shared view of the cosmos as well.⁴³ Klawans and Ullucci seem to represent “a growing scholarly recognition of the early Christian appreciation of the Temple and the sacrificial cult.”⁴⁴

In a recent study comparing the early Jerusalem community to alternative “temples” in Samaria, Leontopolis, and Qumran, Timothy Wardle shows that a number of Jewish communities were willing to create an “alternative” temple. He also notes that both the historical Jesus and the early Jesus movement engaged in polemical

³⁸ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 221.

³⁹ Daniel C. Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3; “Before Animal Sacrifice: A Myth of Innocence,” *R & T*, 15 (2008), 357–74.

⁴⁰ Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*, 8.

⁴¹ Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*, 12.

⁴² Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downer’s Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 157, argues that “the early believers purposefully ignored the sacrificial cult going on in the temple.” Contra Johannes Zachhuber, “Modern Discourse on Sacrifice and Its Theological Background,” in J. Zachhuber and J. T. Meszaros (eds.), *Sacrifice and Modern Thought* (Oxford University Press, 2013), 12–28, here 15, 17: “At no point, then, in the New Testament or throughout late antiquity were Christians opposed to sacrifice as such.”

⁴³ See George Heyman, *The Power of Sacrifice: Roman and Christian Discourses in Conflict* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007).

⁴⁴ Regev, “Temple Concerns,” 89.