

THE NEW TEMPLE, THE NEW PRIESTHOOD, AND THE NEW CULT IN LUKE-ACTS

~: Michael Patrick Barber ~:

John Paul the Great Catholic University

I. Introduction

More than perhaps any other New Testament writer, Luke stresses the theme of prophecy and fulfillment.¹ This motif occurs in the very first verse of the Gospel of Luke, which speaks of “the things fulfilled [*peplērophorēmōn*] among us” (Luke 1:1). Likewise, at the end of his Gospel we find the Risen Lord explaining to the disciples how he has brought fulfillment to all the Scriptures: “And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, *he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself*” (Luke 24:27). This theme is continued in the Acts of the Apostles (see, for example, Acts 1:16; 3:18).

Yet, one aspect of the prophetic hope is often overlooked. Scholars have shown little interest in the way Luke interacts with the prophets’ announcement of a coming new priesthood and cult. While some scholars have explored Luke’s interest in expectations for a new temple (see Luke 19:46 = Isa. 56:7),² many have simply neglected the way he envisions the realization of related hopes for a new priesthood and cult.³

In fact, cultic imagery seems to frame Luke’s Gospel. The narrative opens with an angelic announcement to a priest serving in the Temple (Luke 1:7–11) and ends with the apostles returning to the Temple to praise God after the ascension of Jesus (Luke 24:53). Cultic concerns are picked up again in Acts 1 where Luke underscores that the apostles’ journey back to Jerusalem following the ascension complied with Sabbath regulations (Acts 1:12). While contemporary scholars may downplay the significance of such elements in his presentation,⁴ Luke’s emphasis

1 Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 12: “... Luke’s use of ‘prophecy and fulfillment’ goes far beyond that found in any other NT writing.”

2 See, for example, the excellent treatment in Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 59–64.

3 See Darrell Bock, *Acts*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on The New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 75–76.

4 Two notable exceptions are Rick Strelan, *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Third Gospel* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); and Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “Jesus Inspects His Priestly War Party (Luke 14:25–33),” in *The Old Testament in the New Testament. Essays in Honour of J.L. North*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 189; ed. S. Moyise (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 126–143.

on such matters was not lost on the early Church fathers. Irenaeus, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine all identified his Gospel with the symbol of the ox precisely because of the evangelist's perceived focus on cultic imagery.⁵

Contemporary scholarship's lack of interest in these features is not hard to explain. Because of certain longstanding biases, the cultic dimension of Israel's faith has long been perceived as unpalatable. Such prejudices can be traced back to the pioneers of the historical-critical methods.⁶ For many Protestant scholars, the priestly and cultic elements of the Old Testament represented the degeneration of Israel's religion in the post-exilic era and the very antithesis of the Gospel proclaimed by Jesus.⁷

Such biases have led scholars to overlook the role of the cult in Luke-Acts. In this paper, we shall begin by examining how the threefold hope for a new temple, a new priesthood, and a new cult was proclaimed by the prophets and how such hopes continued into Jesus' day. As we shall see, the three ideas were inextricably linked together for ancient Jews. We shall then identify ways that Luke describes their fulfillment in the New Covenant established by Christ. Specifically, as we shall show, Luke describes Jesus and the Church as the new temple, Jesus and the apostles as the new priests, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper as the new cult.

II. *The Restoration of Israel and the Eschatological Cult in Ancient Judaism*

1. *Jewish Hopes for an Eschatological Temple and Cult*

In the past, the importance of the cult in prophetic literature was downplayed due to a prevailing tendency that equated the prophetic critique of the Temple with a wholesale rejection of it, an attitude that was no doubt shaped by Protestant theological biases.⁸ The trend in recent research, however, has shifted. It is now generally accepted that while the prophetic literature condemns corruption in the priesthood, it was not radically opposed to the temple cult in and of itself, recognizing it as a divine institution.⁹

5 See Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.11.8; Ambrose *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, Prologue; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Ezechielem libri XVI*, 1.1.10; Augustine, *De Consensus Evangelistarum*, 1.6.9; 4.10.11; *Tractatus in Joannis Evangelium*, 36.5.

6 See, for example, Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), especially 3–10.

7 See, for example, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 4/2 (2006): 156.

8 See Peter Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation: The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," *American Sociological Review* 28/6 (1963): 940–950 at 942.

9 See also James Swetnam, "Malachi 1,11: An Interpretation," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31/2 (1969): 200–209 at 207; Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple*, 75–100; Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT)," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 5:881. See also Marvin A. Sweeney,

Indeed, in numerous places the scriptures of Israel link the hope for the restoration of Israel to the Temple. Specifically, the Temple is understood as the future site of the ingathering of Israel in the messianic age. This hope is powerfully attested in Isaiah 2:

² It shall come to pass in the latter days that *the mountain of the house of the LORD* shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; and *all the nations shall flow to it*, ³ and many peoples shall come, and say: “Come, let us go up to *the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob*; that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths (Isa. 2:2–3; see Mic. 4:1–2).¹⁰

A host of other biblical texts could also be cited.¹¹ That such hopes continued into the Second Temple period and beyond is also clear.¹²

Frequently overlooked, however, is that hopes for a new Temple were inextricably linked to another expectation: the coming of a *new cult*. The two ideas—new temple and new cult—were inseparable. For ancient Israel, the temple was understood as the place of sacrificial worship.¹³ It is no surprise then that many prophetic texts that anticipate the coming of a new temple describe cultic worship taking place there. Malachi describes how the eschatological age will involve the Lord coming to his temple (Mal. 3:1) and the purification of the sons of Levi, who will present “right offerings” (Mal. 3:3). Ezekiel supplies an exhaustive account of what this new cult will look like, detailing the specific offerings that will be made in the new temple (see, for example, Ezek. 42:13; 43:18–27; 44:11, 15–16, 29–30; 45:13–25; 46). A number of texts also link the idea of the restoration with the offering of sacrifice (see, for example, Zeph. 3:10; Ps. 51:18–19; 69:30–36; 107:22).

“The Priesthood and the Proto-Apocalyptic Reading of Prophetic and Pentateuchal Texts,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series 46; eds. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak (London: T & T Clark, 2003), 167–178.

10 Among other passages, see Isa. 60:3–7; Neh. 1:8–9 (see Deut. 12:10–11); Ezek. 37:21–28.

11 In addition to the passages below, see also Ezek. 37:21–28.

12 See Tob. 14:5–7; Sir. 36:11–14; 2 Macc. 1:27–29; 4Q448 (*Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer*) A, 8–10; 11Q19 (*11QTemple^a*) XLVII, 1–18; 2 Bar. 68:4–7; T. Ben. 9:2–3; Jub. 1:15–18; Tg. on Isa. 53:15; Tg. on Zech 6:12; Gen. Rab. 2:5; 56:2; Exod. Rab. 31:10. The same hope is found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*) frags. 1 col. I, 21, 2:2–7; 1Q28 (*1QRule of the Community*) V, 1–7; VI, 2–5; VIII, 4–10; IX, 4–5; 4Q171 III, 11; 1Q33 (*1QWar Scroll*) II, 1–6; 4QpPs XXXVII, III, 1–11; see 5QNJ; 11Q19 (*11QTemple^a*). Even in those cases where an explicit reference to the temple’s role in the eschatological ingathering is absent, the restoration is virtually always linked with *Jerusalem* or *Mt. Zion*, the site of the Temple (see, for example, Ps. 87:5–6). See R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 11, n. 2: “The descriptions of the New Zion presuppose a new temple, for no good Israelite could think of one without the other.”

13 E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 47–54.

From Second Temple sources such as the Dead Sea Scrolls we know these hopes were still maintained in Jesus' day.¹⁴

Some depictions of the future cult go beyond what even the Mosaic Law would seem to allow. For example, though Deuteronomy insists that all sacrifices must be brought to the central sanctuary, i.e., the Temple (Deut. 12:13–14), Isaiah asserts that Gentiles will offer sacrifices to the Lord in Egypt: "In that day there shall be an altar to the LORD in the midst of the land of Egypt ... and the Egyptians will know the Lord in that day and worship with *sacrifice* and *burnt offering* [*minhâ*]..." (Isa. 19:19a, 21).¹⁵ This closely resembles Malachi 1:10–12:

¹⁰ I have no pleasure in you, says the LORD of hosts, and I will not accept an *offering* [*minhâ*] from your hand. ¹¹ For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure *offering* [*minhâ*]; for my name is great among the nations, says the LORD of hosts. ¹² But you profane it when you say that the LORD's table is polluted, and the food for it may be despised.

This prophecy has been read by some as contrasting the polluted sacrifices of the corrupt cult with the pure sacrifices of the eschatological age.¹⁶

One particular sacrifice that is frequently associated with the restoration of Israel is the *tôdâ*, the thanksgiving sacrifice. The *tôdâ* was a kind of peace offering.¹⁷ Specifically, the *tôdâ* was linked to the idea of deliverance. The LXX identifies it as a *thysias sôtêriou*, a "sacrifice of salvation/deliverance" (see LXX Lev. 7:11). Given this rendering it is probably no wonder that it was associated with the redeemed in

14 See, for example, 2Q24 [2QNew Jerusalem ar] IV; 11Q18 [11QNew Jerusalem]; see also 1Q28b [1QRule of Benedictions] III, 1–3; 4Q504 [4QDibHam] IV, 9–11; CD–A [Damascus Document^a] XI, 17–12:2; 16:13–19; 1Q33 [1QWar Scroll] II, 1–6.

15 See John D. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, Word Biblical Commentary 24; rev. ed. (Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 315. The passage goes on to describe how the Assyrians will join with the Egyptians in worshipping the Lord (Isa. 19:23).

16 That an eschatological view is likely present is suggested by the similarity of language to the eschatological visions of other prophets contained in the collection of the "Book of the Twelve". See Donald K. Berry, "Malachi's Dual Design: The Close of the Canon and What Comes Afterward," in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of D. W. Watts*, eds. J. W. Watts, J. D. W. Watts, P. R. House (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 277–278; Peter Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 228.

17 The principle prescriptions for this sacrifice are laid out in Lev. 7:12–15. In addition, the *tôdâ* likely served as the life-setting for many of the psalms. For further discussion see David E. Stern, "Remembering and Redemption," in *Rediscovering the Eucharist: Ecumenical Conversations*, ed. R. Keresztky (New York: Paulist Press, 2003), 11–12; Hartmut Gese, *Zur biblischen Theologie*, 117–122; Patrick D. Miller, *They Cried to the Lord: The Form and Theology of Biblical Prayer* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 197–198; Herman Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933), 265–292.

the eschatological age. For example, Psalm 107:22 describes those returning from exile, saying, “let them offer *sacrifices of thanksgiving*, and tell of his deeds in songs of joy!”¹⁸ In addition, Jeremiah, looking forward to the future restoration of Israel, announces:

¹⁰Thus says the LORD: In this place of which you say, “It is a waste without man or beast,” in the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem that are desolate, without man or inhabitant or beast, there shall be heard again ¹¹the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voices of those who sing, *as they bring thank offerings to the house of the LORD*: “Give thanks to the LORD of hosts, for the LORD is good, for his steadfast love endures forever!” For I will restore the fortunes of the land as at first, says the LORD. (Jer. 33:10–11; see also Jer. 17:26)

Citing this passage, later rabbinic tradition explained: “In time to come all offerings will come to an end, but the thanksgiving-offering will never come to an end” (*Pesiq. Rab.* 9:12).¹⁹

2. The Restoration of Israel and the New Priesthood

Closely associated with the idea of the new cult in Jewish sources is the expectation of a new priesthood. A key element of the future age described by Ezekiel is the installment of the sons of Zadok as the priests in the Temple, a belief also present in the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁰ As mentioned above, Malachi also links the eschatological age with the purification of the priesthood (Mal. 3:3). By Jesus’ day it even seems that at least some Jews were anticipating the coming of a priestly messiah.²¹

18 That the term *tôdâ* in such contexts refers to actual cultic sacrificial offerings and not simply to a spiritual sacrifice is clear. See Norman Whybray, *Reading the Psalms as a Book*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 222 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 113.

19 Cited from Jacob Neusner, trans., *Pesiqta deRab Kahana: An Analytical Translation*, Brown Judaic Studies 122; 2 vols. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 1:151. See also *Leviticus Rabbah* 9:7.

20 The concern to preserve the Zadokite priesthood is also evidenced in the Dead Sea Scrolls (for example, see 1Q28b III, 22; CD–A [*Damascus Document*^a] IV, 3–4).

21 The Dead Sea Scrolls refer to the “the Messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel” (CD–A [*Damascus Document*^a] XII, 23–13:1; XIV, 19 [=4Q266 (4Q*Damascus Document*^a) X, 1:12]; XIX, 10–11; XX, 1; 1Q28 [*1QRule of the Community*] IX, 11). Many scholars think that these references, particularly the one in the passage from 1Q28, indicate a hope for two distinct figures, one Davidic (a royal figure) and one Aaronic (a priestly figure). For recent discussions see Eric Mason, ‘*You are a Priest Forever*’: *Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 87–93; Joseph Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *Studies on the Texts of the Deserts of Judah* 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 171–208.

Moreover, just as some passages in the prophets suggest a vision for the future cult that transcends the Mosaic Law, so there are passages that seem to suggest something similar regarding the priesthood. For example, as the book of Isaiah envisioned Egyptians worshipping the Lord at an altar in Egypt, something apparently at odds with Deuteronomy, it also suggests that non-Levites will be allowed to serve as priests:

⁶ And the foreigners who join themselves to the LORD, to *minister* [šārat] to him, to love the name of the LORD, and to be his servants, everyone who keeps the Sabbath, and does not profane it, and holds fast my covenant— ⁷ *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; for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples.* (Isa. 56:6–7)

²⁰ And they shall bring all your brethren from all the nations *as an offering to the LORD*, upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon dromedaries, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, says the LORD, *just as the Israelites bring their cereal offering in a clean vessel to the house of the LORD.* ²¹ And *some of them also I will take for priests and for Levites,* says the LORD. (Isa. 66:20–21)

The expectation that foreigners will “minister” [šārat] to the Lord in Isaiah 56 is striking. The terminology employed (šārat) is used to describe priestly activity throughout the Old Testament.²² Stunningly, this passage is omitted from the text of the book of Isaiah found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. As scholars recognize, its absence is likely due to discomfort with the suggestion that Gentiles will somehow serve as priests.²³ The announcement that God will “take” some “for priests and Levites” in Isaiah 66 also suggests the bestowal of sacerdotal responsibilities on those who otherwise would not be entrusted with them.

That such ideas could be drawn from Isaiah 56 might be concluded from the *Testament of Levi*:

22 See, for example, Exod. 28:35; Num. 3:6; 8:26; 18:2; Deut. 10:8; 17:12; 1 Kings 8:11; 2 Chron. 5:14; Jer. 33:21. For the cultic implication of šārat see F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 1058, which links Isa. 56:7 to the idea “of foreigners admitted to priesthood.” Likewise, see Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004), 262 n. 29: “Is. 56:6 even says that Gentiles will ‘minister’ to the Lord in the temple as priests, which Is. 66:18–21 makes clearer.”

23 See Dwight W. Van Winkle, “An Inclusive Authoritative Text in Exclusive Communities,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, eds. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 425.

Levi, your posterity shall be divided into *three offices* as a sign of the glory of the Lord who is coming. The first lot shall be great; no other shall be greater than it. The second shall be in the priestly role. But the third shall be granted a new name, because from Judah a king will arise and shall found a *new priesthood in accord with the gentile model and for all nations*. His presence is beloved, as a prophet of the Most High, a descendant of Abraham, our father. (*T. Levi* 8:11–15)²⁴

Three priesthods are mentioned in this text: (1) the high priesthood given to the descendants of Aaron; (2) the order of the Levites; and (3) a priesthood established by a coming king, likely the Davidic messiah (“from Judah”), which is linked with Gentiles. Although this schematization could easily be seen as betraying the hand of a Christian editor, it should be pointed out that the association of Gentiles with the priesthood may also simply reflect what is found in the passages above that seem to link the Gentiles with priestly activity in the eschatological age. Its apparent association of the priesthood with the Davidic Messiah is also not entirely inexplicable, as we explain below.

3. *The Priestly Davidic Messiah*

In some texts the Davidic messiah is explicitly described as having a cultic role. Jeremiah 30:21 explains, “Their prince shall be one of themselves, their ruler shall come forth from their midst; I will make him *draw near* and *he shall approach* me, for who would dare of himself to approach me? says the LORD.” The word translated, “I will make him draw near” (*qārab*), is frequently used in cultic settings (see Exod. 29:4, 8; 40:12, 14; Lev. 3:6; 7:35; 8:6, 13, 24; Num. 8:9, 10; 16:5, 9, 10), as is the word for “*he shall approach*” (*nāgaš*—see Exod. 28:43; 30:20; Lev. 21:23; Ezek. 44:13). Used together, these terms unavoidably convey the notion that the future Davidic king will have cultic responsibilities.²⁵

The Davidic figure of the eschatological era in Ezekiel is also associated with cultic responsibilities. He is given the unique privilege of entering the eastern gate and is able to “eat bread before the Lord” (Ezek. 44:3). Here it seems that the Davidic king is associated with the Bread of the Presence, food reserved for the priests. In addition, he is said to provide the sacrificial offerings (Ezek. 45:17, 22–25; 46:6–15).

24 See J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1:791.

25 See Walter Kaiser, *The Messiah in the Old Testament*, Studies In Old Testament Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 190–191 who writes: “Most surprising of all is the fact that this king will also be a priest, for verse 21c specifically declares God’s promise, ‘I will bring him near and he will come close to me.’ To ‘come near’ or ‘approach’ God means to engage in the work of the priest (see Ex 24:2; Nu 16:5) ... Thus, the picture is of a ‘Glorious Ruler-Priest’ who performs both political and priestly duties—a well-known concept in the ancient Near East.”

Ezekiel's description of the future Davidic king's cultic role seems to have influenced the author of *Psalms of Solomon*, a work dating to the Second Temple period. Scholars recognize allusions to Ezekiel in the description of the Davidic Messiah in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 (compare *Ps. Sol.* 17:21 with Ezek. 34:23 and *Ps. Sol.* 17:32 with Ezek. 37:24). Here the Davidic king is presented as carrying out responsibilities otherwise associated with the priests.²⁶

Recognizing a priestly role for the Davidic figure in the eschatological age would not be entirely unprecedented. Psalm 110, a passage that was interpreted eschatologically in later Jewish sources,²⁷ describes the Davidic king as "a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek" (*Ps.* 110:4). Even more striking, David's sons are said to be "priests" (*kōhenim*) in 2 Samuel 8:18.

Numerous other texts could be mentioned.²⁸ For example, David himself is described as having priestly prerogatives: he wears the ephod (the priestly garment—see 2 Sam. 6:14; 1 Chron. 15:27; compare Exod. 28:4), erects the tabernacle for the ark (2 Sam. 6:17; 1 Chron. 15:1; 16:1; compare Num. 1:51; 4:1–33), offers sacrifices (2 Sam. 6:17; 1 Chron. 16:2; compare Num. 3:6–8, 14–38; 4:47; 6:16–17; 8:14–26), and blesses the people (2 Sam. 6:18; compare Num. 6:22–27). Given this background, it is not at all surprising to find sources describing the eschatological Davidic figure as enjoying priestly prerogatives.

III. The New Temple in Luke-Acts

1. Jesus' Condemnation of the Jerusalem Temple and the Messianic "House of Prayer"

That new temple hopes play a role in Luke's portrayal of Jesus' mission of fulfillment is clear from his description of Jesus' action in the Temple. Luke writes, "And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold, saying to them, 'It is written, *'My house shall be a house of prayer';* but you have made it a *den of robbers*'"

26 See Fletcher-Louis, "Jesus as High Priestly Messiah," 1:163 n. 28; Jostein Ådna, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel: Die Templaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/119 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000), 65–70; P. N. Franklyn, "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 18 (1987): 1–17.

27 The messianic interpretation of this psalm is found in *b. Sanh.* 38b; *Midr. Ps.* 18:29; *Tg. on Ps.* 110. It also appears to be applied to eschatological figures in 4Q491 and the *Similitudes of 1 Enoch*. See Rikk Watts, "The Psalms in Mark," in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, eds. S. Moyise and M. J. Menken (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 38.

28 For a fuller treatment of David's priestly connections, see Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*, Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 2009), 187–194; Scott W. Hahn, *The Kingdom of God as Liturgical Empire: A Theological Commentary on 1–2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 44–45, 50–64, 73–77, 90–95, 105–137.

(Luke 19:45–46). Jesus' action evokes Zechariah 14:21, which explains that in the eschatological age "there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the Lord ..."

Moreover, Luke's quotation of Jesus' words draws on two Old Testament passages. The first ("My house shall be a house of prayer") is taken from the vision of the eschatological temple found in Isaiah 56, which we have already examined above. By drawing from this prophecy, Jesus is presented as endorsing its vision for a future temple.

The second quote, however, is taken from the condemnation of the Temple in Jeremiah 7, which links the Jerusalem Temple to the defunct sanctuary at Shiloh. As the sanctuary at Shiloh was destroyed on account of the people's sin, so too, the prophet explains, God's judgment is about to come upon the Temple in Jerusalem:

¹¹ Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, I myself have seen it, says the LORD. ¹² Go now to my place that was in Shiloh, where I made my name dwell at first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel... ¹⁴ therefore I will do to the house which is called by my name, and in which you trust, and to the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I did to Shiloh. (Jer. 7:11–14)

In citing this text Jesus is doing more than merely critiquing the *status quo*. Jesus specifically targets a prophecy of the destruction of Solomon's Temple to signal the coming destruction of the Herodian Temple. That Luke understood this episode along these lines is clear from the context: immediately before the account of Jesus' temple action we read about Jesus' prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem (Luke 19:41–44),²⁹ a prophecy Jesus reiterates in Luke 21:5–6.

Yet this raises an important question. If the Jerusalem Temple is not the temple of the messianic age and if Jesus has come as the Messiah, what for him would constitute the promised temple of Isaiah 56? Moreover, if Jesus affirmed Isaiah's prophecy of a coming eschatological temple, how did he envision the realization of the expectations of a new priesthood and new cult related in that passage?

2. The Parable of the Vineyard and Jesus' Identity as the "Cornerstone"

A critical clue in answering these questions is found in the Parable of the Vineyard and the cornerstone saying that accompanies it (Luke 20:9–18). The imagery of the parable comes from Isaiah 5.³⁰ In Luke 20, as in Isaiah 5, Israel is described

29 Scholars have detected numerous allusions to Jeremiah within these verses, many of which occur in the near context of the prophecy from Jeremiah 7:11 cited by Jesus in the temple episode. See John Nolland, *Luke*, 3 vols., Word Biblical Commentary 35 (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 3:923; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*, Novum Testamentum Supplements 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 359.

30 For a list of scholars who take this view see Green, *Luke*, 704 n. 21. There are a number of similarities between Jesus' parable and Isaiah 5: (1) a vineyard is used as a symbol of the "house

as a vineyard, an image used elsewhere in Jewish literature to symbolize God's people.³¹ As scholars note, the owner of the vineyard in Luke's parable is therefore an image of the Lord. The "servants" sent by the owner and rejected by the tenants are widely recognized as representing the prophets.³² Finally, the son who is killed by the tenants in the parable clearly symbolizes Jesus.

Jesus closes the parable by citing Psalm 118: "The very stone which the builders rejected (*apodokimazō*) has become the cornerstone" (literally, "head of the corner" [*kephalēn gōnias*], see Luke 20:17; compare Ps. 118:22). As with the figure of the son who is killed in the parable, Jesus' use of the psalm's imagery clearly anticipates his passion and exaltation.³³ The language closely mirrors Jesus' passion prediction in Luke 9:22: "the Son of Man must suffer ... and be rejected (*apodokimazō*)."

That Jesus moves from a story about a "son" to imagery of a "stone" may at first appear strange. However, the transition would not have seemed odd to a Jewish audience. A word-play on the Hebrew words for "stone" (*'eben*) and "son" (*ben*) was well established in ancient Israel (compare Exod. 28:9).³⁴

While the sudden introduction of "stone" imagery is therefore not difficult to account for, the exact terminology used by Jesus—the "cornerstone"—is not insignificant. As other scholars have noted, the appearance of "cornerstone" language is likely related to cultic imagery embedded in the parable. The "cornerstone" is almost certainly a reference to the architecture of the Temple.³⁵ Psalm 118, the source of the saying, was clearly envisioned as a song sung in the Temple (Ps.

of Israel"; (2) righteousness is symbolized by "fruits"; and (3) the passage ends with judgment on the wicked, which is symbolized by coming destruction. Green also points out verbal parallels: *ton agapēton* (Luke 20:13; Isa. 5:1); *ti oun poiēsei* (Luke 20:15; Isa. 5:4–5); and *ho kurios tou ampelōnos* (Luke 20:15; Isa. 5:7).

31 For example, see Isa. 1:8; 3:13; 27:2–7 [37:30–32; 65:21]; Jer. 12:10–11; Ezek. 19:10. See also *L.A.B.* 12:9; 28:4; 4Q500 1; *Midr. Tanh. B. Qeḏošin* § 6; *Exod. Rab.* 30.17 [on Exod. 21:18]; *Midr. Prov.* 19:21.

32 The imagery of the prophets as "messengers" is particularly evocative of 2 Chron. 36:15–16. Moreover, in many of passages the prophets are identified as "servants" of the Lord (see, for example, Jer. 7:25–26; 25:3–4; 26:2–6). See Klyne R. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 288, 682 n. 133.

33 See, for example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1282; Nolland, *Luke*, 3:955.

34 Many scholars accept that the wordplay explains Jesus' language. Especially insightful is the approach taken in Seyoon Kim, "Jesus—The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man, and the Servant," 134–148, who makes a plausible case for Jesus' combination of various texts.

35 See Michael Giesler, "The Rejected Stone and the Living Stones: Psalm 118:22–23 in New Testament Christology and Ecclesiology," *Letter & Spirit* (2008): 98; Beale, *Temple and the Church's Mission*, 184; Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 121; Timothy Gray, *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/242* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008), 76.

118:26: “We bless you from the *house of the LORD*”).³⁶ The language of the psalm also appears in the temple-building scene of Ezra 3 (see Ps. 118:29 and Ezra 3:11).³⁷ Moreover, the psalm was closely associated with the feast of Tabernacles (*m. Sukk.* 4.5), a feast closely associated with hopes for an eschatological temple (compare Ezek. 40:1–2; Zech. 14:16–21; Hag. 2:1–9). In sum, the “cornerstone” mentioned by the psalmist seems best read as an allusion to temple traditions. It is simply impossible to imagine an ancient Jew thinking that any *other* building is in view.

In fact, “stone” imagery is frequently linked with temples and sacred sites in the Old Testament (see, for example, Gen. 28:10–22; Isa. 8:14–15; 28:16; Zech. 4:7–9) and Jewish literature (*m. Yoma* 5.2; *b. Yoma* 54a–b; *Lev. Rab.* 20.4; *Bet ha-Midr.* 5.63; *Num. Rab.* 12.4), as well as in 1 Peter (1 Pet. 2:4–8). Significantly, Jesus connects “stone” language to the Temple in the very next chapter of Luke (Luke 21:5–6).³⁸

Noteworthy in this discussion is *Testament of Solomon* 23:6–8. Here “cornerstone” imagery is used in connection with the building of the Temple. If the passage is pre-Christian it can be included with other Old Testament and Jewish sources that closely link stone imagery to the Temple. If not, it can be cited with 1 Peter as evidence that Christians linked the psalm’s cornerstone language to the sanctuary.³⁹

That the “cornerstone” is to be identified with the Temple is also reinforced by its association with the parable. As Evans and others have shown, that Jesus would close the Parable of the Vineyard by alluding to temple imagery makes sense.⁴⁰ Isaiah 5, the most probable quarry of the story’s vineyard symbolism, was itself closely linked to the Temple. The “tower” the Lord is said to have built in his vineyard (Isa. 5:2) was identified with the Temple in the Enochic literature, the

36 That the psalm was linked to the temple worship in the Mishna and later Jewish literature simply confirms the cultic connections already present in the psalm itself (see, for example, *m. Pesah.* 5.5–7, 10.6–7; *m. Sukkah.* 3.9; 4.5; *t. Pesah.* 4.10–11; *b. Pesah.* 95b).

37 For a fuller discussion on the background of the psalm, see the excellent treatment in Gray, *Temple in the Gospel of Mark*, 72–77.

38 See Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 120–121.

39 For a fuller discussion, see, for example, Dennis C. Duling, “Testament of Solomon,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: A New Translation and Introduction*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 Vols. (New York: Yale University press, 1983), 1:943–944; Dennis C. Duling, “Solomon, Testament of,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, 6 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:111–117; Michael E. Stone, *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud: Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1978), 327; Ian K. Smith, *Heavenly Perspective: A Study of the Apostle Paul’s Response to a Jewish Mystical Movement at Colossae* (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 83.

40 For what follows see Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 226–227; Craig A. Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 397–401; Gray, *Temple in the Gospel of Mark*, 70–77.

Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as in rabbinic tradition (see *1 En.* 89:56–73; 4Q500⁴¹; *t. Meil.* 1.16; *t. Sukkah* 3.15). Moreover, the “winepress” of the vineyard in Isaiah 5:2 was linked to the altar in the Targum of Isaiah 5 and in the Tosephta (see *t. Meil.* 1.16; *t. Sukkah* 3.15). The temple-vineyard connection may have also been reinforced by the Herodian Temple’s architecture. Josephus relates that a giant golden vine was prominently displayed above the main entrance of the Temple (*A.J.* 15.395).

While some might insist that the temple connections of Isaiah 5 are merely coincidental and are unrelated to Jesus’ parable, what weighs heavily against such a view is the context: Jesus offers the parable and identifies himself with the cornerstone of Psalm 118 while teaching *in the Temple* (Luke 20:1). Indeed, the parable comes as a response to questions about his authority to act so imperiously (driving out the merchants) and to teach in the Temple (Luke 19:45–20:2). In light of this, it can hardly be an accident that Jesus responds to the Jewish leaders’ question about his authority with a story and a saying both containing imagery (“vineyard” and “cornerstone”) closely connected to the Temple.

Further support for the idea that temple imagery is in play may be found in the saying that immediately follows the quotation of Psalm 118: “Everyone *who falls on that stone* will be *broken to pieces*; but when it falls on any one it will *crush him*” (Luke 20:18). Here Jesus appears to employ the Jewish hermeneutic of *gezerah shavah*, which connects passages based on common words.⁴² Specifically, Jesus appears to link the “stone” of Psalm 118 with two prophetic texts, both of which also seem linked to eschatological temple imagery: Isaiah 8:14–15 and Daniel 2:44–45.⁴³ Let us look briefly at these texts.

First, scholars recognize that Jesus’ description in Luke 20:18 of a “stone” that many will “fall upon” and thereby be “broken” draws from Isaiah 8:14–15: “[*The Lord*] will become a sanctuary, and a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel ...¹⁵ And many shall stumble thereon; *they shall fall and be broken*; they shall be snared and taken.” It is important to point out that the stone in the Isaianic prophecy is closely related to temple imagery. The prophecy, cited

41 4Q500 I is poorly preserved, however, it is clear that it links the vineyard with “the gate of the holy height,” a term linked with the Temple (see Ezek. 20:40), and has points of contact with the Targum on Isaiah 5, which connects the vineyard with the sanctuary. See, among others, Evans, *Mark*, 232; Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries*, 400–401; George J. Brooke, “4Q500 I and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 268–294.

42 For further discussion see, David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C.E.*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 30 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992), 17–18.

43 These allusions are recognized by many scholars. See, for example, Nolland, *Luke*, 3:953; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1282; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006), 213; Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 67–68.

by Jesus in the parable, anticipates a future day when the Lord will *himself* become a sanctuary (see also Isa. 28:16).

The second prophetic text alluded to in Jesus' saying is found in Daniel 2. Here Daniel relates and interprets a dream of Nebuchadnezzar. He explains that it involved a statue composed of four parts, which he explains represents four wicked Gentile powers (Dan. 2:31–45). He goes on to explain that the king had seen a "stone" that was "cut out by no human hand," which destroys the statue, causing it to be "broken in pieces" (Dan. 2:34–34). This passage is likely the source of Jesus' teaching that, "Everyone who *falls on that stone*"—in context, the cornerstone of Psalm 118:22—"will be *broken to pieces*." It also informs his warning that "when it falls on any one *it will crush him*."

Once again Jesus appears to target a passage with temple associations. In particular, Zion imagery may be detected in the vision's description of the stone that "became a great mountain and filled the whole earth" (Dan. 2:35). The vision of a growing "great mountain" would have naturally evoked traditions regarding the eschatological temple in Zion (see Isa. 2:2; Mic. 4:1). As mentioned above, stone imagery was frequently linked to the sanctuary or other sacred sites in Jewish literature.

Furthermore, the likelihood that such traditions are in play in Daniel 2 is further reinforced by the fact that the imagery of a mountain growing from a stone is used in connection with descriptions of temples in other ancient Near Eastern texts, such as the Sumerian *Cylinders of Gudea*.⁴⁴ It is also worth mentioning that 4 *Ezra* 13:36 explicitly links the stone of Daniel 2 with the eschatological Zion. Given that hopes for the eschatological Zion were inextricably linked to hopes for a new temple,⁴⁵ this offers strong confirmation that Jewish readers linked the stone imagery to temple traditions.

All of this confirms the idea that the "cornerstone" saying involves temple imagery. In addition, by alluding to Isaiah 8 and Daniel 2 Jesus specifically evokes passages relating to the *eschatological* age. In some way, then, it seems that he identifies *himself* with the eschatological temple. The prophecy of Isaiah 8:14 is fulfilled: in Christ, the Lord has become a temple.

It should also be pointed out that the language chosen by Jesus—his being the "cornerstone" of the Temple—seems to imply that the new temple would involve something more than merely himself. In Acts 2, the Spirit appears as "tongues of fire" over the heads of the members of the Christian community (Acts 2:3). As Beale and Perrin note, the language may well have evoked the imagery of the heavenly temple, which is described as being composed of tongues of fire in

44 See Cyl. A 12.1–9; 18:24–25; 19:13–14, 17–20; 21:19–23; B 23.25; 1.1–10. For a discussion, see Beale, *Temple and the Church's Mission*, 149–151.

45 See n. 12 above.

ancient Jewish sources (see 1 En. 14:8–25; 71:5; 4Q204 VI, 19–29).⁴⁶ That Acts 2 has numerous similarities with the theophany at Sinai⁴⁷ further strengthens the possible temple imagery, since Sinai was closely linked to the sanctuary.⁴⁸ Jesus is therefore portrayed as the cornerstone of the new temple, but, as 1 Peter also indicates, believers are incorporated into this structure as well, which, by virtue of the ascension, is ultimately a heavenly reality. All of this illuminates the meaning of Stephen’s speech in Acts 7: as he insisted before the Jewish leaders, the true temple is not “made with hands” (Acts 7:48).

IV. *The New Priesthood and the New Cult in Luke-Acts*

1. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants and Hopes for a New Priesthood*

Some have interpreted the Parable of the Vineyard as a lesson communicating God’s rejection of Israel in favor of the Church or the Gentiles. This view, however, misses a key element in the parable: it is the *tenants*, not the vineyard itself, which are judged.⁴⁹ As many scholars recognize, since the parable is specifically directed at the Jewish leaders, the wicked tenants are best seen as a reference to them.⁵⁰ Jesus’ mention of the “builders” who reject the cornerstone in Psalm 118 further reinforces such a reading. In Second Temple and rabbinic Judaism the terminology of “builders” was frequently used as a term for the Jewish leaders.⁵¹

It is significant, therefore, that the tenants (= Jewish leaders) are punished by having the vineyard taken away from them. This raises the question: what does it mean for the vineyard to be given to *others*? It seems that the parable’s message is not simply that God will judge the leaders but that he is also going to appoint *new ones*.⁵² Moreover, given the cultic overtones of the context discussed above, it seems probable that what is in view is the institution of new *temple officials*, in essence, new *priests*. Who would these new priestly leaders be?

46 Beale, *Temple and the Church’s Mission*, 63; Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 63.

47 On the Sinaitic imagery in Acts 2 see Alan Thompson, *One Lord, One People: The Unity of the Church in Acts in Its Literary Setting*, Library of New Testament Studies (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 85–88.

48 See John Davies, *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19:6*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 395 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 137.

49 Against the view that the parable teaches that Jesus has rejected Israel, Evans points out that the identity of the vineyard remains constant, it is the *tenants*—likely the Jewish “leadership” which changes hands. See Evans, *Mark*, 223.

50 See, for example, Snodgrass, *Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, 77; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 239; Bock, *Luke*, 2:1605; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1287; Nolland, *Luke*, 3:949.

51 See 1QIsa^a LIV, 13; CD IV, 19; VIII, 12; *b. Šabb.* 114a; *b. Ber.* 64a; *Song Rab.* 1.5 §3; *Exod. Rab.* 33.10; *Tg. Ps.* 118:22–28; see also Acts 4:11.

52 See Morna Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, Black’s New Testament Commentaries (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 276; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 360; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 237.

2. Jesus as the Davidic Priestly Messiah and Suffering Servant

Scholars have long noted priestly hues in Luke's portrait of Jesus' ascension.⁵³ Luke tells us, "Then he led them out as far as Bethany, and *lifting up his hands he blessed them*" (Luke 24:50). By "lifting up his hands" while giving a blessing, Jesus performs an unmistakably priestly gesture. In Leviticus 9:22 we read, "Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people and blessed them." Likewise, Sirach 50 relates how the high priest Simon, "*lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the sons of Israel, to pronounce the blessing of the Lord with his lips, and to glory in his name*" (Sir. 50:20). Thus, just as Luke's narrative begins with the priest Zechariah (Luke 1:8–23), it concludes with the image of another priestly figure, Jesus.

The sacerdotal identity of Jesus in Luke 24 coheres well with other imagery connected with him in Luke-Acts. In particular, Luke identifies Jesus with two figures associated with priestly roles: the royal-priestly figure of Psalm 110 and the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52:7–53:12. The priestly roles identified with these figures should not be overlooked, especially given Luke's portrayal of the ascension.

First, Jesus is associated with Psalm 110, which declares that the Davidic king is "a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4). In Luke 20:41–44, Jesus explains that this psalm describes the Messiah. Luke makes it clear that Jesus is the Messiah, leaving no doubt that the psalm applies to him. Moreover, the psalm is directly tied to Jesus' resurrection and ascension in Acts (Acts 2:29–36; 5:31; 7:55–56). Since Luke uses this psalm to describe Jesus' ascension, his depiction of Jesus blessing the disciples as a priest immediately before he is taken up in Luke 24:51 makes sense. Furthermore, that Luke would identify Jesus as a priestly figure should hardly seem surprising: as we have already seen, aside from Psalm 110, there are numerous texts that link the Davidide to priestly activity.

Second, Luke-Acts clearly links Jesus with the Suffering Servant. In Acts 8:29–35, Philip explains to the Ethiopian eunuch that Jesus is the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52:7–53:12. Other descriptions of Jesus in Acts also seem influenced by this passage. For example, Stuhlmacher points out that passages in Acts 3 and 4 which portray Jesus as the anointed "servant" (*pais*) of the Lord who is put to death according to the will of God and exalted (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30) are undoubtedly influenced by Isaiah 61:1–2 and the Suffering Servant Song. That Jesus is identified in Acts 3 as the "Righteous One" confirms the presence of Suffering Servant imagery (compare Acts 3:14 with Isa. 53:11).⁵⁴

53 See K. M. Kapic, "Receiving Christ's Priestly Benediction: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Exploration of Luke 24:50–53," *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005): 247–260; Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1227; J. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Regensburger Neues Testament (Regensburg: Pustet, 1977), 672.

54 Peter Stuhlmacher, "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, eds. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 156.

It is important to underscore that the Suffering Servant is presented as a *priestly* figure. This is evident in a number of ways. First, he offers a *sacrifice* for sin—himself (see Isa. 53:10). Second, Isaiah relates that the Servant “bore” (*nāśā’*) the sins of many (see Isa. 53:12). The same term is used in the description of the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16; the scapegoat is said to “bear” (*nāśā’*) the sin of the people (Lev. 16:22). The term is also applied to the high priest in Exodus 28:30: “Aaron shall *bear* (*nāśā’*) the judgment of the people of Israel upon his heart before the LORD continually.” Leviticus 10 even speaks of bearing sins as a priestly function, explaining that the priests must consume the sin offering so that they can “bear [*nāśā’*] the iniquity of the congregation” (Lev. 10:17). Given the sacrificial imagery present in Isaiah 53:10, it seems likely that such cultic connotations are in play in the description of the Servant.

In addition, Adams argues for a connection with the cult in the description of the servant as being “afflicted” (*ānâ*) (Isa. 53:4), language also linked with the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:29).⁵⁵ Finally, whatever one makes of these specific cultic echoes in Isaiah 53, it seems hard to deny that, at least in some way, ancient readers identified the Servant as a priestly figure since its imagery appears to be used in the description of the eschatological priest in *4QApocryphon of Levi*.⁵⁶

3. *The Eucharistic Words and Jesus’ Sacrificial Death*

Jesus, then, like the Suffering Servant, is portrayed as a priestly figure that offers his own life as a sacrifice. This idea is especially emphasized in the Eucharistic words of Jesus at the Last Supper. For the moment, let us bypass Jesus’ words and actions over the bread, which are somewhat more ambiguous than those associated with the cup, and consider the cup-saying⁵⁷: “This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood” (Luke 22:20).

As scholars note, since “blood” and “life” were closely linked in Judaism (see Lev. 17:11–13; 11Q19 LIII, 6), by *giving* the cup associated with his blood to the disciples Jesus conveys the idea of giving his life.⁵⁸ Contextually, it is clear that Jesus’ death is in view. Jesus links “cup” imagery to his death immediately after the Last Supper in his prayer in Gethsemane (Luke 22:42). Moreover, Jesus speaks of

55 See the treatment in Jim W. Adams, *The Performative Nature and Function of Isaiah 40–55* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 203–206.

56 Émile Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*; eds. J. T. Berrera and L. V. Montaner (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 467–470.

57 In this we follow the approach of Kim Huat Tan, *The Zion Traditions and the Aims of Jesus*, Society for New Testament Study Monograph Series 91 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 200–201.

58 See, for example, I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), 91.

the cup, identified with his blood, being “poured out” (*ekchynnōmai*), terminology often linked with the depictions of a violent death.⁵⁹

Yet Jesus’ cup-saying not only anticipates his death, it describes it as a *sacrifice*. Not only is the language of Jesus’ blood being “poured out” (*ekchynnōmai*) a reference to his violent death, the terminology evokes the imagery of cultic sacrifice; the terminology used in depictions of cultic offerings (see, for example, Lev. 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 4Q220 I, 3; 11Q19 LII, 11).⁶⁰

That the sacrificial connotation of “poured out” is intended is clear from the fact that Jesus explicitly links the term to the language of a “new covenant.”⁶¹ For ancient Israelites, covenants were sealed by sacrifice. The psalmist thus explains, “Gather to me my faithful ones, who made a covenant with me by *sacrifice!*” (Ps. 50:5).⁶² The sacrificial dimension of covenant making is particularly evident in the covenant ratification ceremony related in Exodus 24, where Moses seals the covenant between God and Israel through cultic offerings made on Mt. Sinai (Exod. 24:3–8).

The importance of Exodus 24 for understanding the Eucharistic words can hardly be overstated. By speaking of the cup of “the new covenant in my blood” Jesus evokes the words spoken by Moses at the close of the covenant ceremony: “Behold, *the blood of the covenant* which the LORD has made with you ...” (Exod. 24:8). While the Lukan formulation of the cup-saying bears less resemblance to this declaration than its Matthean and Markan parallels (Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24), it is hard to deny that a connection to Moses’ words is present.⁶³ Though Luke’s version of the cup-saying, which has Jesus speak of the “the cup of the new covenant in my blood,” clearly evokes the new covenant prophecy of Jeremiah 31, such an allusion does not mute the echoes of Exodus 24.⁶⁴ For one thing, as many have noted, Jeremiah 31 itself draws upon Exodus 24. The allusion of the cup-

59 See LXX Gen. 9:6; Judg. 9:25; Isa. 59:7; Ezek. 18:10; 22:13; 4Q201 1 IV, 7; 4Q219 II, 18. See also, for example, Green, *Luke*, 762.

60 The majority of interpreters recognize this connotation. See, for example, Adela Yarbro Collins, “Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus,” *Journal of Religion* 78 /2 (1998): 174; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1391, 1402–1403; Green, *Luke*, 763.

61 Evans describes the use of covenant language as the “major interpretive issue” in understanding the Institution Narrative (*Mark* 8:27–16:20, 386).

62 For further discussions see Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981), 91–92.

63 Against Beasley-Murray’s attempt to pit an allusion to Exodus 24 in Matthew and Mark against a reference to Jeremiah 31 in Luke and Paul (*Jesus and the Kingdom of God* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], 264–265), see the discussion in Tan, *Zion Traditions and the Aims of Jesus*, 204–205. Indeed, most commentators recognize the allusion to Exodus 24 in the cup saying. See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1391; Green, *Luke*, 763.

64 See Tan, *Zion Traditions and the Aims of Jesus*, 215; Marshall, *Last Supper and the Lord’s Supper*, 92.

saying to Exodus 24 is therefore reinforced, not diminished.⁶⁵ Moreover, it is hard to figure out how Jeremiah 31 alone explains the connection drawn between blood and covenant language: nowhere does Jeremiah link covenant to blood.

The appearance of “blood” with “covenant” is not the only parallel between Exodus 24 and Luke’s account of the Last Supper. The Septuagintal version of Exodus 24:8 explicitly states that the sacrificial blood is *poured out* (*enecheen*) by Moses. This mirrors the terminology used by Jesus, further reinforcing the link with Exodus 24. In addition, that Luke has Jesus linking his blood to the motif of covenant while celebrating a *meal* mirrors not only Moses’ words concerning the “blood of the covenant” but also the sacred *feast* that culminates Exodus 24 (see Exod. 24:8–11). Moreover, just as Exodus 24:4 highlights the way God’s covenant is established with the *twelve tribes*, the *twelve apostles* are prominent in Luke’s Last Supper scene (Luke 22:14, 30). Taken individually, each of these parallels are only suggestive of a connection between Jesus’ words and Exodus 24. Taken together, however, these points of contact are too strong and numerous to be written off as mere coincidence. All of this leads us to concur with the conclusion drawn by Protestant scholar I. Howard Marshall: the idea of sacrifice in the Eucharistic words is “inescapable.”⁶⁶

The clear presence of cultic language in the cup-saying throws into relief the sacrificial imagery associated with Jesus’ words and actions over the bread. Jesus explains, “This is my body which is *given for you*” (*touto estin sōma mou to hyper humōn didomenon*) (Luke 22:19). While the idea of “giving one’s life” need not have sacrificial implications, its close connection to the cup-saying’s cultic allusions suggests that such a meaning is intended here as well. Moreover, Jesus’ language also evokes Isaiah 53:12, a passage we have seen Luke use elsewhere in connection with Jesus. As we have seen, Isaiah 53 identifies the Suffering Servant as a *sacrificial* offering.⁶⁷ We might also observe that elsewhere in the New Testament the term *hyper* (“for”) is employed to describe the atoning nature of Jesus’ death (1 Cor. 15:3; Rom. 5:6, 8). Finally, it should be noted that Jesus’ actions with the bread also appear to compliment his words. Jesus has *broken* the bread, and *given* it to the disciples, a symbolic action that seems to suggest that his “body” is to be broken (=death) and *given* away for others.⁶⁸

65 For an especially detailed look at the intertextual echoes between Exodus 24 and Jeremiah 31 see A. van der Wal, “Themes from Exodus in Jeremiah 30–31,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 126; ed. M Vervenne (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1996), 564.

66 Marshall, *Lord’s Supper and Last Supper*, 91. See also Nolland, *Matthew*, 1079.

67 See Stuhlmacher, “Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts,” 152, who stresses this point.

68 Some have denied that this symbolic meaning is intended, insisting that breaking the bread was merely an action necessary for its distribution (see, for example, Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper*, 86; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 389–390). However, to insist that simply because the breaking of the bread had a *practical* function it was therefore not infused also with *symbolic* meaning is unconvincing. Indeed, it is striking that many of the same scholars who deny the

4. The Eucharistic Rite as Cultic Act

Yet Jesus does not simply speak of his *death* in cultic terms; such language is also used for the Eucharistic rite *itself*. This is most evident in Jesus' instructions to the apostles that they must repeat what he has done: "Do this in *remembrance* (*anamnēsin*) of me" (Luke 22:19b). The language of "remembrance" or "memorial" (*anamnēsis*) was closely linked to Israel's cultic life.⁶⁹ To give a few examples:

On the day of your gladness also, and at your appointed feasts, and at the beginnings of your months, you shall blow the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; they shall serve you for *remembrance* (LXX: *anamnēsin*) before your God: I am the LORD your God. (LXX Num. 10:10)

And you shall put pure frankincense with each row, that it may go with the bread as a memorial (LXX: *anamnēsin*) portion to be offered by fire to the LORD. (LXX Lev. 24:7)

A Psalm of David for remembrance (*anamnēsin*) concerning the Sabbath. (Superscription of LXX Ps. 37).

The cultic connotation is reinforced by Jesus' command to "do" (*poieō*) the rite, terminology that scholars also recognize as closely associated with Israel's liturgy (see, for example, LXX Exod. 29:35; LXX Num. 15:11–13).⁷⁰ Specifically, Luke's presentation of the Eucharistic rite seems to evoke three particular offerings: the bread of the presence, the Passover, and the *tôdâ* (thank offering).

Before proceeding, the reader should be aware that these three sacrificial offerings are not to be understood as hermetically sealed categories. An allusion to one does not necessarily rule out the likelihood that imagery from another is in play. For ancient Jews, these three sacrifices were easily linked together. Thus

symbolic meaning of Jesus' act of *breaking* the bread go on to find symbolic meaning in his *giving* it to the disciples (see Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 84; Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 389–390).

69 See, for example, David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on The New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 548, who, writing on the appearance of the same terminology in 1 Corinthians 11, explains: "The memorial requires that Christians reenact ritually what Christ did at his last meal to betoken his death and to explain its significance. The repeated imperative, 'do this unto my remembrance,' then, commands ritual remembrance of this foundational saving event (see Exod. 12:14; Ps 77:12–12; 105:5). It is related to Jewish liturgical remembrance that praises and proclaims the mighty acts of God."

70 Marshall (*Luke*, 804) points out that the verb *poieō* ("do") "is used of repeating rites" (see Exod. 29:35; Num. 15:11–13; Deut. 25:9; 1QS II, 19; 1Q28a 2:21). See also Otfried Hofius, "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition," in *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor. 11 and other Eucharistic Texts*, The Cambridge Conference on the Eucharist August 1988; NGS 6; ed. B. F. Meyer (Macon: Mercer, 1993), 101, 106–111.

Passover and the *tôdâ* were often closely linked. In the Jerusalem Talmud, regulations for the *tôdâ* are laid out in the tractate on Passover (see *y. Pesah* 27d). Given the similarities between the Passover and the *tôdâ* the two sacrifices could easily be linked. Both involved a *sacred meal* in which the worshipper ate of the sacrifice and of the unleavened bread (Exod. 12:8; Lev. 7:12). The rabbis even state that the specific regulations for the *tôdâ* were derived directly from the ordinances relating to the Passover (see *m. Menah* 7:6). Furthermore, as we stated earlier, the *tôdâ* was also linked to praising God for deliverance. In this the *tôdâ* was also very similar to the Passover. It is no wonder that Philo describes Passover as “a reminder and thank-offering” (*Spec.* 2:146). Notably, Philo also links the unleavened bread of Passover to the bread of the presence (see *Spec.* 2:158–161). Suffice it to say that Luke can be seen highlighting connections between all three offerings simultaneously in his presentation of the Eucharistic words and deeds of Jesus.

First, Jesus’ use of the word *anamnēsis* in connection with bread, wine, and covenant imagery likely alludes to the Bread of the Presence. The Bread of the Presence offering was directly linked to the motif of the covenant (Lev. 24:8), to drink-offerings (Exod. 25:29), and to “memorial” (*anamnēsis*) language (Lev. 24:7).⁷¹ This connection is anticipated earlier in Luke’s narrative when Jesus compares himself and his disciples to David and his men who were given access to this sacred bread (Luke 6:1–5).

Second, given the Passover context of Jesus’ meal in Luke, it hardly seems coincidental that the word *anamnēsis* closely resembles the term used for the Passover, *mnēmosynon* (see Exod. 12:14).⁷² The two terms are synonymous, meaning “memorial” or “remembrance.” Jesus’ choice of a Passover meal as the context for his command to repeat the Eucharistic rite as a “memorial” (Luke 22:15, 19) manifestly draws on the imagery of the feast itself. That Jesus alludes to Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecy in his Eucharistic words may also reinforce the Passover imagery; Jeremiah’s vision of the new covenant age is explicitly linked to the Passover in the Septuagint (LXX Jer. 38:8).

The Passover imagery also makes sense of why both Jesus’ death and the Eucharistic meal are described in cultic terms. In light of the paschal connection, Jesus’ act of giving the bread (=his body) to the disciples to be *consumed* is the natural corollary of his role as the sacrificial victim; the Passover lamb was not only sacrificed but also *eaten*. Indeed, eating the lamb was a *necessary* part of the cultic celebration. Thus Jesus is presented as the *paschal* sacrifice that must be consumed.

71 For further discussion see Mary Douglas, “The Eucharist: Its Continuity with the Bread Sacrifice of Leviticus,” *Modern Theology* 15/2 [1999]: 209–224.

72 See also Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1057; Green, *Luke*, 762.

As Fitzmyer explains, “[Jesus’] own body and blood will replace the Passover lamb ...”⁷³

Third, and finally, scholars have argued that the Eucharistic rite seems to evoke the thanksgiving sacrifice (*tôdâ*). Luke’s Last Supper narrative emphasizes Jesus’ act of giving *thanks* over the bread (Luke 22:19).⁷⁴ By itself the language of giving thanks need not point to the *tôdâ*. Other observations, however, incline the reader to make the connection.

First, as we have seen, Jesus alludes to Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecy. It can hardly be dismissed as irrelevant that this prophecy is followed by a vision of the messianic age in which the returned exiles offer *tôdâ* sacrifices (see Jer. 33:11). In this light, if Jesus is being presented as instituting a cultic rite in connection with the new covenant, the appearance of “thanksgiving” imagery seems fitting, if not even expected.⁷⁵ Second, the *tôdâ* was closely linked to language of “remembrance,” a motif that is obviously also found in the Eucharistic words. Third, the rest of the passion narrative is especially linked with psalms that were closely linked with the *tôdâ* offering, for example, Psalm 22. Finally, like the Passover connection, such an allusion would make sense of why the Eucharistic meal itself, and not simply Jesus’ death, would be identified with cultic language: in the *tôdâ*, the meal is of a piece with the offering of the animal—the worshipper partakes of the sacrificial victim.

5. The Eucharistic Words and the Priesthood of the Apostles

If the Eucharist is described as a cultic rite, and if Jesus is assuming a priestly role in the rite, then his instructions to the apostles to repeat it would seem to imply a priestly role for them as well. Indeed, the language Jesus employs, “Do [*poieô*] this,” evokes the language used for the priests’ performance of the cultic rites of the Old Testament (LXX Lev. 4:20; LXX Num. 15:11–13). In fact, in the immediate

⁷³ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1392.

⁷⁴ For what follows, see, in particular, Hartmut Gese, *Essays in Biblical Theology*, trans. K. Crim (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981), 128–140. Other scholars have also noted the connection. See Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 216 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007), 274–277; Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1988), 48–50; D. R. Lindsay, “*Todah* and Eucharist: The Celebration of the Lord’s Supper as a “Thank Offering” in the Early Church,” *Restoration Quarterly* 39 (1997): 83–100; James Swetnam, “The Crux at Hebrews 5,7–8,” *Biblica* 81 (2000): 347–361.

⁷⁵ Here we might also note the objection of Paul F. Bradshaw that the *tôdâ* fails to explain the eschatological significance of the meal (*The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992], 65). What Bradshaw fails to recognize is the eschatological associations made with the *tôdâ* in passages such as those outlined above. See also Lindsay, “*Todah* and Eucharist,” 89: “There is an eschatological dimension to the thank offering. This becomes obvious in Isa. 25:1–10 where a song of thanksgiving transforms the eschatological feast into a thank offering of the entire spiritual community of God.”

context of the Last Supper narrative Jesus applies other language to the apostles that would have appeared to suggest a priestly role for them.

Shortly after the Institution Narrative, Jesus tells the twelve that they will “sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Luke 22:30). The priestly implications here are often missed. According to the Old Testament, “judging” the twelve tribes was primarily a *priestly* task (see Deut. 17:9; 2 Chron. 19:8–11). Such a task was viewed as a priestly responsibility in Jesus’ day. Josephus assigns the task of judging *solely* to the priests, omitting the secondary role of lay elders elsewhere mentioned by the Law (see *A.J.* 2.165; 4.304).⁷⁶ Grossberg writes, “In Hellenistic times the high priest replaced the king as the principle judge...”⁷⁷ “Judgment” was also linked to the high priest,⁷⁸ the president of the Sanhedrin (see 1 Macc. 14:44; Acts 5:17; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.194; *A.J.* 20.200, 251).⁷⁹

Furthermore, judging the twelve tribes in the *eschatological* age was particularly associated with priests. Ezekiel explains that priests will be the judges in the future age (Ezek. 44:23). According to the Dead Sea Scrolls, even the Messiah will defer to the priests’ juridical authority (see 4QpIsa^a 8-10:24–25). Therefore, when Jesus assigns special juridical power over the twelve tribes—clearly envisioning their eschatological restoration—it strongly suggests that the apostles would be functioning as priests.

The priestly nature of the apostolic ministry is also supported by other passages in Luke-Acts. In Acts 1, Luke describes how the apostles chose a replacement for Judas. Specifically, Luke explains that this was accomplished by the casting of lots (Acts 1:26). While the practice was associated with games of chance (see Matt. 27:35; Mark 15:24), such does not appear to be its purpose in Acts 1. According to the Old Testament, lot-casting was a sacred rite. Significantly, the duties of the priests were assigned by the casting of lots (1 Chron. 24:31). In choosing the man to “share in this ministry” (Acts 1:17), the apostles’ make recourse to the practice used for determining priestly responsibilities.

That the Old Testament rite of lot-casting is in the background of Acts 1:26 is reinforced when one recognizes that Luke begins his Gospel narrative by

76 See Sanders, *Judaism: Practice & Belief*, 171: “In summarizing Deut. 31, in which Moses consigns the law to the priests and the elders, Josephus left out the elders” (*A.J.* 4.304).

77 Daniel Grossberg, “Judges,” in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, eds. D. N. Freedman, A. C. Myers, and A. B. Beck (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 752. In addition, see Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 171.

78 The high priest’s task of judging is particularly underscored in his association with the Urim and Thummim. While their exact nature is unclear, we do know that they were related to judgment (see Exod. 28:30; Num. 27:21; Sir. 45:10; see also Lev. 8:8; Ezra 2:63; Neh. 7:65).

79 See G. H. Twelftree, “Sanhedrin,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 730.

highlighting the priestly associations of the practice. Introducing Zechariah, the evangelist tells us, “Now while he was serving as priest before God when his division was on duty, *according to the custom of the priesthood, it fell to him by lot to enter the temple of the Lord and burn incense*” (Luke 1:8–9).

The placement of the two scenes of lot-casting in Luke-Acts seems intentional: Luke begins the narrative of both his Gospel and Acts with a scene involving the practice. This is hardly accidental. Scholars have long noted the way the material in Acts mirrors the flow of the narrative of the Gospel.⁸⁰ To name a few of the parallels:

- ✦ Both works begin with a prologue to Theophilus (Luke 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–2).
- ✦ The commencement of Christ’s ministry in Luke and the apostles’ ministry in Acts is described in similar ways. Both begin with an account of the descent of the Spirit in visible form: the dove at the Baptism of Jesus (Luke 3:21–22) and the tongues of fire at Pentecost (Acts 2:1–3 [described as “baptism” in Acts 1:5]).
- ✦ Just as in Luke Jesus begins his ministry with a speech in the Jewish place of worship, the synagogue (Luke 4:16–27), Peter launches the apostles’ ministry in Acts with a speech likely delivered in the Temple (Acts 2:14–40).
- ✦ Jesus performs a miracle involving the healing of a man who is unable to walk (Luke 5:17–26). Peter’s first miracle involves the healing of a lame man (Acts 3:1–10).
- ✦ In Luke 7:1–10 a centurion who is well respected by the Jews sends men to Jesus to ask him to come to his house. In Acts 10:1–48 a centurion, also well-spoken of by the Jews, sends men to ask Peter to come to his house.

These parallels run through the entirety of Luke-Acts. That Paul stands accused before rulers *four* times at the end of Acts (Acts 23: Sanhedrin; Acts 24: Felix; Acts 25: Festus; Acts 26: Agrippa) is hardly a coincidence for Luke—Jesus also ap-

⁸⁰ See, for example, Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, Society for Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974).

peared before rulers on *four* occasions (Luke 22:54: the high priest and the council; Luke 23:1: Pilate; Luke 23:9: Herod; Luke 23:11: Pilate).

Given this parallel structuring of Luke-Acts it hardly seems coincidental that both books begin with a scene of lot casting. In addition, given the cultic associations of the Eucharist, which Jesus commands the apostles to perform, and the priestly connotations of “judging” the twelve tribes at the Last Supper, it is unlikely an accident that Luke describes the selection of Judas’ successor by means of a process he elsewhere explicitly links to the priesthood.

V. Conclusion

Luke-Acts presents Jesus as bringing about the fulfillment of the Scriptures of Israel. This includes the realization of messianic hopes rooted in the prophets. Yet Luke also reveals Jesus as the one who brings about the realization of expectations for a new temple, a new priesthood, and a new cult. God’s people would be restored at the new temple as the prophets envisioned—yet this new temple would not be a building. Christ is the cornerstone of this new temple, which believers are incorporated into by virtue of their union with him. Since Christ is now ascended into heaven, the members of the Church are identified with tongues of fire, an image associated with the heavenly temple.

Likewise, the coming new priesthood is identified with Christ and the apostles. Jesus is the priest who offers his life as a sacrificial oblation like the Servant of Isaiah. Jesus is also the fulfillment of the figure related in Psalm 110, the priest in the order of Melchizedek. Notably, just as Melchizedek’s priesthood was associated with bread and wine (Gen. 14:10), Jesus identifies his priestly self-offering with the Eucharistic bread and wine.

Furthermore, as the Parable of the Vineyard suggests, Jesus installs a new priestly leadership over God’s people. The apostles are described as priests inasmuch as they are tasked with repeating the Eucharistic rite that forms one piece with Christ’s sacrificial death on the cross. They are also established as the eschatological priestly judges, who are to be replaced by successors. As prophets such as Isaiah suggested, the eschatological age would transcend the limitations of the Law. Presumably, not all of the apostles are Levites—nor would they need to be, as Isaiah suggests.

Likewise, as Isaiah announces, right offerings are no longer bound geographically to Jerusalem. Luke reveals that the restoration of Israel is essentially a *sacramental* reality. Expectations for a new cult are realized in the Eucharistic celebration, the true Paschal celebration, “the *tôdâ* of the Risen One,”⁸¹ and true bread of the presence. As the people of God gather around the Eucharistic body of Christ, they are restored at the true eschatological temple.

81 Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger [Pope Benedict], *Feast of Faith*, trans. G. Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 59.