

# De-Centralizing the Temple: A Rereading of Romans 15:16

Kathleen Troost-Cramer

Boston University School of Theology | Kathleent@eteachergroup.com

*JMJS* No. 3 (2016): 72–101

## Introduction: Romans 15:16

*Inasmuch as I am a priestly servant (λειτουργός) of Jesus Christ to the nations, serving the gospel of God as priest, so that the offering of the Gentiles (ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνων) may be acceptable, made holy by holy spirit.*<sup>1</sup>

This fascinating passage provides the key to Paul's definition of his Gentile Jesus-communities as *temple*. Throughout his writings, Paul employs Jewish cultic terms in a metaphorical manner in order to establish the reality that these communities are temples to YHWH. As many scholars have observed, this usage is drawn from the Old Testament (LXX), particularly the Wisdom tradition, and is similar to what can be found in Hellenistic Jewish literature (particularly in Diaspora settings), the Dead Sea Scrolls, and polytheistic Greek writings.<sup>2</sup> This paper argues that Paul employs cultic metaphor in order to define the community of Gentile Jesus-believers as an *extension of the temple* in Jerusalem, not in order to claim that this institution has become redundant with

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation mine, from Barbara Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th Revised ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft [United Bible Societies], 1998).

<sup>2</sup> Burkhard Beckheuer, *Paulus Und Jerusalem: Kollekte Und Mission Im Theologischen Denken Des Heidenapostels*, European University Studies (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 171, 222; Robert J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background before Origen*, ed. Johannes Quasten, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1978), 139; Dieter Georgi, *Geschichte Der Kollekte Des Paulus Für Jerusalem*, Theologische Forschung (Hamburg: Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag GMBH, 1965), 49. For the similarity to Hellenistic metaphor, see Albert L. A. Hogeterp, "Paul's Judaism Reconsidered: The Issue of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence," *Ephemerides Theologicae Louvaniensis* 81, no. 1 (2005): 89–90, 103; C. J. Roetzel, "Sacrifice in Romans 12–15," *Word & World* 6, no. 4 (1986): 415–16.

the appearance of Christ.<sup>3</sup> Paul achieves this by drawing on three chief concepts: synagogue holiness maintained by communal purity (which, as Jonathan Klawans has perceived, Paul considers to be moral/ethical in character), the multiple-temple character of polytheist Roman religion familiar to his Gentile converts, and the sacrifice-centered worship associated with both. Paul combines the Jewish concept of *imitatio templi* with the polytheist concept of multiple temples to single deities in order to claim the legitimacy of multiple temples to YHWH in the form of Jesus-communities.<sup>4</sup> In this way, Paul *de-centralizes* the Jerusalem temple.

The characteristics defining Paul's Jesus-communities as temples are: 1) sacrifice, which took the form of ethical behavior and financial offerings to the eschatological temple-community in Jerusalem; and 2) priesthood, performed by Paul in preaching the gospel, which brought the Gentiles to God as a cultic offering. In turn, the Gentiles themselves acted as priests in offering the sacrifices of their behavior and finances. The fact that the Gentiles were coming to "Zion" by sending their offerings to the eschatological Jesus-community in Jerusalem marked the fulfillment of prophetic promises, particularly those found in Isaiah, that the nations would flock to YHWH in the last days.

---

<sup>3</sup> Paul's attribution of temple holiness to the Jesus-communities does not create "an either/or situation: for Paul, God's spirit dwells both in Jerusalem's temple and in the 'new temple' of the believer and of the community (Rom 9.4; cf. Matt 23.21)." Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 2 (April, 2010): 232–52, 248–49.

<sup>4</sup> For the moral/ethical character of communal purity in Paul, see Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity & Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 151–55. For a thorough discussion of *imitatio templi* in first-century Judaism, see Steven Fine, *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue During the Greco-Roman Period*, ed. Gregory E. Sterling, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1997), esp. 132. Fine uses this term in his discussion of post-70 CE synagogues; but as Pamela Eisenbaum and Jonathan Klawans respectively assert (see below), the term could equally apply to synagogues of Paul's day. Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian* (New York: HarperOne, 2009), 156–57; Jonathan Klawans, "Interpreting the Last Supper," *New Testament Studies* 48, no. 1 (2002): 1–17. I will argue in this paper that Paul's definition of the Gentile Jesus-communities as "temple" goes further than solidarity with Jerusalem worship and defines Gentile-Jesus-communities as temples.

### Multiple Loci of Worship in Hellenistic Judaism and in Greco-Roman Polytheism

Jewish concepts of synagogue sanctity were themselves “related to larger trends in Greco-Roman religion, particularly the development of religious communities that were not temple-based,” as for example in voluntary associations.<sup>5</sup> This malleability of Greco-Roman religion very likely influenced Jewish conceptions of places dedicated to prayer and the reading of Scripture as equal in holiness to the temple, though in many cases these “prayer places” were very far removed from the Jerusalem temple geographically. Such holiness attributed to synagogues “seems to be derived from two sources: the sanctity of the biblical scrolls and the application of Temple motifs,” expressed through synagogue architecture and prayer practices in a state of purity akin to that required for worship at the Jerusalem temple.<sup>6</sup> These imitations of temple characteristics allowed individual synagogues to be called “temples” in a very concrete sense. In *JW* 7:44–45, Josephus uses the terms “synagogue” and “temple” interchangeably, and employs the term *ἱερόν* when referring to the synagogue at Antioch on the Orontes.<sup>7</sup> Josephus also (*Ant.* 14:260) “preserves a Roman decree, which gave the Jews of Sardis the right to come together in a ‘place’ (*topos*) of their own to ‘offer their ancestral prayers and sacrifices to God.’”<sup>8</sup> While the nature or content of such “sacrifice” is impossible to know, three possibilities are suggested by Steven Fine: the polytheistic Roman authorities may have misunderstood synagogue ritual, the Sardis congregation may have wished to “describe its liturgy using a term that was comprehensible to its neighbors,” or this synagogue may have offered real sacrifice in some form.<sup>9</sup> If the latter is the case, then the Romans understood the Sardis liturgy perfectly well and the Sardis Jews were not simply presenting their worship practices in a way to which polytheists could relate. It is most unlikely, however, that animal sacrifices were going on in the Sardis synagogue. I suggest that the sacrifice offered by the Sardis Jews consisted of the temple tax and the practice of prayer, which were common practices among Jewish communities in Diaspora settings. In sum, “the synagogue of Antioch, like the ‘prayer places’ of Egypt and perhaps the *topos* of Sardis Jewry, was seen by non-Jews and apparently by Jews alike as a local

---

<sup>5</sup> Fine, *Holy Place*, 25.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 29–32; Klawans, “Interpreting,” 13.

<sup>7</sup> Fine, *Holy Place*, 29. Lanci cites Josephus’ usage as evidence that *ναός* and *ἱερόν* possessed a range of meanings and hence need not necessarily identify a place as a “temple” (see n. 13 below).

<sup>8</sup> Fine, *Holy Place*, 28.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

temple.”<sup>10</sup> It is worthwhile to recall also the presence of the Jewish temples in Elephantine and Leontopolis, which, although regarded as invalid rivals to the temple at Jerusalem by the authorities of the latter, were not regarded as such by those who built them. Rather, the creators of, and worshipers at, the Egyptian Jewish temples viewed their places of worship as equal in holiness to the worship locus in Jerusalem. We may therefore surmise that the temples at Elephantine and Leontopolis would have been considered by their adherents to be extensions of the Jerusalem temple’s holiness. This concept is of vital significance to this thesis, as we will see that Paul’s communities of Gentiles-in-Christ are depicted similarly as extensions of the Jerusalem temple’s holiness.

Most interesting for our discussion is Fine’s assertion that the identification of synagogues as holy places in first-century Palestine is found chiefly “in sources that stem from the margins of Jewish society: the rebel’s meeting house on Masada, a statement from the *Damascus Covenant* . . . and in Philo of Alexandria’s description of the Essenes.”<sup>11</sup> The early Jesus-communities could certainly be included among movements existing on “the margins of Jewish society.”

Noting Fine’s work, Pamela Eisenbaum and Jonathan Klawans respectively perceive the fostering of a similar *imitatio templi* among Paul’s congregations, which attests not to an abrogation of the temple institution but to a form of *solidarity* with it.<sup>12</sup> Paul’s description of the Corinthian believers as “God’s building” (1 Cor 3:9–15) has been noted as a particularly overt definition of the community as a temple, as shown by the immediate context: verses 16 and 17 specifically state that the Corinthian Jesus-community (second plural, ὑμεῖς) “are God’s most holy place (ναός).”<sup>13</sup> I will argue below that Paul’s self-

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Eisenbaum, *Paul*, 156–57; Klawans, “Interpreting,” 14.

<sup>13</sup> Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 57; John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, ed. Hemchand Gossai, *Studies in Biblical Literature* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 11, 91–92, 120. I concur with Lanci and Gärtner here; but I must disagree with both scholars that Paul’s terminology possesses a strictly symbolic significance that never goes more deeply than metaphor, and with Lanci’s arguments that: a) Paul did not see himself in an accompanying priestly role; and b) the term *ναός* does not portray the Jesus-community as holy of holies, given that word’s flexible use in antiquity (as shown in Josephus). As locus of God’s presence, the community is indeed portrayed as the holy of holies by Paul and we may interpret *ναός* accordingly.

designation as a “priestly servant” is predicated upon his mission as a builder of temple-communities. He stands in the role of the priesthood by opening the way of holiness to the nations through the preaching of the gospel. In turn, as we will also see, the Gentiles themselves become priests by offering the fruit of their lives as a worship sacrifice, no different and no less than the sacrifices offered in the Jerusalem temple.

Temple imagery would have resonated with Paul’s audiences in two chief ways. Firstly, there was precedent for multiple worship loci in the Hebrew Scriptures themselves. The scope of this paper does not allow a detailed treatment of this practice; here, we must simply note that the existence of “high places” is well documented in the canonical Scriptures, chiefly depicted through the lens of the centralized Jerusalem worship cultus that viewed multiple shrines as susceptible to syncretic worship forms that, in this view, threatened the unity of Israel’s God.<sup>14</sup> After the construction of the Jerusalem temple, multiple shrines continued to exist and thrive, both in the Southern and the Northern Kingdoms, even in the presence of the major worship centers at Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim. Kings Hezekiah and Josiah each found that “high places” were reviving in Judah (if indeed they had ever ceased to function) during their respective reigns and made it their mission to eradicate these places.<sup>15</sup> In the view of those who worshiped at such shrines, however, they were the true preservers of the most ancient traditions. Among their number in the north were the early sanctuaries of the divine Presence at Gilgal, Shechem, Shiloh, and Beth-El, Dan, and Beersheba.<sup>16</sup> Multiple sanctuaries for the worship of YHWH therefore had a long history within Israel. Accordingly, although Paul’s audiences were predominantly Gentile Jesus-believers, many of these would have come to the Jesus-movement through attachment to a synagogue community as God-fearers or proselytes.<sup>17</sup> Thus, they, along with any Jewish

---

<sup>14</sup> For detailed treatment of this phenomenon, see e.g. Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religions in the Old Testament Period, Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy* (originally published as *Religionsgeschichte Israels in Alttestamentlicher Zeit* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992]), trans. John Bowden (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), esp. 84–88, 95–99, 143–46, 149–56, 187–216; Richard S. Hess, *Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), esp. 39, 297–314.

<sup>15</sup> Albertz, *History*, 198–216; Hess, *Israelite Religions*, 252–53.

<sup>16</sup> Albertz, *History*, 143–46. Hess (*Israelite Religions*, 300–302) discusses archaeological evidence for sacrificial worship at Tel Dan and Beersheba, including a horned altar in the latter locale and remains of a possible horned altar in the former.

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations,” 238–39.

hearers of Paul's letters, would be familiar with the ancient *Israelite* practice of worshipping YHWH at locations beyond the Jerusalem temple.

Secondly, Paul's Gentile audience would have also recognized temple and cultic imagery in terms of their former Greco-Roman polytheistic worship.<sup>18</sup> Gentiles attached to Diaspora synagogues who were unable to travel to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage festivals would never have seen the Jerusalem temple, but the temples and rites of Greco-Roman worship would have formed a part of their own pre-conversion lives. Paul's purpose in using terms drawn from cultic worship, both pagan and Jewish, is to elucidate the inclusion of Gentile Jesus-believers with the people of the God of Israel by way of their participation in the locus of presence of that God, the Jerusalem temple. At the same time, I submit that Paul envisions this participation in one specific characteristic of pagan worship: the fact that one deity is allowed limitless numbers of temples.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, Paul's language relating to priesthood, particularly as this bears on his mission in preaching the gospel and in taking up the monetary collection for the Jerusalem community, would have been recognized by his Gentile audiences as similar to the roles of Roman priests, as we will see shortly.

### **“Metaphorization”<sup>20</sup> of Cult**

#### *Some Examples from Hellenistic Judaism and the Diaspora*

The centrality of the Jerusalem temple and cult was maintained by Diaspora Jews, who were physically far removed from it.<sup>21</sup> The language of metaphor relating to cult is an inheritance of the Hellenistic influence upon Judaism,

---

<sup>18</sup> David J. Downs, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*, ed. Jörg Frey, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 157–58. See also Lanci, *New Temple*, 125–26.

<sup>19</sup> In agreement with Lanci, *New Temple*, 10.

<sup>20</sup> Hogeterp, “Paul's Judaism,” 89; Lanci, *New Temple*, 9. Hogeterp rightly prefers “metaphorization” to “spiritualization,” the latter term creating a false distance between Diaspora communities and the Jerusalem temple cult, as well as lending itself to supersessionist interpretations. I concur with this assessment and will therefore use *metaphorization* throughout this paper.

<sup>21</sup> See Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 160; Hogeterp, “Paul's Judaism,” 94–95; Roetzel, “Sacrifice in Romans,” 415. As noted above, some Diaspora Jews decided to extend the Jerusalem temple's holiness by creating their own “satellite” temples in Elephantine and Leontopolis, the existence of these in no way intended to decrease the sanctity of the temple in Jerusalem.

found particularly within the Diaspora contexts in which Paul carried out his mission.<sup>22</sup> This is a natural development of Diaspora communities' physical distance from the Jerusalem temple<sup>23</sup> and higher degree of exposure to Greek populations and immersion in Greek culture; but as we have seen, concepts of synagogue holiness even in Palestine display similar strategies of metaphorization in connecting synagogues to the Jerusalem temple and in rendering synagogues holy places in their own right. The impossibility of performing regular material sacrifice in the Jerusalem temple led Diaspora Jews and interested Gentiles affiliated with their communities to develop atonement practices in the form of moral deeds, especially almsgiving, Sabbath fasting (among Jewish communities in Rome, contrary to typical practice), and purity practices similar to those practiced by Jewish communities in Palestine with physical access to the temple.<sup>24</sup> All of these practices were intended to allow Diaspora Jewish communities their own ways of performing cultic sacrifice. We have discussed the possibility that the Sardis synagogue performed some form of sacrifice which identified it as a temple. In addition we may add the observation of Keith F. Nickle that the half-shekel temple tax paid by Diaspora communities was a way in which Diaspora Jews (and, I would add, interested Gentiles, including Jesus-believers) could "maintain contact with, personally participate in, and express their sense of identity with cultic Judaism as it was exemplified in

---

<sup>22</sup> See Stephen Finlan, *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*, ed. Mark Allan Powell, Academia Biblica (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 47–50, 68–69; Lanci, *New Temple*, 121–24.

<sup>23</sup> See Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 160.

<sup>24</sup> John Bowker, *Jesus and the Pharisees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 68; Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 121; Hogeterp, "Paul's Judaism," 103; John C. Poirier, "Purity Beyond the Temple in the Second Temple Era," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122, no. 2 (2003): 247–65; Charles L. Quarles, "The New Perspective and Means of Atonement in Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period," *Criswell Theological Review* 2, no. 2 (2005): 39–56; Roetzel, "Sacrifice in Romans," 415–16; Margaret Williams, "Being a Jew in Rome: Sabbath Fasting as an Expression of Romano-Jewish Identity," in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, ed. John M. G. Barclay (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004). I cannot agree with Poirier's claim that purity practices in Diaspora communities had no connection to the rites of the Jerusalem temple, considering that, as already stated, Diaspora Jews cherished strong ties to that central focus of Jewish worship, tradition, and identity, and that purity regulations were associated with temple worship long before the establishment of Diaspora communities.

the Temple worship.”<sup>25</sup> These practices were not so much substitutes for cultic worship, as they have sometimes been called, as they were ways in which the synagogue worshipper might possess some degree of *participation* in the cult of the Jerusalem temple. Prayer, purity observances, and the temple tax were never intended to *replace* temple worship; rather, they served as a long-distance link to the temple service.<sup>26</sup> Nickle has shown that Paul modeled his own monetary collections specifically on the half-shekel temple tax.<sup>27</sup> However, Nickle also claims that while the temple tax was “directly related to the very nucleus of Jewish cultic worship . . . Paul’s collection was not directly related to the worship of the Church. It was instigated to help provide the funds necessary to care for the poor.”<sup>28</sup> Against Nickle, I contend that these two purposes are not mutually exclusive: it is not a case of *either* poverty relief *or* the worship of the Jesus-communities, but rather a case of providing poverty relief *as a form of* communal worship. That Paul’s collection was directly related to the worship of the Gentile Jesus-communities with which he corresponded is shown by his clear evocation of the Jerusalem cult in referring a) to the community as a temple; and b) to the collection as one of the temple-community’s sacrifices, mediated by the priesthood of Paul and by the priestly functions of his Gentile congregants in offering their financial means as their own sacrifice.

Additionally, there is evidence that one of the roles of the polytheist Roman priesthood was the overseeing of finances. *IKyme 37*, a marble

---

<sup>25</sup> Keith F. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul’s Strategy*, Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1966), 86, 89, 90. See also Lanci, *New Temple*, 93–94. Georgi (*Geschichte der Kollekte*, 28), suggests this idea in the negative, claiming that an attitude critical of the temple was quite rare in Hellenistic Judaism. One exception, of course, is provided by the Qumran sect.

<sup>26</sup> Gruen, *Diaspora*, 121. For metaphorization in Jewish contexts that never proposes to replace material sacrifice, see J. Andrew Overman, “The Diaspora in the Modern Study of Ancient Judaism,” in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*, ed. J. Andrew Overman and Robert S. MacLennan, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 63–78; Xavier Paul B. Viagulamuthu, *Offering Our Bodies as a Living Sacrifice to God: A Study in Pauline Spirituality Based on Romans 12,1*, Tesi Gregoriana: Serie Spiritualita (Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregoriana, 2002), 237–38. For participation as opposed to substitution, see Richard H. Bell, “Sacrifice and Christology in Paul,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 53, no. 1 (2002): 1–27, 3–4, 9; Hogeterp, “Paul’s Judaism,” 102–103; Roetzel, “Sacrifice in Romans,” 416; C. William Swain, “‘For Our Sins’: The Image of Sacrifice in the Thought of the Apostle Paul,” *Interpretation* 17, no. 2 (1963): 133–34.

<sup>27</sup> Nickle, *Collection*, 74–75, 87–93.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.



inscription from Kyme/Aiolis dating to the late first century BCE or the early first century CE, records the action of a group of initiates in the mysteries of an unnamed deity in collecting funds to purchase property and buildings for the group's sacred use.<sup>29</sup> Here, the contributors are referred to as "sacred partners" (μετεχόντω[ν], line 10) by virtue of making a contribution to this sacred purpose.<sup>30</sup> In this case, a sub-group within the initiates' own number collected the money; but one person within this sub-group, Herakleides Olympicos, was appointed to actually make the purchase of the property, and it would appear that he also performed some priestly functions in dedicating the property to the initiates' chosen deity.<sup>31</sup> This is similar to Paul's attribution of a priestly role to himself in taking the collection from his congregations for the Jerusalem church.<sup>32</sup> Other texts and inscriptions, such as *SEG 37:1010* (third century BCE), *SEG 46:1519* (third century BCE), *TAM V 1462* (second century CE), and *I Aph 12.538* (180–189 CE), refer to "high priests" as financial officers tasked with overseeing the bookkeeping of temples and/or collecting funds to provide for sacrifices and other rites on behalf of groups of devotees.<sup>33</sup> In one case in particular, a funerary inscription found in Ionia, *OGIS 326* (*Posthumous Honors by Attalists for Kraton*, 146–133 BCE), Kraton, a "priest of the synod," is honored for not only contributing to the group's ritual needs from his own resources (including slaves and materiel in addition to money) but also for securing resources from the king for like purposes.<sup>34</sup>

Each of these inscriptions attests that a significant aspect of Roman priesthood was *benefaction*, the priesthood being viewed as bearing responsibility for the good of an association as a whole, providing for the group's material worship needs.<sup>35</sup> The wide range of dates for the inscriptions

---

<sup>29</sup> In John S. Kloppenborg, Richard S. Ascough, and Philip A. Harland, eds., *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary: Vol. II, North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2014), 86–94.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 87, 90, 92. See also *Agora 16:161*, which details "partnership (κοινωνία) in the sacrifices," in John S. Kloppenborg and Richard S. Ascough, eds. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. Volume I: Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 80–81.

<sup>31</sup> Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume II*, 92.

<sup>32</sup> F. W. Horn, "Paulus und die Herodianische Tempel," *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 184–203, 200.

<sup>33</sup> Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume II*, 184, 216–17, 340.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 313, 324–30.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 386–87, 388–89, 425–26.

mentioned here shows that this characterization, as well as the expectation of group members to contribute to the costs associated with worship spaces and rituals, persisted across the time of Paul. Therefore, Paul's appeals to his Gentile Jesus-believers that they contribute to the collection for Jerusalem would have been familiar to non-Jewish ears; indeed, many in Paul's congregations may have recalled contributing to the sacrifices of polytheist associations to which they had belonged prior to joining the Jesus-movement. Significantly for a study of Paul, another marble inscription dating to the late second century CE, *IPessinous 18*, details the beneficent works of priests affiliated with an association in Galatia.<sup>36</sup>

Also significant in the polytheist Roman context is the fact that priests were frequently in leadership positions in Greco-Roman associations.<sup>37</sup> Such communities would be centered around a priest; in some cases, associations owned temples in which they performed sacrifices, and sacrificial worship seems to be the reason for some associations' very existence.<sup>38</sup> Most intriguing for our purposes is the practice among the Epicureans of having a *philosopher*-priest at the head of their associations; we may see a similarity here to Paul in his self-described priesthood of preaching the gospel, which we will discuss further below.<sup>39</sup> To other similarities between Paul's congregations and Greco-Roman associations must be added this characteristic of members participating in the *κοινωνία* or *σύνοδος* specifically by contributing to the sacrificial worship of the group.

Within the Jewish context, attribution of temple holiness through written metaphor was not limited to the Diaspora. It is particularly in the Dead Sea Scrolls (henceforth DSS), of Judean provenance, that we find the most interesting and, for this essay, pertinent examples of Jewish cultic metaphor that establish the reality of the faith community as a temple. This Qumranic usage of sacrificial metaphor provides the closest parallel to the usage found in Paul. A word of caution is in order before we begin this section. It is not my desire to

---

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 421–26.

<sup>37</sup> Kloppenborg and Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume I*, 11, 23; see also Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume II*, 372.

<sup>38</sup> As attested by, *inter alia*, *IG IP 1261*, *IG IP 1290*, *IG IP 1297*, *IG IP 1298*, in Kloppenborg and Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume I*, 60–4, 77, 110; *IBosp 1134*, *IBosp 1283*, *SEG 46:1519*, Strabo, *Geography* 12.2.3., 12.3.36, in Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume II*, 17, 22–3, 32–8, 211–12, 214ff.

<sup>39</sup> Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, *Greco-Roman Associations Volume II*, 367ff., 382–83.

attempt to prove direct dependence of Paul on the literature of Qumran. Rather, I intend to highlight particular aspects of the DSS that shed some light on the employment of cultic metaphor that existed in Palestine in Paul's day, and to which he may have been exposed by way of his cultural milieu.<sup>40</sup>

*The Community of the Elect as Temple of God, Sacrifice to God, and Cultic Ministers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

The striking similarity of Pauline cultic imagery to certain passages in the DSS is most apparent in the Manual of Discipline (1QS) and the Damascus Document (CD).<sup>41</sup> Let us consider some representative DSS passages that feature cultic metaphors establishing the community of the elect as both temple and cultus:

<sup>6</sup>By the spirit of God's truth a person's ways are atoned, all <sup>7</sup>his iniquities, to behold the light of life; and by the holy spirit of the *yahad* (יחד) in his truth, he will be pure from all <sup>8</sup>his iniquities, and by a disciplined and humble spirit his sin will be atoned. And by humbling himself to all God's statutes, <sup>9</sup>his flesh will be pure by sprinkling with the water of purification and sanctifying himself with the water of cleansing (במי דוכי). And let him make his footsteps firm to walk perfectly <sup>10</sup>in all God's ways, just as he commanded, at the appointed times of his testimonies; and not <sup>11</sup>to turn to right or left, and not to transgress one of all his words. Then he will be accepted by a soothing atonement (בכפרי ניהוח) before God, and it will be for him a covenant of <sup>12</sup>the eternal *yahad*. (1QS III, 6b–12)<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> See Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 157–58, 161; Horn, “Herodianische Tempel,” 189. Daly and Gärtner respectively assert direct dependence of the early Christian communities on Qumran. My argument agrees with Daly's allowance that this need not necessarily be the case, but that any apparent dependence might be due to the prevailing cultural-religious milieu in Hellenized Palestine. In the following section, we will focus on DSS passages that feature concepts of the elect community as temple of God and holy living as a daily sacrifice to God, the two correspondences emphasized in the work of Gärtner and Daly.

<sup>41</sup> See James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 545.

<sup>42</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all DSS translations mine, from James H. Charlesworth et. al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, 10 vols., vol. 1 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994).

It is noteworthy that the phrase *במי דוכי* in this passage is used of washing a sacrificial victim.<sup>43</sup> *בבפרי ניחוח* describes an “odor of soothing” as in the incense sacrifice (which, as we will see, Paul uses as a metaphor for the offering of the Gentiles).<sup>44</sup> The member of God’s community is portrayed here as a sacrifice by virtue of living an upright life in following God’s (and the community’s) commandments.

<sup>1</sup>In the congregation of the *yahad* there shall be twelve men and three priests, who are perfect in everything revealed from the whole <sup>2</sup>Torah, to do truth and righteousness and justice, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly (each) one with his companion; <sup>3</sup>to keep fidelity in the land with a sustained purpose and a broken spirit, and to make satisfaction for iniquity by doing justice <sup>4</sup>and suffering trials; and to walk with everyone by the measure of truth and by the regulation of the time. When these <sup>5</sup>exist in Israel, the congregation of the *yahad* will be established in truth, an eternal planting, a holy house for Israel and a most holy assembly <sup>6</sup>for Aaron, perpetual truth for judgment and chosen by (divine) favor to atone for the land and to return <sup>7</sup>to the wicked their recompense. . . . <sup>8</sup>(They will be) a most holy dwelling <sup>9</sup>for Aaron, with knowledge of the covenant of justice, and to offer a soothing aroma: a house of perfection and truth in Israel <sup>10</sup>to uphold the covenant of everlasting statutes. And they will be accepted to atone for the land and to determine judgment on wickedness by perfection of way, and (there will be no) iniquity. (1QS VIII, 1–10)<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003).

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> For a discussion of the community as “holy of holies (or ‘most holy dwelling’) for Aaron” in this passage, see Hogeterp, “Paul’s Judaism,” 95–96; Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*, ed. B. Doyle, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, *Biblical Tools and Studies* (Dudley: Peeters, 2006), 105.

Here, the community itself is portrayed as *both* the holy of holies, the dwelling-place of YHWH, *and* the sacrifice made in the temple, so that the community is at once the temple and the atoning sacrifice offered within.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>3</sup>When these exist in Israel according to all these regulations, for a foundation of holy spirit for eternal truth <sup>4</sup>to atone for the guilt of transgression and the unfaithfulness of sin, and for favor to the land apart from the flesh of burnt offerings (מבשר עולות) and apart from the fat of sacrifice, then the offering of <sup>5</sup>lips for justice (will be) as a righteous soothing, and those who are perfect of the way as an acceptable freewill offering. At that time, the men of <sup>6</sup>the *yahad* will separate: a holy house for Aaron, for the most holy *yahad*; a house of the *yahad* for Israel, those who walk in perfection. (1QS IX, 3–6)

In these two texts, atonement (for all Israel, not only for the יחד) is achieved through the blameless behavior of יחד members according to the purity regulations and ethical demands of the Mosaic law.<sup>47</sup> In 1QS IX, 4, מבשר עולות refers to the עולה, the whole burnt-offering. So the behavior of the “men of the *yahad*” will serve the atoning function of the עולה and the יחד itself will be “a holy house”—a temple. Hence, the community is at the same time priest, sacrifice, and temple.<sup>48</sup> The community is also described as a temple in 4Q174 (4QFlorilegium) I, 1b–7a:

<sup>1</sup>The son of unrighteousness [will not increase his affliction] as formerly and as from the day that <sup>2</sup>I commanded judges over my people Israel. It is the house that [. . . at] the end of days, just as it is written in the book . . . <sup>3</sup>“The sanctuary of the Lord, which] your hands have established. YHWH will rule eternally.” It is the house to which [. . .] will not come <sup>4</sup>forever, or Ammonite or Moabite or bastard or foreigner or sojourner,

---

<sup>46</sup> Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 166, 256. See also John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 73.

<sup>47</sup> Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 25, 30, 44–45.

<sup>48</sup> Daly (*Christian Sacrifice*, 167–68) interprets יחד in these passages to mean the community as a whole effecting atonement, not only the 15-member Council of the Community.

forever, because my holy ones are there. <sup>5</sup>[. . .] eternal[ly]. He will be seen upon it continually, and foreigners will not ravage it again as they formerly ravaged <sup>6</sup>the sanctu[ary of I]srael by means of their sin. And he said to build for him a human sanctuary (מקדש אדם) to be those who make sacrifices in it to him, <sup>7</sup>works of the Torah before him.<sup>49</sup>

The obvious sacrificial language in all of these passages creates rather fluid images. The יחד offers the sacrifice of an upright life (= “works of the Torah”), therefore its members act as priests (see also CD III, 21–IV:4).<sup>50</sup> They also are, themselves, the sacrifice, which is portrayed as both a sin-offering and a freewill offering. The community is also the temple where the acceptable sacrifices of perfectly Torah-observant living are offered.<sup>51</sup> This fluid association of images illuminates the background of Paul’s own references to the Christ-believing congregation as both temple and sacrifice, particularly regarding holiness of life. It is important to note that it is *sin* that defiles the temple-community<sup>52</sup> and

---

<sup>49</sup> Translation mine, from John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I (4q158–4q186)*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968). Against Lanci (*New Temple*, 15ff.), my translation of מקדש אדם agrees with that of Gärtner (*Temple and Community*, 34–35), whose translation is “human temple” according to his reading of the overall *context*: “The theme of the text . . . is that the eschatological temple is to be made up of the community—a theme developed in the remainder of the passage. This interpretation also fits in admirably with the temple symbolism of 1QS.”

<sup>50</sup> Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 170.

<sup>51</sup> Lanci (*New Temple*, 15ff.) argues on linguistic grounds that “holy house” cannot mean “temple,” since the MT refers to the temple not as “holy house” but as “house of God” and the latter term does not occur in 1QS. Likewise, Lanci claims that “holy of holies” must be a superlative and cannot refer to a specific place, i.e. the holy of holies in the temple where God’s presence dwells. However, I am more convinced by Gärtner’s approach, which focuses on the overall context in order to determine the meaning of individual phrases. Certainly, the whole context of 1QS creates the picture of community as temple, as Gärtner and Daly respectively observe. If Aaron represents the priesthood, as he surely does, then a “house of Aaron” is a house of the priesthood—a temple. Additionally, Qumran terminology need not parrot Jerusalem terminology. In fact, given Qumran’s opposition to Jerusalem, the terminology of the DSS would likely reflect that separation. Fine’s work has also demonstrated that at least some “prayer places” beyond the temple were placed on a par of holiness with the temple itself, and accordingly viewed as temples in their own right.

<sup>52</sup> I borrow this very appropriate term from Lanci, *New Temple*, 116.

renders its offerings ineffective.<sup>53</sup> Thus the elect community, as temple, must practice ethically upright living if the presence of God is to continue among/within them.<sup>54</sup>

The *מקדש אדם* of 4Q174 III, 6 corresponds to the eschatological temple mentioned earlier in the same passage (III, 3–5), similar to the community's expectation of the restoration of the Jerusalem temple and priesthood at the eschaton on display in 1QM II, 1–6.<sup>55</sup> The community's status as temple was thus a temporary provision to render fitting sacrifice to God until this event should occur.<sup>56</sup> Just as the original intention of the physical temple was to provide a dwelling-place for the *שכינה* of YHWH, the intention of the DSS community was to exist as the locus of God's presence in the world until God should fully redeem Israel in the last days (as also in 11QT).<sup>57</sup> The *יחד* is not a kind of "secondary" temple but has *completely replaced* the Jerusalem temple institution and all its functions.<sup>58</sup> Hence, the community is not a metaphorical "temple" but a real temple established through metaphorical language.

In Paul, similar usage indicates a similar intent: the Jesus-communities are temples in that they possess priests and perform sacrifice, acting as the locus of God's presence in the world until the parousia of Christ Jesus. At the same time, the differences between Paul and Qumran are as significant as the similarities. The DSS are replete with polemic against the priestly establishment and, by extension, the ritual worship of the Jerusalem temple. Indeed, the Qumran community existed to withdraw itself from what it viewed as the

---

<sup>53</sup> Indeed, we read similar ideas in Josephus, who intimates that the shedding of human blood defiles the temple (*JW* IV.158–81). For the association of holy living as directly related to temple holiness, see Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 33–34; Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 317, 385. An in-depth study is Klawans, *Impurity & Sin*.

<sup>54</sup> Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 33–34. *Contra* Lanci, *New Temple*, 13–19.

<sup>55</sup> Hogeterp (*God's Temple*, 103) translates *מקדש אדם* as "Temple of Man." For the eschatological restoration of the temple in 1QM II, 1–6, see Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 170–71.

<sup>56</sup> See Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 21; Hogeterp, "Paul's Judaism," 107–108.

<sup>57</sup> Florentino Garcia-Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*, ed. F. Garcia-Martinez and A. S. Van der Woude, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (New York: Brill, 1992), 205–206; Hogeterp, *God's Temple*, 96–97; David A. Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*, ed. Ernest S. Frerichs et al., *Brown Judaic Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 39–41. See also Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 188.

<sup>58</sup> Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 23–24, 30.

corruption of the temple establishment.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, the community saw itself and its practices as a *substitution* for the temple cult, until proper worship could be restored by the expected messianic deliverers. There is no evidence in Paul's writings that he defined the Jesus-communities in this way.<sup>60</sup> Rather, Paul's concern to include the Gentile Jesus-believers in the people of Israel argues for his intention to facilitate the Gentiles' inclusion in Jewish worship, including the cult of the Jerusalem temple.<sup>61</sup> At the same time, the correspondences between the cultic metaphors in the DSS and in Paul's letters are informative. Paul could certainly make use of the same methods, working them to his own ends, while not parroting precisely the same meanings.

### **Paul's Gentile Jesus-Communities as Temples of God**

#### *The Nature of the "Offering of the Gentiles"*

There is considerable debate among scholars as to whether the genitive in Rom 15:16 ("of the Gentiles," τῶν ἐθνῶν) should be read as subjective or objective. Georgi and Downs argue for the former, in which case the "offering" would refer to the monetary collection for the Jerusalem church. In this case, Paul's λειτουργία would consist of his carrying and presenting the money-offering to Jerusalem.<sup>62</sup> Beckheuer interprets the "liturgical service" as the collection rendered by the Gentiles according to the following context in Rom 15:27, arguing that through the offering "the Gentiles now serve the Jews as priests."<sup>63</sup> These *subjective* readings would also be supported by Phil 4:18, which clearly refers to the collection in cultic language as "a fragrant aroma" and "an

---

<sup>59</sup> Garcia-Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 205; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 20; Hogeterp, *God's Temple*, 87, 103, 105–107.

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. Hogeterp, "Paul's Judaism," 103; Lanci, *New Temple*, 11–13.

<sup>61</sup> See e.g. Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 191: Whereas the Qumran community did not expand its sense of temple holiness to Gentiles, Paul included the Gentiles in his similar concept of community-as-temple. Where I disagree with Horn is in his suggestion that Paul's scheme of Gentile Jesus-communities as temple stemmed from the inability of Gentiles to go to the Jerusalem temple.

<sup>62</sup> David J. Downs, "'The Offering of the Gentiles' in Romans 15.16," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29, no. 2 (2006): 173–86; Downs, *Offering*, 149–50, 152–53; Georgi, *Geschichte der Kollekte*, 74–76. For Downs, the subjective interpretation is bolstered by the genitive of origin ("of your faith," τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν) in Phil 2:17, which is linguistically similar to προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν in Rom 15:16. This of course assumes that Downs is correct in arguing that Phil 2:17 refers to the collection, which, as I will argue below, is questionable.

<sup>63</sup> Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 259. See also Downs, *Offering*, 155.



acceptable sacrifice” to God; and by Rom 12:1, which urges believers to present their own selves/bodies “as a living sacrifice.”<sup>64</sup> Hence the subjective interpretation has the Gentiles acting as priests in contributing to the collection, and fits a view of Paul’s exhortation to the collection as a participation in the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Zion promised in Isa 61:6 (referenced in Rom 15:16a–b) and 66:20 (referenced in Rom 15:16c).<sup>65</sup>

The view of Paul’s vision of Gentile inclusion as eschatological pilgrimage has been challenged recently, most notably by Terence Donaldson, who has questioned this interpretation on two main bases: 1) “Paul never cites pilgrimage texts, despite plenty of opportunities and occasions where such biblical support would have been useful”; and 2) the “order of salvation” is Israel first, then Gentiles.<sup>66</sup> Both of these points may be contested, however. Taking the first, it is not the case that ancient standards of “biblical support” such as exist in modern scholarship would have been incumbent upon Paul, or upon any other contemporary writer. At the same time, it is not entirely accurate that Paul “never cites pilgrimage texts.” It may be argued that a pilgrimage text appears in Rom 15:12, which quotes Isa 11:10: “The root of Jesse shall come, the one who rises to rule the Gentiles; in him the Gentiles shall hope.” Read in the context of the whole epistle, this verse appears to have an eschatological significance. An articulate response to Donaldson’s view has been offered by Matthew V. Novenson, who observes that Rom 15:12 indicates Paul’s assignment of a messianic role to Jesus, which relates to the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles: Isa 11:10 (LXX), quoted by Paul, anticipates the Messiah’s rule over “the nations,” which Paul interprets in light of Christ as the prophetically-promised “obedience of the Gentiles.”<sup>67</sup> Rom 15:12 does therefore cite an eschatological pilgrimage text, since the Isaiah passage looks to the eschatological subjugation (which Paul terms “obedience”) of the Gentiles to the Messiah of David. In addition to Novenson’s observations, we must consider not only the text of Romans but the whole body of Paul’s undisputed letters, across which the theme of eschatological pilgrimage is clearly present. Where I diverge from Novenson, however, is in the claim that Paul’s interpretation of the pilgrimage has no geographical content. The financial offerings collected from

---

<sup>64</sup> Georgi, *Geschichte der Kollekte*, 48–49.

<sup>65</sup> See Horn, “Herodianische Tempel,” 201. *Contra* Downs, *Offering*, 144.

<sup>66</sup> Terence Donaldson, “‘Riches for the Gentiles’ (Rom 11:12): Israel’s Rejection and Paul’s Gentile Mission,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112, no. 1 (1993): 81–98, 92.

<sup>67</sup> Matthew V. Novenson, “The Jewish Messiahs, the Pauline Christ, and the Gentile Question,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, no. 2 (2009): 357–73, 367–72.

the Gentiles are going to Jerusalem. In a manner similar to Diaspora Jews' participation in the Jerusalem temple and its rites by virtue of paying the temple tax and performing sacrificial acts, as discussed above, Paul sees the participation of his Gentile Jesus-believers in the collection for the Jerusalem community as the anticipated Gentile pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Taking Donaldson's second point, the "order of salvation" as Israel first, Gentiles second, is accurate—although not quite in the way that Donaldson envisions. Paul is fairly explicit about this order in all of his letters, explicitly in Rom 1:16: "[The gospel] is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith; to the Jew first and also to the Greek"; and in Rom 2:9–10, where Paul affirms that God's judgment for both reward and condemnation would fall upon "the Jew first, and also the Greek." However, while Donaldson argues that the eschatological event has not yet occurred for Paul,<sup>68</sup> it can be argued that the eschatological event has indeed already occurred: the resurrection event. For Paul, the resurrection of Christ has inaugurated the eschatological age, although a final judgment remains, which will take place at the parousia.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, we may agree with N. T. Wright that Israel's redemption has arrived with the resurrection, and that the Gentiles are following on Israel's salvation.<sup>70</sup>

Standing in tension with this are Paul's apparent assertions elsewhere that the salvation of the Gentiles does chronologically precede that of the Jews, the parade example being the reference to Isa 66:20 in the passage central to this thesis, Rom 15:16c.<sup>71</sup> The Isaiah passage that Paul quotes speaks of the Gentiles

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> For the resurrection event as an eschatological/apocalyptic event in Paul, see Michael J. Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), esp. 106–109, 128–29, 137–38, 142–44, 159–63, 174–77; Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, & Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); N. T. Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (Downer's Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), 101, 106, 148, 214–15; idem, *The Paul Debate* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015), ch. 3, 90–91; idem, *Paul in Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 52.

<sup>70</sup> Wright, *Paul Debate*, 89–91.

<sup>71</sup> E.g., *inter alia*, C. K. Barrett, *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 179; Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 221–23; Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 247; Richard J. Dillon, "The 'Priesthood' Of St Paul, Romans 15:15–16," *Worship* 74, no. 2 (2000): 156–68, 166; Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 201–202; Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, "Romans 15:14–29 and Paul's Missionary Agenda," in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism*, ed. Pieter W. van der Horst et al., Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology (Dudley: Snow Lion Publications Peeters, 2003), 143–59, 148–49.

leading the exiled Jews back to Zion (showing Gentiles acting in a priestly capacity, “offering” God’s people back to God in the location of sacrifice). These apparent contradictions in Paul may be resolved if his assertions that salvation is offered to “the Jew first and also to the Greek” are understood as a matter of primacy or favor, rather than of chronology. Israel remains the primary people of God through the covenants, as Paul affirms in Rom 9–11. However, Paul clarifies that chronologically, the Gentiles are coming to Zion first, as suggested by Isa 66:20.<sup>72</sup>

This would support the subjective reading of the genitive in Rom 15:16: the Gentiles *are* not the offering, but *make* the offering.<sup>73</sup> However, Paul’s fluid use of metaphor easily allows that subjective and objective meanings could both be intended: the Gentiles both are sacrifice and perform sacrifice. We have seen a similar polyvalent usage in the DSS, with the  $\text{רִי}$  described as both offering and priest. According to the present thesis, however, if the delivery of the collection composes Paul’s priesthood, it does so only in the sense that the success of the collection validates to the Jerusalem Jesus-community his priesthood of preaching the gospel. The surrounding context and Paul’s widely-attested anxiety to secure the sanctification of the Gentiles before the parousia (see e.g. 1 Thess 3:13; 5:23; 2 Cor 1:14; 11:2) strongly support the *objective* reading—that

---

<sup>72</sup> Wright, *Justification*, 57–61; Wright, *Paul Debate*, 80–81. In much of Wright’s work, Paul is interpreted as portraying the eschatological event of the resurrection as the mark of an end to Israel’s “continued exile.” Although the exile theme fits nicely into our present discussion in terms of Paul’s references to the Gentiles escorting the returning exiles back to Zion, Wright argues across his work that the reason for the exile is that Israel bears the “curse of the covenant” as a consequence for breaking Torah. Although Wright frames this in terms of “prophetic critique,” and although it is indeed true that the prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures had taken Israel to task for the nation’s failures to be faithful to the covenant with its God, there is little to no evidence to support Wright’s view that Paul anywhere attributes an exile status to unfaithfulness on the part of Israel as a whole—not even on the “part” of Israel that has been “hardened” (Rom 11:25). Indeed, Paul himself admits that he does not know why this “hardening” has come about and attributes it to God’s mysterious, “inscrutable ways” (Rom 11:25, 33). See, *inter alia*, Wright, *Climax*; idem, *Justification*, 123–25, 135, 197; 211–16; idem, “Justification by (Covenantal) Faith to the (Covenantal) Doers: Romans 2 within the Argument of the Letter,” *The Covenant Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (2014): 95–108, 100–103, 106; idem, *Paul in Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 23, 140.

<sup>73</sup> See e.g. Downs, “The Offering of the Gentiles’ in Romans 15.16,” 175. Indeed, Paul’s use of cultic terminology to refer to the Philippians’ financial support of his mission in Phil 4:18 would be similar.

the Gentiles themselves are the offering being presented to God (by Paul).<sup>74</sup> It is this preaching that offers the Gentiles to God as a sacrifice and hence may truly be called *λειτουργία*—cultic service. I suggest we recognize that Paul’s metaphorical use of cultic terms allows single images to possess polyvalent meaning and that we need not nail a single interpretation to the phrase “offering of the Gentiles” in Rom 15:16. The phrase can mean *both* of the following at once: the Gentiles as priests in the active, sacrificial offering of their daily lives in obedience to God’s will and of their material wealth for the spread of the gospel; *and* the Gentiles’ *being offered* to God as a sacrifice through membership in the Christ-believing community via Paul’s priesthood of preaching the gospel.<sup>75</sup>

The extensive use of cultic metaphor in Paul’s letters therefore reveals his purpose to include Gentiles-in-Christ in Jewish worship and ethics. This evidence weighs heavily against scholarship that argues the opposite, such as we find in Barclay, who posits that Paul allowed the continuation of Jewish practices (such as kashrut regulations and festival observances) as a temporary accommodation to a culturally and temporally limited form of faith in Christ, *even by Jews-in-Christ*, who are defined as “the weak” in Rom 14. While Barclay is correct to observe that Paul exempts Gentiles-in-Christ from observing the regulations of Torah and does not directly instruct Jews-in-Christ to cease Torah observance, he is not correct in his arguments that Paul presents the Torah and Jewish worship as “a merely human, cultural phenomenon” with an entrenched attitude and practice of “cultural imperialism.” In Barclay’s view, the continuation of Jewish worship practices by Jews-in-Christ was for Paul a temporary, limited concession, entirely optional for Jewish “Christians” (including Paul himself, which is supported nowhere in the undisputed letters). Jewish worship may be observed as a provision for “weakness” but, along with even ethical living, no longer has real value for one’s standing before God.<sup>76</sup> Quite to the contrary, Paul advocates the continued life of Judaism through the

---

<sup>74</sup> See Daly, 247; Dillon; Horn, 201; E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 171.

<sup>75</sup> Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations,” 249.

<sup>76</sup> See John M. G. Barclay, “‘Do We Undermine the Law?’ A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 89, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996), 287–308, esp. 304–308; idem, “Faith and Self-Detachment from Cultural Norms: A Study in Romans 14–15,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 104, no. 2 (2013): 192–208, esp. 194–203; idem, *Obeying the Truth: Paul’s Ethics in Galatians* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 125–36, 141–45, 235–51, 239 n. 25; idem, “Pure Grace? Paul’s Distinctive Jewish Theology of Gift,” *Studia Theologica* 68, no. 1 (2014): 4–20, esp. 12–14.

inclusion of the Gentiles via sacrificial worship, which emphatically includes the sacrifice of upright living.

### *Cult as Community Descriptor*

The Gentiles' offering does not only consist of financial support of the collection, however.<sup>77</sup> The wider context of Rom 15:16 defines the "offering" as the entirety of the Gentiles' daily lives in obedience to God. Immediately following, Rom 15:18 speaks of Paul's priestly service as "bringing about the obedience of the Gentiles," which we may define by referring to Rom 1:5, 9:4, and especially 12:1–2.<sup>78</sup>

Paul's use of the term *λειτουργός* is significant not only for the collection but also for the offering-up of the Gentiles in the form of *obedience*, which is not solely obedience to the collection.<sup>79</sup> Because this Greek term had direct associations with the Jewish temple cult, we may understand the use of this term to indicate that Paul saw himself filling the role of priest as he presents the Gentiles as an acceptable sacrifice to God through the preaching of the gospel, all in order to render the Gentiles pure in obedience to God's will in preparation for the parousia of Christ Jesus.<sup>80</sup> Against claims that Paul's collection had no

---

<sup>77</sup> Downs (*Offering of the Gentiles*, 153) allows the possibility that the "offering of the Gentiles" "refers also to the obedience of the Gentiles in a wider sense, with the collection standing as one concrete manifestation of that obedience," but finally maintains the centrality of the collection itself, offered via Paul's priestly service.

<sup>78</sup> Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248–49; Peerbolte, "Romans," 149. See also Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 544; Roetzel, "Sacrifice in Romans," 416–18; Viagulamuthu, *Offering*, 320–21, 354–61. For the association of holy living as directly related to temple holiness, see Hogeterp, *God's Temple*, 317, 385. While Downs (*Offering*, 153) argues that "the passive form of Rom 15:16 seems to move in a slightly different direction from the active presentation of bodies as an act of spiritual worship in 12:1" because "the offering . . . in Rom 15:16 has been entirely entrusted to the priestly service of Paul, and through him it becomes acceptable," the Gentiles are certainly active in *making* the offering in the first place, so that 15:16 corresponds to 1:5 and 12:1.

<sup>79</sup> See e.g. Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 171; Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 200.

<sup>80</sup> Paula Fredriksen, "Paul, Purity, and the *Ekklesia* of the Gentiles," in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Jack Pastor and Menachem Mor (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2005), 213–14; idem, "Judaizing the Nations," 248–49. See also Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 247; Downs, *Offering*, 144; David J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 250; Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 60–70; Sanders, *Paul*, 171. Indeed, given Paul's emphatic use of this term it is difficult to sustain Lanci's claim (*New Temple*, 11–12) that no "priests" existed in the Pauline communities. Dunn (*Theology of Paul*, 330) similarly draws a distinction between

worship significance, and that Paul “completely abrogated” cultic worship in favor of an abstract, intellectual/spiritual approach, Paul’s cultic allusions are on display in his adoption of the liturgical language of the Hebrew Scriptures to describe the collection.<sup>81</sup> Through this language, “Paul employs the liturgy concept precisely in connection with the collection, which suggests the supposition that Paul has understood the conveyance and organization of the collection as liturgical service.”<sup>82</sup> Although Paul does not appear to view his priesthood as a mediation between God and the community, “the collection-action . . . orients itself to the cult of the Father, and is carried out according to the order of concrete priestly laws.”<sup>83</sup> Similarly, the Greek term *λογεία*, describing the community’s monetary offering in 1 Cor 16:1–4, is found in Egyptian papyri and ostraca specifically designating cultic purposes.<sup>84</sup> In Phil 1:5–6, 10; 2:16; Gal 4:11; and 1 Thess 3:1–13, Paul expresses a concern that his labor in preaching the gospel to the Gentiles will prove to be “in vain” at the parousia, should his communities stray from the gospel he preached to them. Such a development would spell the failure of Paul’s priesthood and result in the loss of the Gentiles.<sup>85</sup> As priest, Paul cannot offer a blemished sacrifice! Recall also our discussion above regarding the subjective reading of Rom 15:16, according to which the Gentiles make the offering, indicating a priestly function. We may safely affirm therefore (with Williams) that Paul does not see only himself as “priest”; he sees the entire community as “priests” by virtue of the communal observance of (moral) purity practices and financial provision for Paul’s collection, which are depicted as sacrifices in no less real fashion than the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple.<sup>86</sup> For Paul, therefore, Gentile Jesus-believers

---

“priestly service” and “priest(hood)”; I do not see the same distinction in the term *λειτουργός* itself.

<sup>81</sup> For the idea that Paul wished to abrogate all cultic practices, see e.g., *inter alia*, Downs, *Offering*, 143–45, 147, 152, 158; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 58; Georgi, *Geschichte der Kollekte*, 74–77; Nickle, *The Collection*, 137. N. T. Wright (*Paul*, 167) casts the collection in terms of unity of the body of Christ, but this does not go far enough. For Paul’s use of Jewish liturgical language in connection with his collection, see Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 222.

<sup>82</sup> Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 219–20.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 220. See also Horn, “Herodianische Tempel,” 200.

<sup>84</sup> *Lanci, New Temple*, 127–28.

<sup>85</sup> See Stowers, *Rereading*, 213–14.

<sup>86</sup> Williams, *Paul’s Metaphors*, 249. This is *contra* Horn (“Herodianische Tempel,” 191), who does not see purity concerns among Paul’s vision of priesthood for his Gentile congregations.

function as priests who minister (perform *λειτουργία*, as in Phil 2:17) in the temple that is their Jesus-community. Paul's use of metaphorical language portrays the Gentile Jesus-community fulfilling the functions of priesthood, as similar metaphorical language also depicts Paul as fulfilling priestly functions in preaching the gospel and in taking up the monetary collection. Again, we recall similar ideas of sacrifice and communal priesthood in the DSS and in synagogue holiness concepts.

Similar to the concept of righteous deeds as acceptable sacrifices in the DSS and in Diaspora Judaism, Paul presents holy (= separate) conduct as a real sacrifice (as in Rom 12:1–3).<sup>87</sup> We have seen that, similar to the DSS, Paul holds a view of the community as the dwelling place of God's presence, as expressed in 1 Cor 3:16, which speaks of God's Spirit dwelling within the temple-community (see above).<sup>88</sup> Because the community is the locus of God's presence in the world, it must keep itself morally undefiled so that its sacrifices will continue to be acceptable and efficacious.<sup>89</sup> Obedience, therefore, takes the form of the *sacrifice* of ethical behavior as well as of monetary offerings. This is tantamount to the obedience of proper worship commanded in the Hebrew Scriptures. We have seen such a strategy in operation also in the DSS, and there are corollaries between that literature and 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in terms of the specific terminology of *temple*, *foundation*, and *planting*.<sup>90</sup> Since many scholars consider the 2 Corinthians passage to be a later interpolation, we will only consider 1 Cor 3:16–17 here:

---

<sup>87</sup> See e.g. Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 189.

<sup>88</sup> See Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 58–59; Horn, "Herodianische Tempel," 192; Renwick, *Paul*, 42–43; N. T. Wright, *Climax*, 262; idem, *Justification*, 172. In the cited *Justification* passage, Wright correctly observes that Paul defines the oneness of Gentile and Jew in Christ as the dwelling-place of God's Spirit "through the controlling image of the temple"; however, while Wright cites Gal 3:28–29 in this regard, he includes also Eph 2:14–16. While the essential observation about Paul's vision of community-as-temple is accurate, the present essay deals only with the undisputed letters. (Whether the deutero-Pauline author of Ephesians seized upon Paul's earlier identification of community-as-temple is an intriguing consideration, though it must remain separate from our discussion.) Renwick (*Paul*, 46) works chiefly with passages in 2 Corinthians to, as he says, "*establish the possibility* of Paul's vital concern for God's presence" (emphasis in original). Space does not permit a detailed analysis of Renwick's arguments here; I only point to his work as an extended discussion of Paul's intention to find the presence of God in the Jesus-community.

<sup>89</sup> See Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 58–59; Lanci, *New Temple*, 131–33.

<sup>90</sup> Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 60.

Don't you (2nd plural, throughout) know that you are the most holy place (*ναός*) of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's *ναός*, God will destroy that one; for the *ναός* of God, which you are, is holy.

A similar note is sounded in 1 Cor 6:19:<sup>91</sup>

Don't you (2nd plural, throughout) know that your body is a temple (*ναός*) of the holy Spirit that is in you, which you have from God, and that you are not your own?

The second-person plural pronouns in these verses indicate that Paul is addressing the community as a whole. When he speaks of the temple of God being destroyed, Paul is referring to teachers who attempt to build upon his foundation and fail to properly prepare the community for eschatological judgment (1 Cor 3:10–15).<sup>92</sup> Recall also that Paul's use of the word *ναός* in describing the Corinthian Jesus-community provides an intriguing terminological similarity to the view of community as holy of holies in 1QS VIII, 6.

While I concur with Gärtner that Paul's terminology largely agrees with that of the DSS and finds many ideological points of contact with the scrolls as well, in Paul there is no sense of the same kind of *physical* separation that we find in the DSS.<sup>93</sup> Rather, Paul seems to view the community as *morally and spiritually* separate from the ways of the wider Greco-Roman culture. He does not instruct his churches to retire to the wilderness. The separation Paul advocates is actualized in an ethical way of life, lived out and expressed through membership in the Jesus-community. As Klawans notes, that community is for Paul the *ναός* which must maintain its purity by remaining undefiled by moral

---

<sup>91</sup> See Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248.

<sup>92</sup> Lanci, *New Temple*, 66–68. Lanci disputes the eschatological significance, claiming that present-tense verbs, the presence of the words *ἐπι* and *νῦν*, and the phrase "up to the present time" indicate that Paul speaks here only of the present time. However, given the general context of Paul's anxiety to present his Gentile congregations blameless at the parousia, I (in agreement with others; see below) argue in favor of the eschatological tenor of this passage.

<sup>93</sup> See *ibid.*, 132.



uncleanness.<sup>94</sup> Indeed, such a way of life is nothing less than *sacrificial*, and Paul accordingly uses cultic terms to describe it:

So I exhort you, brothers, through the mercies of God, to offer your bodies, a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God, your rational worship. (Rom 12:1)

But even if I am being poured out upon the altar and *priestly service* (λειτουργία) of your faith, I rejoice. . . . (Phil 2:17)

I understand “priestly service of your faith” in the quoted Philippians passage to signify Paul’s role in the moral formation of the Philippian community, as the context in 2:15 concerns their being “blameless and innocent” at the parousia.<sup>95</sup> Note that the Greek term λειτουργία here is identical to the word Paul uses to describe his own ministry in Rom 15:16, calling himself λειτουργός of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles; hence, the meaning of “priestly service” in Phil 2:17 informs the meaning of the term in Rom 15:16: the “offering of the Gentiles” is the cultic offering not only of their money, but of their very lives.

The nature of the moral defilement Paul dreads for his congregations is grounded in the worship of idols.<sup>96</sup> For Paul, there is a direct correlation between the worship of idols and δαίμονια and moral defilement (1 Cor 10:14–21).<sup>97</sup> Paula Fredriksen has shown that it was this constant state of being that prevented the Gentiles from approaching the sacred temple precincts past a certain point (the Court of the Gentiles).<sup>98</sup> Josephus (*Jewish War*) relates that tensions over “the relation of the Jerusalem temple cult to the rule of foreigners, that is, to Roman rule” was a flashpoint in the buildup to the war of 66–70 CE; the Maccabean texts and certain DSS manuscripts (particularly 4Q174 I, 1b–7a cited above) also contain polemic against the influx of foreign ways into

---

<sup>94</sup> Klawans, *Impurity & Sin*, 150–55. See also Eisenbaum, *Paul*, 156; Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 57–59; Hogeterp, *God’s Temple*, 341–45; Lanci, *New Temple*, 131–32.

<sup>95</sup> In contrast, Beckheuer (*Paulus*, 219–20) and Downs (*Offering*, 144–45) respectively agree in interpreting “priestly service of your faith” as a reference to the collection.

<sup>96</sup> See Rom 1:18–32. Gärtner (*Temple and Community*, 49–56) examines Paul’s exhortation to purity in the temple-community through the avoidance of idols as expressed in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. As already noted, I do not deal with that passage here since its authenticity is questioned.

<sup>97</sup> Fredriksen, “*Ekklesia*,” 209–10; idem, “Judaizing the Nations,” 246. See also Hogeterp, *God’s Temple*, 375–76.

<sup>98</sup> Fredriksen, “*Ekklesia*,” 209–10; idem, “Judaizing the Nations,” 246.

Jerusalem and increasing Gentile influence within the sacred temple establishment itself.<sup>99</sup> Paul stands apart from those who would deny Gentiles access to the holiness of the temple. While 4Q174 excludes “foreigners” from the “most holy dwelling” that is the יחד, Paul claims that the “foreigners” indeed *compose* the “most holy dwelling,” and this stance rests entirely on his conviction that the parousia of Christ is imminent. In the words of E. P. Sanders, “Paul’s entire work, both evangelizing and collecting money, had its setting in the expected pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mount Zion in the last days.”<sup>100</sup> Paul views his priesthood as the fulfillment of God’s promises delivered through Jewish prophecy, particularly as found in the prophet Isaiah: Isa 2:2, which predicted the nations’ going up to the mountain of the Lord’s house in the last days; and more importantly Isa 60:5f., the vision of the Gentiles bringing gifts of treasure to Mount Zion.<sup>101</sup>

Scholars have also observed parallels to Isa 55:4–5, 10 (“nations that did not know you will run [to you]”), and especially to 56:6–8:<sup>102</sup>

<sup>6a</sup>. . . the foreigners who join themselves to the LORD to minister to him (לשרתו) . . . <sup>6c</sup>and those who hold fast to my covenant—<sup>7a</sup>I will bring them to my holy mountain and make them rejoice in my house of prayer. <sup>7b</sup>Their holocausts and

---

<sup>99</sup> Hogeterp, *God’s Temple*, 69–70.

<sup>100</sup> Sanders, *Paul*, 171.

<sup>101</sup> Johannes Munck, *Paulus Und Die Heilsgeschichte* (Ejnar Munksgaard-København: University of Aarhus, 1954), 298, 301–302. See also Beckheuer, *Paulus*, 257; Georgi, *Temple and Community*, 72, 76, 85; Nickle, *Collection*, 130, 138–39.

<sup>102</sup> Downs, *Offering*, 3–8; Georgi, *Temple and Community*, 72. While Downs acknowledges the presence of Isa 56:6–8 in the Pauline passage, he denies its eschatological significance for Paul, claiming that Paul cites no pilgrimage texts, the Pauline delegation served the purpose of mere escorts, and the collection was not destined for the Jerusalem temple but for the Jerusalem poor. As I have argued throughout this paper, Paul’s overall context shows his anxiety that the Gentiles be blameless at the parousia of Christ Jesus and the collection figures into that state of being. Jerusalem must be seen as significant for the destination of the collection because Jerusalem is the location of the temple; indeed, the Jerusalem congregation itself would have been a “satellite” temple as Paul’s Gentile congregations were. Finally, as Georgi notes (*Temple and Community*, 26, 29–30), the “poor” possessed eschatological significance in the prophetic writings, especially in Isa 14:30, 32, and Zeph 3:9, 12, and it was for this reason that the poor of the Jerusalem congregation were singled out for special attention.

their sacrifices (will be) acceptable on my altar,<sup>7</sup> for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all people.<sup>103</sup>

The acceptance of foreigners into the temple cult is anticipated here, both in the priesthood offering acceptable sacrifice (שרת, used of temple service<sup>104</sup>) and in obedience to the covenant. How very like what we have seen of Paul in this discussion: Gentiles in the “last days” are accepted into the temple (= the Christ-believing community), serving as priests by offering acceptable sacrifice (= daily living in obedience to God). Isaiah’s שרת becomes the *leitourgia* of Paul and of the Gentile Jesus-believers.

For Paul, the “building” that is the Gentile Jesus-community is a temple of the God of Israel, complete with sacrifices and priestly service. However, Paul would make an important codicil to the Gentiles’ inclusion: While they may approach God’s holiness *qua* Gentiles, *they must be “in Christ.”* It is the Gentiles’ membership in the Jesus-community, their “in-Christ” state of being, that allows them to approach the God of Israel in a state of purification resulting from their participation in the sacrifice of God’s Messiah, and hence to become one with Israel.<sup>105</sup> Just as the offerer of material sacrifice in the Jerusalem temple participated in the sacrificial rite, so the Jesus-believing Gentiles participate in Jesus’ purifying death and resurrection.<sup>106</sup> Thus these Gentiles, no longer idol-worshippers with the moral deviancy historically attributed to idol-worship in the Israelite faith (see 1 Thess 1:9b–10), are now “holy” in the true sense of the word: “set apart” for the *obedience of cultic service* to the God of Israel.<sup>107</sup> Since it is Paul’s preaching of the gospel that “publicly displays Christ as crucified” (Gal 3:1) and thereby makes purification accessible through participation in that sacrifice, Paul is the *leitourgos* who presents the Gentiles to God as a pure and spotless offering, as, for example, Christ offers the community as pure sacrificial

---

<sup>103</sup> Translation mine, from K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

<sup>104</sup> Brown, Driver, Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*.

<sup>105</sup> Fredriksen, “*Ekklesia*,” 213; idem, “Judaizing the Nations,” 239–43, 247–48. See also Finlan, *Background and Content*, 116–19; Viagulamuthu, *Offering Our Bodies*, 306, 316; Wright, *Paul Debate*, 78, 89–90.

<sup>106</sup> See Bell, “Sacrifice and Christology,” 3–4, 8–9; Roetzel, “Romans,” 416.

<sup>107</sup> Fredriksen, “*Ekklesia*,” 213. See also Stowers, *Rereading*, 257–58, chapter 11; Wright, *Justification*, 121–22; idem, *Paul Debate*, 89. I am not convinced that Stowers’ “adaptability” is the key to ethical behavior; however I agree with his basic claim that the Gentiles are enabled to live according to the moral precepts of the God of Israel through their participation in Christ.

incense in 2 Cor 2:14–16 (recall the בכפרי ניהוה of 1QS III, 11, discussed above).<sup>108</sup> The Gentiles also perform λειτουργία by offering pure sacrifice in contributing to the collection and in blameless living.

### Summary and Conclusions:

*Contra* Lanci, Paul did not simply employ cultic metaphor in order to “make a point” that would help him to “win over” both Jews and Gentiles.<sup>109</sup> This essay has shown that these metaphors serve a much deeper purpose, one which transcends the purpose of the collection as provoking thanksgiving and praise toward God (as articulated by Georgi and Downs).

It is not only the Gentiles’ money that is offered to Jerusalem/Zion by their own priesthood, but the Gentiles themselves, by Paul’s priesthood of making Christ’s sacrificial death and life-bestowing resurrection accessible through his preaching of the gospel. Accepting Paul’s gospel, the Gentiles have been made holy by their participation in the purifying sacrifice of Christ via membership in the ναός of the Jesus-believing community. They have abandoned their idol-worship with its associated moral turpitude and are thereby set apart (= “holy”) for the (liturgical) service of God.<sup>110</sup> They maintain the purity of the temple-community by acting as priests in offering up their lives through upright behavior, an unblemished sacrifice in obedience to God’s will. The ναός of the Jesus-community maintains the שכנה of God in the world until the parousia. Hence, as in the DSS, the community fulfills the functions of priest, temple, and sacrifice until the last days.<sup>111</sup>

The most significant difference between Paul and the DSS (in addition to Paul’s inclusion of the Gentiles in the temple-community) is that the Qumran community saw itself as a replacement for the Jerusalem temple, while Paul, in keeping with Judaism’s consciousness of synagogues as places equally holy to the

---

<sup>108</sup> See e.g. Dillon, “‘Priesthood,’” 165; Roetzel, “Romans,” 416. In 1 Cor 9:13–14, the preaching of the gospel is directly related to temple cult. The temple rite invoked in these verses is not a purification rite; still, Paul here correlates gospel preaching and temple service. For Paul as priest presenting the Gentiles blameless, see Dillon, “‘Priesthood,’” esp. 157, 159–60, 162, 165; Hogeterp, “Paul’s Judaism,” 106; Peerbolte, “Romans,” 147–49. For the offering in 2 Cor 2:14–16 as related to cultic observance, see Bonnie Bowman Thurston, “2 Corinthians 2:14–16a: Christ’s Incense,” *Restoration Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (1987): 65–69.

<sup>109</sup> Lanci, *New Temple*, 124–25, 133–34.

<sup>110</sup> Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations,” 249; Wright, *Paul Debate*, 89.

<sup>111</sup> See Horn, “Herodianische Tempel,” 189.

Jerusalem temple, saw his Gentile Jesus-communities as *extensions* of that institution. Paul's metaphors draw on features of the Jewish cult, yet are readily recognizable also to Gentiles as features of polytheistic worship. Jewish worship communities in the Diaspora felt a strong connection to the locus of worship in Jerusalem, despite their physical separation from it, as shown by practices such as prayer, almsgiving, purification rites, and the temple tax. Paul works within this cultural milieu to shape his Gentile Jesus-communities. Through his use of cultic metaphor, he blends the Jewish concept of synagogue temple holiness with the concept, easily recognizable and understandable to his Gentile converts, of multiple temples to single deities. In this way, Paul renders the Jesus-communities as "satellite" temples of the temple in Jerusalem and effectively decentralizes that institution without by any means de-fusing it. A similar approach had already been taken long before by Jews in Elephantine and in Leontopolis, as noted above. Might this have been at least a partial cause of the opposition to Paul—a passionate objection to what appeared to his detractors as too great a concession to the Hellenistic environment? Was Paul seen by some as a contemporary Jason, the Seleucid sympathizer opposed by the Maccabees a century before?

If there was any anti-temple sentiment in Paul's day, it found expression in the Qumran community—and the Qumranites emphatically claimed to be the only proper Jews! Certainly, if the Qumranites were not anti-Jewish for their stand against the temple, Paul cannot be considered anti-Jewish for acknowledging the Jerusalem cult and claiming that his congregations were extensions of its holiness, just as that holiness extended also to synagogues. It is imperative to realize that Paul was not "spiritualizing" the Jerusalem temple and its worship, rendering it to the nebulous world of abstract concepts. Nowhere does Paul condemn temple ritual or advocate its abrogation. Quite to the contrary—his appropriation of temple imagery with reference to the community of God's Messiah *validates* the efficacy of Jewish worship.<sup>112</sup> Otherwise, his confidence that the Gentiles share in Israel's hope has no meaning. Paul was no supersessionist—this phenomenon only begins to appear in post-70 CE texts. Paul could not possibly have foreseen the adoption of temple motifs in later Christian churches as signs that the church has replaced Israel.<sup>113</sup> His application

---

<sup>112</sup> See Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248; Hogeterp, *God's Temple*, 377–78; 384; Klawans, "Interpreting," 12, 14.

<sup>113</sup> For a discussion of this phenomenon, see Joan R. Branham, "Mapping Sacrifice on Bodies and Spaces in Late-Antique Judaism and Early Christianity," in *Architecture of the*

of temple motifs by means of cultic metaphor was rather participationist—a means of defining Gentile Jesus-communities as satellite temples of the Jerusalem temple and its rites, and hence members (not replacers) of Israel.

*www.jjmjs.org*

 EISENBRAUNS

---

*Sacred*, ed. Bonna D. Wescoat and Robert G. Ousterhout (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 201–30.