

chen Schriften," in W. Baier, *Weisheit Gottes* (St. Ottilien: Eos, 1987) 1:419-40; K. Wegenast and D. Fürst, "Teach," *NIDNTT* 3:759-81; H. F. Weiss, "διδάσκω κτλ," *EDNT* 1:316-20; A. Zimmerman, *Die urchristlichen Lehrer* (WUNT II/12; 2d ed.: Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988). R. Riesner

TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. See DEAD SEA SCROLLS.

TEACHER OF THE LAW. See SCRIBES; TEACHER.

TEACHINGS OF JESUS. See ETHICS OF JESUS; GOD; HISTORICAL JESUS; QUEST OF; PARABLES; PRAYER; SERMON ON THE MOUNT/PLAIN; KINGDOM OF GOD; TEACHER.

TEMPLE

The Jerusalem Temple was a significant element in the religious, social and political setting of Jesus' life and ministry. It comes to the forefront most prominently in Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (see Temple Cleansing) and his words about its coming destruction (see Destruction of Jerusalem), but its presence and significance is assumed in many other Gospel contexts. In order to comprehend the meaning of the Temple for Jesus and the Gospels, one must understand the history of the Temple and particularly the attitudes represented in Judaism of approximately the first century A.D.

1. The Temple Structures
2. Attitudes Toward the Temple
3. The Temple in the Gospels

1. The Temple Structures.

Before Solomon built the Temple at Jerusalem, the tribes of Israel had worshipped in a number of sanctuaries, most prominently Shiloh. Shiloh was destroyed around 1050 B.C., evidently by the Philistines as a result of the battle recorded in 1 Samuel 4, when they also took from Israel the Ark of the Covenant. Eventually, however, the Ark returned to rest in Jerusalem, and Solomon (or perhaps better, David, his father—note the difference in emphasis between 1 Kings 5:17-19; 8:15-21 and 1 Chron 22:8-10; 28:3) determined to build a Temple in which it might be housed. A description of the Solomonic Temple appears in 1 Kings 6—7 and again, with a few variations, in the summarizing 2 Chronicles 3—4.

The description in Kings is very difficult to interpret for a number of reasons. First, the account utilizes a large number of technical terms not known elsewhere

in Hebrew, some of which were distorted during scribal transmission. Second, the editor of Kings either did not have or chose to omit many details which, from an architectural perspective, are absolutely essential for any reconstruction—for example, the layout of various structures and the thickness of walls. And archeology is no help with this matter, as virtually nothing has survived from the First Temple. Thus scholars attempting to visualize Solomon's work make do with the texts as best they can, and have recourse where applicable to comparisons with other Semitic sanctuaries, especially those of Syro-Phoenicia. Not surprisingly, reconstructions differ markedly from one another, and the following discussion attempts merely to highlight those points on which there is a measure of agreement.

The Solomonic Temple was a long, narrow structure oriented toward the east. It was divided into three parts: an outer vestibule (*ūlām*), a large interior for worship (*hēkāl*) and a rear compartment known in Hebrew as *d'bir* or *qōdēs q'dāsīm*, "the holy of holies." Excluding the walls, whose thickness is not given, the whole was 70 cubits long and 20 cubits wide. The interior paneling consisted of cedar imported from Lebanon. In front of the vestibule stood two bronze pillars, approximately 27 feet high; their function is uncertain, but apparently they did not support the lintel of the vestibule. Some scholars liken them to the traditional steles (*massēbōt*) which are well known from Canaanite and Phoenician sanctuaries. The Temple stood within a courtyard or inner court; later, by the mid-seventh century at the latest, there were two courts (2 Kings 21:5; Jer 36:10).

The furnishings of the Temple included at first the Ark, which however was lost very early in the history of the First Temple. This stood in the *d'bir*, surmounted by the cherubim. Outside the rear compartment, in the *hēkāl*, stood the golden altar of incense, the table of shewbread and ten candlesticks. Outside the Temple building was the altar of bronze upon which the sacrifices took place. To the southeast of the Temple stood the "Sea" of bronze, which contained water used by the priests for their ablutions. On either side of the Temple entrance were located ten bronze basins, five to each side. Here the priests would cleanse the sacrificial victims. All of these basic cultic elements, with certain modifications, were later to be found in the Herodian Temple.

It was essentially the Temple of Solomon that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed in 587 B.C. when Jerusalem fell to the Babylonians. With the return from Exile beginning in 538 B.C., the Temple was rebuilt; apparently it was structurally very similar to the earlier

Temple

version, though lacking that Temple's rich adornment. Completed in 515 B.C., it is known as the Temple of Zerubbabel, the governor of the period. Over the centuries that followed this Temple was damaged or, perhaps, even destroyed on various occasions; of the details little is known. In the period 200 B.C.—150 B.C. we know that it suffered substantial damage at least twice. Still, it was rebuilt, and when Herod (*see* Herodian Dynasty) came to build the structure whose beauty was proverbial throughout the Roman world, practically speaking it was the Temple of Zerubbabel that he tore down and replaced.

For the reconstruction of Herod's Temple, we are somewhat better informed than is the case with the earlier Temples. Detailed descriptions have come down in tractate *Middot* of the Mishnah and in the two major works of Josephus,* the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities*. Tradition assigns the mishnaic tractate to Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob, who was a young boy at the time of the First Revolt. Although his description (if it really is his) is perhaps idealizing at points, it is still useful for the task of reconstruction. Josephus's descriptions (*Ant.* 15.11.1-3 §§380-402; *J.W.* 5.5.1-6 §§184-227) do not always agree with each other or with that of the Mishnah, but by and large these disagreements do not affect major elements of the Temple structures.

Herod's work began in 20/19 B.C., and except for matters of detail and added adornment was completed within a decade. Those additional matters, however, occupied the Jews for almost all of the years between c. 10 B.C. and the outbreak of the revolt in A.D. 66, in part by design: Such labor provided jobs for many who would otherwise have been unemployed.

Herod was a man of grand ambitions, and his reconstruction of the Temple of the Jews reflected that aggrandizing character. He essentially doubled the foundation, or Temple Mount, that had existed from Solomon's day. To do so he lengthened the eastern wall at both ends and added new walls on the other three sides. In the process, he found it necessary to reshape the topography of Jerusalem. The middle or Tyropoean Valley, bordering the Temple on the west, he filled in. He did the same to a small valley lying to the north of the old mount, and to the upper slope of the Kidron Valley to the south. According to the Ritmyers' recent study of the archeological remains, the Temple Mount retaining wall measured 1,590 feet on the west, 1,035 feet on the north, 1,536 feet on the east and 912 feet on the south; it thus approximated a rhomboid equivalent in area to thirty-five football fields.

If a Jewish man and woman at the time of Jesus

were to enter the Temple complex from the south, they would emerge from a large plaza to ascend a broad stairway. Off to their right they would see a ritual bathhouse (it was forbidden to enter the precincts without such immersion) and the council house where the Sanhedrin* sat in session. Straight ahead would be the Double Gate and further to the right the Triple Gate. Entering through the Double Gate, they would pass directly beneath the royal stoa that surmounted the wall of the outer court. In the outer court, or Court of the Gentiles, they would now be standing in the place where the blind and lame came to Jesus (Mt 21:14), where the children greeted him (Mt 21:15) and where he drove out the merchants (Mt 21:12; cf. Mk 11:15; Lk 19:45; Jn 2:14). Surrounding this court were the pillared halls where Jesus and later the disciples* taught (Mk 14:49 etc.).

Their eyes would now light upon the Temple structure, rising high above them and separated by yet another stairway, a barricade and the walls of the inner courts. Entering from the outside, the first inner court would be the Court of the Women (*'ezrat hannašim*), where all Jews including women could advance, but which was off-limits to Gentiles* on pain of death. Here Anna prayed (Lk 2:37), Jesus watched the widow offer the last of her money (Mk 12:44 and par.) and, probably, the encounter with the adulterous woman has its setting (Jn 8:2-3).

The man alone could continue to advance toward the sanctuary itself, entering the Court of the Israelites. This court was open to all ritually pure (*see* Clean and Unclean) Jewish men, but none others. The sacrificial altar stood here. This inner court is the narrative setting for the Pharisee* praying (Lk 18:11), for the disciples praying (Lk 24:53) and, of course, for Jesus standing before the altar (Mk 11:11). No one but priests could continue on to enter the Temple building itself.

If the man were to look beyond the Temple to the northwest corner of the complex, he could see the fortress called Antonia. This fortress connected to the Temple's outer court by means of a stairway, so that Roman soldiers could very quickly cross if needed. They did just that, for example, at the time of the riot associated with the apostle Paul's last visit to Jerusalem (Acts 21:31-32).

Josephus relates that the entire façade of the Temple was covered with gold plates. When the sun rose the reflection was nearly blinding. On a clear day the brilliance of the Temple was visible from a considerable distance outside Jerusalem. And this brilliance was not due to gold alone; the upper parts of the Temple were pure white, probably marble. Once a

year the priests applied whitewash to this upper section. At the very top gold spikes lined the roof. Approaching the Temple, twelve steps led up to the entrance of the vestibule (*ʿūlām*). The inner walls of this vestibule, like the façade, were gilded. Carved oak beams comprised the lintel of the portal. The vestibule rose to the full height of the inner portions of the Temple, but exceeded these in width by twenty-six feet on each side. This space formed two rooms wherein were housed sacrificial implements.

At the entrance to the sanctuary (*hēkāl*) hung a veil woven in Babylon, embroidered in four colors: scarlet, light brown, blue and purple. According to Josephus the veil symbolized "a panorama of the heavens, excluding the signs of the zodiac" (*J.W.* 5.5.4 §§212-14). In front of the veil was a golden lamp given by Queen Helena of Adiabene, a convert to Judaism.* Two tables also stood at the entrance before the veil, one of marble and the other of gold. At the weekly changing of the priestly courses, the marble table received the new shewbread introduced into the Temple, while the golden one held the old bread. Standing outside the Temple and looking into the entrance, one could see into the vestibule as far as the veil and the tables holding the shewbread, but it was impossible to see further into the sanctuary.

The sanctuary and the Holy of Holies comprised one long room, 103 feet long, 35 feet wide and 69 feet high and demarcated by curtains. These curtains were beautifully embroidered with lions and eagles. Entirely overlaid with gold panels, the interior of the sanctuary housed the lampstand, the shewbread table (distinct from the two tables already described that stood outside the entrance), and the altar of incense. All were made of gold. The seven branches of the lampstand symbolized the seven planets, while the twelve loaves of the shewbread, which had originally stood for the twelve tribes of Israel, had been reinterpreted so that they now represented the signs of the zodiac as well.

Only the high priest could enter the Holy of Holies, and that only on the Day of Atonement. In the Second Temple period the interior was devoid of all furnishings save for a small rock upon which the high priest made his annual offerings of incense. The artisans who maintained the Temple did "enter" the inner sanctum, but only in a way that was interpreted as not entering. Lowered from the roof in cages closed on the sides, they were unable to see their surroundings. Thus they worked blind and, technically, did not enter the room since they did not come through the entrance and saw and touched nothing.

A great deal of the intellectual and spiritual life of

the city took place in the courtyards of the Temple, the outermost of which, as indicated, was extremely capacious. There scholars wrote, read and instructed their students, and there political debate occurred. Surrounded by the splendors of the Temple, it was only natural to feel a sort of numinous awe. That, however, was not the only or, perhaps, the most important emotion to which the Temple built by Herod gave rise.

2. Attitudes Toward the Temple.

Attitudes toward the Temple at Jerusalem varied considerably from time to time and from group to group within intertestamental Judaism. In many respects the theology of the Temple within this period continued along the lines already developed in the First Temple period. Thus, the Temple was considered to be the very dwelling place of God,* in a way shared by no other place on earth. Even the prophets who had grave reservations about the cultic practices going on in their own time believed that the Temple was nevertheless God's dwelling among humankind. Ezekiel, for example, who says that he saw the glory of God depart the Temple because of defiling practices (Ezek 8—10), also says that God will return to live forever in a new Temple (Ezek 43:1-12).

The Temple was considered a sign of Israel's election from among the peoples of the earth. It stood on a site chosen by theophany (2 Sam 24:16) long before its construction; Zion was the mountain of God (Ps 68:17) and was even identified with the original location of the Garden of Eden (cf. Ezek 34). Even the destruction of 587 B.C. did not disprove Israel's election; rather, God would return and once more make Jerusalem his choice (Zech 1:17). The peoples of the earth would one day stream to Jerusalem to worship,* and Israel would stand at the head of the nations (cf. Is 2:1-4).

These ideas and other positive assessments of the Temple continued to be believed and elaborated in the intertestamental period. But another strain of thought, also having its roots in the OT, is noticeably more prominent now: the tradition of hostility toward the Temple. This tradition particularly characterizes apocalyptic* thought, and—as is becoming more and more recognized—apocalypticism was the popular religion of Second Temple Judaism. This tradition of hostility toward the Temple is worthy of extended consideration, since it sheds light on the Gospel tradition.

The apocalyptic tradition of aversion toward the Temple at Jerusalem takes a great deal of its inspiration from the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 40—48 consti-

tutes the prophet's famous vision of a new Temple, a new Jerusalem and a new theocratic state. He is given a vision of a Temple in heaven, whence it will be manifest in the end of days. Then the heavenly Temple will descend on Zion, and God will once more take up permanent residence there. Different streams of Judaism understood this vision in different ways. As noted above, Zechariah, for example, believed that the promise was fulfilled in the Temple rebuilt in his own day. But for some groups the Temple of Zerubbabel was not the one promised.

This rejection of the Second Temple probably had its basis in several related perceptions. First was the fact that the Temple rebuilt under Haggai and Zechariah was singularly unimpressive compared with the Solomonic version it attempted to re-create. Surely the God of all the earth would not be content to reside in such a pathetic edifice, which dimmed in comparison not only with Solomon's structure, but much the more so when compared with visions of the heavenly Temple (cf. *1 Enoch* 90:28-29). Even a foremost proponent of this Temple, Haggai, had to recognize this problem. He did his best to blunt the criticisms of those unimpressed with the Temple of Zerubbabel (Hag 2:9; cf. Zech 14:8-11), but he was unable to silence all the critics.

A second significant reason for the rejection of the Second Temple by certain elements of the Jewish people centered on cultic practices. Already in the latter portions of Isaiah and in Ezekiel one can recognize hints of such disputes. These disagreements concerned the proper structures and procedures for the sacrificial cultus, and even the proper times for festivals and assemblies (see Feasts). Note, for example, the words of Isaiah 66:3, "Whoever kills an ox is like one who slays a man; whoever sacrifices a lamb is like one who breaks a dog's neck; whoever offers a grain offering is like one who offers swine's blood. . . . They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delights in their abominations" (NASB, modified). This passage is hyperbolic, of course; no one was really offering dogs or pigs. But in the author's view the priests of the Temple in Jerusalem were not practicing the proper methods, and the result was the same: an illegitimate cultus. The disagreements could hardly have been more fundamental.

It would appear that during the fourth and third centuries B.C.—a period for which we have virtually no written evidence—these disagreements were to some extent resolved. Some sort of *modus vivendi* did emerge. But the problems did not simply go away. Those whose ideas were defeated naturally felt disenfranchised, and it is probably among such groups

that apocalyptic ideas found their most fertile soil. In the view of these disenfranchised elements the groups regnant in the Temple practiced the wrong halakah (see Law); consequently, both the priesthood and the Temple were defiled.

Again and again in the apocalyptic literature these notions recur. Thus in *1 Enoch* 83—90 (c. 150 B.C.) the writer portrays the Temple of Zerubbabel as ritually impure; he says the priests tried to offer bread on the altar "but all the bread on it was polluted and impure" (*1 Enoch* 89:72-73). The Apocalypse of Weeks (now found in portions of *1 Enoch* 91 and 93; c. 200 B.C. or earlier) claims that every generation since the exile has been apostate because no one was able to discern the true cultus or "things of heaven" (*1 Enoch* 93:9). The *Testament of Levi* (first century B.C./first century A.D.) calls the priests of the former Temple impure. In the last days, however, when a new priest would arise, "The heavens shall be opened, and from the glorious Temple sanctification shall come upon him" (*T. Levi* 17:10). Along with many others, the author of Jubilees (c. 170 B.C.) despairs that the only remedy is the replacement of the sullied present structure by the eschatological version (23:21).

But perhaps the strongest reason for the rejection of the present Temple stemmed from a belief that it was not built to the specifications that God had provided. This belief in turn derived from a straightforward reading of the biblical accounts. The Temple of Solomon, after all, was built to specifications given to him by his father David. Where had David gotten those plans? The account in Kings does not specify. This was a bothersome problem for some Second Temple Jews. The Chronicler had already offered his solution in 1 Chronicles 28:19, saying that David gave Solomon, "Everything (the whole plan detailed in 1 Chron 28:11-18) in a book from the hand of God. . . ." Thus the Chronicler believed that David must have received his Temple plans from God himself, and could not have relied on human artifice for so important a structure. But many Jews did not agree with the Chronicler's solution. It must be recalled that the portion of Hebrew Scripture called the Writings, among which Chronicles is numbered, were not everywhere accorded the authority given the Torah and the Prophets.

Instead, apocalyptic visionaries found another scriptural portion where God had revealed the divine plan for an earthly Temple. This portion was the description of the building of the Tabernacle contained in the latter chapters of the book of Exodus. Prima facie, it was inconceivable that God would have instructed Moses* about every matter of the Law while neglecting to describe the perfect Temple. Warrant

for the view that Moses had indeed seen the plan for the Temple—or even the heavenly Temple itself—was found in verses such as Exodus 25:9, “According to all that I am showing you, the plan of the dwelling place and the plan of all its implements, thus shall you do.” For such intertestamental exegetes, the equation of “dwelling place” (*mīškān*; conventionally translated “tabernacle”) with the Temple was self-evident. Indeed, Exodus 25:8 explicitly connected the plans which Moses was seeing with the “Temple” (*miqdās*). Accordingly, any proper Temple would have to be constructed not along the lines of the Davidic/Solomonic model, but according to the plans which God had delivered once for all to his pre-eminent prophet, Moses. It further followed that the Davidic/Solomonic Temple, the Temple of Zerubbabel and the Herodian Temple were all illegitimate. For the proponents of such views (which continued even after the destruction of A.D. 70—cf. 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 4:2-6), the proper Temple had yet to be built. The present, improper one was unacceptable to God and, accordingly, to all true worshippers.

Of course, those who held that the Temple should be built according to the plans God had shown Moses faced a certain difficulty: what had happened to those plans? They were not recorded in the OT. The answer that Second Temple authors devised to handle that problem was twofold: First, they said, the plans had been kept hidden until the end and were to be known only to the elect; and second, some details would require additional revelation. In accordance with such an approach several writings from the intertestamental period make claims for new Temple visions.

The Qumranic text (see Dead Sea Scrolls) known as the *New Jerusalem* (5Q15) is one such writing. An angel appears to the anonymous seer (perhaps Ezekiel?) and takes him on a tour of the city and Temple of the last days. The *New Jerusalem* takes up where Ezekiel 40–48 leaves off, providing exact dimensions for buildings associated with the sacrificial cultus. It also describes the city of that new Temple, making interesting modifications on the ideas found in Ezekiel. Evidently the prophet's vision was not felt to be the last word.

The *Temple Scroll* (11QT), another text from Qumran, goes somewhat further. This text implicitly claims to be a new revelation to a Mosaic figure who, like that prophet, speaks with God face to face. Many details of the Temple buildings appear in this text, often in the language of the tabernacle description from Exodus. That was only to be expected, since the allusions to Moses' vision of the heavenly Temple occur in those portions of Exodus dealing with the tabernacle. Neither the *New Jerusalem* nor the *Temple Scroll*

describe a Temple precisely like that of Solomon; some of the details are decidedly different. Presumably the authors of these and similar texts must have regarded the actual Temple in Jerusalem as a sort of imposter.

Still, despite all their rhetoric and even with these fundamental reasons for rejecting the Second Temple structures, one must be cautious about concluding that any groups among the Jews boycotted the Temple altogether. Claims that the so-called Qumran community, for example, had deserted the Temple and that its members considered themselves a new, spiritual Temple, are problematic. These claims mainly depend on certain passages in the *Manual of Discipline* (the view that 4QFlor, with its reference to a *miqdās 'ādām*, means a spiritual rather than physical Temple must be rejected).

The difficulties with this particular conclusion properly require a separate exposition, but perhaps several points should be made. First, we really do not know how the authors of the *Manual of Discipline* regarded that work; some of the imagery which it uses, such as the mustering of “Israel” by hundreds and by thousands, suggests that the text describes an idealized future. If so, then the passages which many understand as rejecting the sacrificial cultus (esp. col. 9) should not automatically be taken as evidence that the group avoided the Temple in the present age. Second, the *Manual of Discipline* stands in some sort of relation with the *Damascus Covenant* (CD), although scholars do not agree on precisely how to define that relationship. The *Damascus Covenant* certainly envisions a circumscribed participation in the Temple cultus (col. 6). This fact has to be borne in mind before reaching any conclusions about the *Manual of Discipline*, especially since the latter work does not explicitly declare the Temple obsolete. Third, at least one unpublished copy of the *Manual* (from cave 4) contains a passage describing the comings and goings of the priestly courses. Such a description may imply that the authors recognized the Temple's fundamental importance and could not simply reject it. Fourth, a point related to this last—the *Manual* apparently existed in various recensions. If so, it is arbitrary to decide that the cave 1 manuscript (the only one fully published) was necessarily the one being followed at any one time—if indeed any of the versions were “followed” or were intended as anything more than idealizing literature.

Even though the present cultus be flawed, sacrifices and festivals were divinely ordained after all. Might one really entirely cease to observe them? A more prudent approach is to suggest that such groups

limited their involvement with the Temple to the bare necessities, while working to change the situation and to force the acceptance of their own viewpoints.

3. The Temple in the Gospels.

In addition to the various Gospel portions which take the Temple structures for their narrative setting (some of which have been noted in the Temple description above), the Temple plays a critical role in three particular pericopes. These are (1) the cleansing of the Temple (Mk 11:15-17; Mt 21:12-13; Lk 19:45-46; Jn 2:14-17; *see* Temple Cleansing); (2) the saying attributed to Jesus concerning the destruction and rebuilding of the Temple (Mk 14:57-58; 15:29-30; Mt 26:61; 27:40; Jn 2:18-22; cf. Acts 6:14; *see* Destruction of Jerusalem); and (3) the prophecy of the Temple's destruction contained in the Little Apocalypse and related texts (Mk 13:2-3; Mt 24:1; Lk 21:5-6; cf. Mk 13:14; Mt 24:15; Lk 21:20; *see* Apocalyptic Teaching). All of these passages have in common a negative attitude toward the Temple. In order to gain a balanced perspective, before examining them it is important to take notice of positive attitudes toward the Temple implicit within the Gospels.

These positive attitudes continue one line of Temple theology alluded to above. Prominently, the Gospels view the Temple as the special place of God's presence (Mt 12:4; Lk 6:4). This dogma underlies the saying about swearing by the Temple (Mt 23:31; cf. Mt 23:16, with a similar rationale). Jesus is depicted as saying that the Temple should be a house of prayer,* not of thieves—a strong affirmation of the sanctity connected with God's presence. Matthew also portrays Jesus as paying the Temple tax (*see* Taxes), if only out of tolerance rather than conviction (Mt 17:24-27).

The three negative pericopes are all problematic, and their interpretation is often a function of a particular scholar's model for understanding the historical Jesus. Furthermore, all three are currently at the vortex of Gospel scholarship. The following discussion is therefore intended as representative and suggestive rather than exhaustive.

Jesus' cleansing of the Temple was an extremely dramatic, if not apocalyptic, act. At its heart is the attitude that the present cultus is corrupt—on that all agree. But is this merely the response of a prophet (*see* Prophets, Prophecy) who acts from the righteous anger of an Isaiah or a Jeremiah in the face of improper worship, or is it more—a messianic claim? Although the cleansing plays no part in the narratives of the trial of Jesus, some (most recently and notably E. P. Sanders) have claimed that the act was that of a revolutionary, and was perceived as such by the

Temple authorities and the Romans (*see* Rome). Sanders can find no other reason for Jesus' arrest, trial (*see* Trial of Jesus) and crucifixion (*see* Death of Jesus). In the context of what we know about apocalyptic thinking it is undeniable that contemporaries might well have believed that Jesus was seeking to inaugurate the eschaton by his actions. In apocalyptic writings renewal of the Temple is often a messianic act, or is at least connected with the rise of the messiah (*see* Christ). And even if it were not so intended, one suspects that Jesus' act was sufficiently militant to arouse zealot feelings and thus discomfit the Romans (*see* Revolutionary Movements). The saying about the destruction and rebuilding of the Temple is, if anything, even more problematic. It is convenient to consider the so-called Little Apocalypse prediction of the Temple's destruction at the same time, as the two appear to be interrelated in the Gospel traditions. According to the latter (Mk 13:14 and par.) Jesus predicted the destruction of A.D. 70 many years before it happened. This prediction is strikingly reminiscent of the charge made against Jesus in the trial before the Sanhedrin. There witnesses declare that they have heard Jesus say that he will destroy the Temple "made with hands" and in three days raise up another "made without hands." As usually understood, Mark seems to say that this charge was false and did not stand because the witnesses contradicted each other. They were, in other words, false witnesses. But it should be noted that Mark does not necessarily mean that the charge was substantively false—he says only that the witnesses disagreed in their accounts of Jesus' declaration in some unspecified manner (*horutōs*). Then in Mark 15:29 bystanders taunt Jesus with the same charge as he hangs on the cross. Were these people aware of the proceedings before the court, wanting only to repeat the false charges? Or did they perhaps believe (whether from the earlier testimony or for other reasons) that Jesus had in fact made some such statement?

The Markan account apparently wants the reader to conclude that Jesus never said that he would destroy the Temple. In and of itself that conclusion would not be problematic. But on comparison with John 2:19-22 a tension arises. John places the saying in the context of the cleansing of the Temple rather than in his account of Jesus' trial. The Jews ask Jesus what warrant he has for his actions, and he replies, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up." The Johannine interpretation then follows, "But he spoke of his body." John seems to admit that Jesus did say something about destroying the Temple, either advocating it or predicting it. John then seeks

to deflect or at least avoid the straightforward interpretation of this tradition. If he did not have a tradition according to which Jesus said something about the Temple being destroyed, his allegorical interpretation could not have arisen.

John therefore attributes a crucial saying to Jesus while Mark, as often understood, may deny that Jesus said it. Scholars have wrestled with this (apparent) contradiction without producing a consensus. If one finds some truth in a zealot model for understanding Jesus, it is felicitous to see here a messianic declaration in which Jesus clears the way for the Temple of the eschaton. Such a declaration would be in keeping with the negative attitudes toward the Temple, and would look forward to a new Temple and, presumably, a new Jerusalem. Even if one rejects this alternative, it seems clear that the Gospel narrators, writing many years after Jesus spoke these words, found them somewhat embarrassing and in need of explanation. Perhaps that is understandable in the face of the First Revolt and the desire to distance nascent Christianity from the parent Judaism. In any event, the place of the Temple traditions within the Gospels will continue to merit study.

See also DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM; JUDAISM; TEMPLE CLEANSING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes* (2 vols; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979-80); R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15; J. Maier, "The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of the Temple Scroll," in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. G. Brooke (JSPSup 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989) 23-62; J. Patrich, "Reconstructing the Magnificent Temple Herod Built," *BRev* 4, 5 (1988) 16-29; K. and L. Ritmeyer, "Reconstructing Herod's Temple Mount in Jerusalem," *BAR* 15, 6 (1989) 23-43; E. P. Sanders, "The Synoptic Jesus and the Law," in *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990) 1-96; M. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God*, ed. F. M. Cross (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976) 414-52; G. Schrenk, "ἱερός κτλ," *TDNT* III.221-47; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel. Volume 2: Religious Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965); M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1990). M. O. Wise

TEMPLE CLEANSING

The incident in the Temple* is recorded in all four Gospels (Mt 21:10-17; Mk 11:11, 15-17; Lk 19:45-46; Jn

2:13-17), although each Gospel writer has interpreted the event in a distinctive way. Precisely because it is attested in all four Gospels, many believe that the incident traces to an event in Jesus' ministry although there is considerable debate about its meaning.

This article will first examine the incident as interpreted by each of the Evangelists before suggesting what the incident might have meant in the context of Jesus' ministry.

1. The Temple Incident in the Four Gospels
2. The Temple Incident in the Ministry of Jesus

1. The Temple Incident in the Four Gospels.

Assuming that Mark is the earliest of the Gospels and that both Matthew and Luke used Mark, we will examine Mark first and then compare it with the Matthean and Lukan versions of the incident (*see* Synoptic Problem). While John's version of the incident has obvious affinities with the Synoptic accounts and may have grown out of a common tradition, it most likely was not drawn from Mark (*see* Synoptics and John).

1.1. Mark: The Symbolic Destruction of the Temple. The following table will set the Temple incident in its Markan context:

- (1) Entry, 11:11
- (2) Framing A (fig tree), 11:12-14
- (3) Incident in Temple, 11:15-17
- (4) Outcome, 11:18-19
- (5) Framing B (fig tree), 11:20-26

Mark frames the incident in the Temple with the cursing of the fig tree so that the two episodes comment on each other. Seen in light of the fig tree episode, the Temple incident is not so much a cleansing as a symbolic destruction (*see* Destruction of Jerusalem). Because it has been unfruitful like the fig tree, the Temple itself will be withered away to its very roots.

Peculiar to Mark is the separation of the entry from the Temple incident by a full day. Jesus first enters Jerusalem, and coming to the Temple "scrutinizes (*periblepsamenos*) everything" before returning to Bethany for the night. The verb is distinctively Markan (six of its seven NT uses occur in Mark) and, when used in reference to Jesus, connotes casting a critical or discerning eye. (3:5, 34; 5:32; 10:23). The first visit prepares the reader for Jesus' return. By depicting two visits to the Temple, Mark creates a place for the first portion of the fig tree episode which otherwise would have interrupted the triumphal entry (11:1-10; *see* Triumphal Entry).

When, on the following day, Jesus enters the Temple he "throws out" (*ekballein*) the buyers and the

Temple Cleansing

dealers and "throws over" (*katestrepsen*) the tables of money-changers and the chairs of the dove sellers (11:15). His actions seem directed against all dealers in sacrifices as well as their customers who include, no doubt, pilgrims visiting Jerusalem in fulfillment of their Torah obligation. In particular, Jesus singles out both the money-changers who convert the varied currencies brought by pilgrims into the Tyrian coinage required by Temple authorities for payment of the Temple tax (*see Taxes*) and the dove dealers who provide sacrifices for the poor.

Many have interpreted these actions as a cleansing of the Temple, although the nature of the cleansing has been disputed. Was Jesus preserving the spiritual nature of the Temple by purging it of commercial transactions? Or was he objecting to the abuse of the merchants who took advantage of the pilgrims through overcharging? Or was Jesus protesting the involvement of the priesthood (*see Priest and Priesthood*) in the commerce of the outer court?

Read in this framework, 11:16 has been taken to mean either that Jesus forbade people from taking short cuts through the Temple's outer court or that he prevented anyone from bringing an unconsecrated vessel into that courtyard. In either case, Jesus would be expressing a desire to restore the holiness of the Temple because he believed in its sanctity (*see Clean and Unclean*).

Problems with these readings of 11:15-16 abound. The dealers and money-changers were performing an essential service for pilgrims and other worshippers (*see Feasts*). Indeed, without their infrastructure of services, it would be difficult to see how the Temple sacrifices could have continued. Moreover, the money-changers charged a modest commission to convert currency into the Tyrian coinage required by the Temple, and the dealers in sacrifices provided unblemished and ritually acceptable victims. It is hard to interpret Jesus' assault on them as cleansing the Temple of crass commercialism. Nowhere does Jesus exhibit the zealous loyalty toward the Temple ascribed to him by those who read the passage in this way. Finally, all such readings conflict with the Markan framing.

What reading then respects the framing and accounts for Jesus' action? The incident makes good sense as a symbolic prophetic action (*see Prophets and Prophecy*) in which Jesus dramatizes the rejection of both the Temple authorities and the economic systems that supported and enhanced their control over its functions. "Throwing out" and "throwing over" represent a rejection not a cleansing. If *skeuos* in verse 16 refers to sacred cult vessels (Jesus would

not permit anyone to carry a sacred vessel through the courtyard), then Jesus' actions are complementary. He would permit no business as usual, either in the subsystems that support the Temple or in the cultic activities themselves.

Jesus' pronouncement, drawn allusively from Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11, reinforces this reading. It declares God's will in making the Temple a source of access to Yahweh for all peoples and denounces the perversion of that purpose by those who have made it "a cave of social bandits" (*spēlaion lēston*). The use of Isaiah 56:7 probably reflects Mark's concern for the Gentiles,* while the allusion to Jeremiah's Temple sermon constitutes a prophetic oracle of doom. The reason for the destruction of the Temple is made clear.

When the incident is understood as a prophetic act signalling the rejection and destruction of the Temple, then the reaction of the chief priests and scribes is understandable. They seek a way to destroy Jesus.

1.2. Matthew: Cleansing the Temple. The following table indicates how Matthew places the incident in his narrative:

- (1) Entry, 21:10-11
- (2) Incident, 21:12-13
- (3) Outcomes:
 - (i) 21:14-17
 - (ii) 21:18-22
 - (iii) 21:23-27

Matthew removes the cursing of the fig tree as a framework for the incident in the Temple. This allows him to elaborate on the entry itself. When Jesus enters Jerusalem, "the whole city was shaken" (*eseisthē*, 21:10). The language is seismic and thereby casts his entry in the imagery of a theophany. This is no demonstration limited to Jesus' followers as in Mark. The entire city takes note, though its citizens are puzzled, asking "Who is this?" But what Jerusalem does not know, the crowd does: This is "the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee." The implicit opposition of the crowd to Jerusalem indicates that this is a positive affirmation not a deficient christology. "The prophet Jesus" may identify Jesus as the fulfillment of the promise made in Deuteronomy 18:15.

Matthew follows Mark in describing the initial actions of Jesus in the Temple. Jesus "threw out" the sellers and buyers and "threw over" the tables of money-changers and dove sellers. However, he omits Mark 11:16 altogether, perhaps because its meaning was unclear. The pronouncement of Jesus is likewise streamlined. The phrase "for all nations" is omitted from the compound quotation, thereby intensifying the accusation against the Temple authorities whose

leadership has led the Temple away from its divine purpose (see Gundry, 412-13).

The justification for the indictment is illustrated in the special Matthean material that follows (21:14-16). Having denounced the perversion of the Temple, Jesus restores its purpose by healing the broken and the outcast. His miraculous powers are hailed by the children in the Temple in fulfillment of Scripture (Ps 8:2; see Old Testament in the Gospels) but draw a predictably negative response from the Temple leaders.

Taken together, the healings and the controversy they generate reflect a typical Matthean pattern: Jesus acts—his opponents protest—Jesus quotes Scripture. They also depict the fulfillment of the purpose for which the Temple was given, a purpose frustrated by the very chief priests and scribes* who object indignantly to what Jesus says and does. The blind, the lame and the children (see Child, Children) on the Temple Mount parallel the crowds at the entry just as the puzzled city parallels the Temple authorities. Matthew portrays a great reversal: the insiders are either ignorant or indignantly obstinate, while the outsiders respond graciously to God's Messiah (see Christ) as he restores the Temple.

Two other outcomes follow rapidly from the incident and its aftermath. The fig tree episode (21:18-22) confirms the reversal of insider and outsider, especially the judgment on the Temple insiders, while the dispute over authority* must now be read in the light of the entire Temple incident. The episode of the question about authority (21:23-27) hearkens back to the healings as well as the disruptions in the Temple's outer court.

1.3. Luke: Preparing the Temple. Again, it will be helpful to study the Temple incident in its Lukan narrative context.

- (1) Frame: weeping over the city, 19:41-44
- (2) Incident, 19:45-46
- (3) Outcomes:
 - (i) 19:47-48
 - (ii) 20:1-8
 - (iii) 20:9-19

Most strikingly, Luke has muted the entire incident. Jesus "began to throw out the dealers." Missing are the references to buyers, money-changers and dove sellers. Moreover, the pronouncement is directed to them alone in such a way that it appears as though Jesus is objecting to their commercial activity, presumably because it detracts from the divine purpose of the Temple as a house of prayer.*

The immediate outcome is that Jesus "was teaching daily in the Temple courtyard" to the enthusiastic

people (*laos*, not *ochlos* "crowd") who listen to his every word. Luke portrays Jesus clearing away the activity of the buyers, preparing the Temple so that he can restore the Temple courtyard as a place of teaching (see Teacher). The twin themes of that teaching are spelled out in the two pericopes that follow, the question about authority (20:1-8) and the parable of the wicked tenants along with its associated sayings (20:9-19). The former pericope establishes Jesus' authority for teaching on the Temple, while the latter specifies the indictment against the current authorities.

The entire episode is introduced by Jesus' prophetic lament over Jerusalem (19:41-44) which concludes by revealing the reason for the turmoil and devastation that awaits city and Temple alike. "You did not grasp the critical moment (*kairon*) of your visitation." The contrast between the deadly visitation of siege armies in 19:43, 44a and the gracious visitation of Jesus is stark. The failure to understand one leads to the fatal outcome of the other.

For what then does Jesus prepare the Temple? In light of its subsequent destruction, prophetically glimpsed in the lament, was Jesus preparing the Temple for its destruction? No. Understood in the context of Luke-Acts, the incident was preparing the Temple for its role as the starting point of a new movement away from Jerusalem announced in the pattern of witness found in Luke 24:47 and elaborated in Acts 1:8. Jerusalem and the Temple would no longer be the goal of pilgrimage but the launching pad of a new mission.

1.4. John: The Cleansing and Replacement of the Temple. The incident in John occurs at the beginning of Jesus' ministry during his first trip to Jerusalem.

- (1) Entry, 2:13
- (2) Incident, 2:14-17
- (3) Challenge, 2:18-22

The entire episode is self-contained, being separated from the miracle at Cana by 2:12 and from subsequent events in Jerusalem by 2:23-25.

Significant differences exist between the Johannine and the Synoptic versions. Jesus' actions are more extreme in John. He makes a whip to drive out the sellers of sheep and oxen, along with the money-changers whose coins he pours out onto the Temple courtyard. But he treats the dove sellers more leniently, simply ordering them to leave with their wares.

The pronouncement itself contrasts "the house of my Father" with "a house of trade," and the scriptural allusion is to Zechariah 14:21. The allusion to Zechariah certainly helps one to interpret the consequent challenge and call for a sign as well as Jesus' response

(2:18-19). The prophecy of Zechariah refers to the eschatological Day of the Lord (*see* Apocalyptic Teaching; Eschatology) when the Temple would become the center of worship* for all peoples. On that day, "there shall be [no] trader in the house of the Lord of hosts" (14:21). So Jesus' actions appear to be informed by a purifying zeal (cf. Ps 69:9) to convert God's house into its eschatological form. In this context 2:19 is a promise to perform such an act. It carries the sense "even if you were to destroy the Temple, in just three days I would raise a better one in its place."

But John intrudes by reinterpreting the saying of Jesus to refer to his resurrection (2:21-22), and with the narrator's reading of the saying the purification theme becomes a replacement motif. For John's community Jesus' body is the Temple that has replaced the Temple of former times.

2. The Temple Incident in the Ministry of Jesus.

Given the diversity among the Gospel writers, it is not surprising that scholars have argued over both the meaning and the details of the incident in Jesus' ministry. Consensus does seem to place the incident at the end of Jesus' ministry rather than at the beginning, thereby favoring the Synoptics over John, but beyond this point, agreement ends.

Although varied, the interpretations of the incident do fall into four basic categories: (1) it is a *religious* event intended to cleanse the Temple of impurities, whether commercial or sacerdotal; (2) it is a *messianic* event intended to include the Gentiles in the scope of the Temple's activities; (3) it is a *prophetic* event intended to announce the destruction of the Temple and its eschatological restoration; (4) it is a *political* event intended to disrupt the commercial and sacerdotal activities of the Temple because they had become oppressive and exploitative. Whatever approach or combination of approaches interpreters may take, however, they must resolve some basic questions about the scope, purpose and content of the event. These can best be examined by looking at its two component parts, Jesus' actions and his pronouncement.

2.1 The Actions of Jesus in the Temple. For some scholars the incident recounts Jesus cleansing the Temple and reclaiming it for its spiritual purpose as a house of prayer. For others, the event is an assault on and attempted political take-over of the Temple. Between these extremes, scholars like R. A. Horsley and E. P. Sanders read the event as a symbolic prophetic action, limited in scope, but condemning the Temple.

Sanders concludes that Jesus either prophesied or threatened the destruction of the Temple as a prelude to its eschatological restoration. Horsley sees the action as an attack on the oppressive political and economic system that found its center in the Temple. More than a symbolic action, it involved violence against the exploiters of the people. Both agree that the demonstration was sufficiently limited in scope so that it would not attract the attention of the Temple police or the Roman troops stationed in the Antonia fortress, yet noteworthy enough to elicit concerted action against Jesus.

2.2 Jesus' Pronouncement in the Temple. The saying is highly debated, most scholars judging it to be Markan or pre-Markan but not traceable to Jesus. G. W. Buchanan, for instance, argues a Markan setting by identifying the *lēstai* of the saying with the "brigands" who seized the Temple during the revolt against Rome.* Others argue that the saying in John 2:19 may reflect Jesus' words more closely than the Markan saying.

If the prophetic-political readings of the passage are correct, however, they suggest a possible reading of the saying recorded in Mark that could place it in the context of Jesus' ministry. If this were the case, then Jesus would be declaring that the true social bandits were not the deviants operating out of caves in the Judean wilderness but the prominent officials of the Temple built over the sacred cave on the Temple Mount. Their exploitative and oppressive domination of the people through taxation and tribute represent the real social banditry of the time, even though it was masked as piety and religious obligation. Understood in this way, the saying fits the action, and both delineate Jesus' prophetic judgment of the Temple that would set the authorities against him and lead to his crucifixion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. C. K. Barrett, "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves," in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel*, eds. E. E. Ellis and E. Grasser (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 13-20; G. W. Buchanan, "Mark 11:15-19: Brigands in the Temple," *HUCA* 30 (1959) 169-77; J. D. M. Derrett, "The Zeal of the House and the Cleansing of the Temple," *DRev* 95 (1977) 79-94; V. Eppstein, "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," *ZNW* (1964) 42-58; C. A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?" *CBQ* 51 (1989) 237-70; R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); N. Q. Hamilton, "Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank," *JBL* 83 (1964) 365-72; R. H. Hiers, "Purification of the Temple:

Preparation for the Kingdom of God," *JBL* 90 (1971) 82-90; R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); C. Roth, "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah," *NovT* 4 (1960) 174-181; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

W. R. Herzog II

TEMPLE TAX. See TAXES.

TEMPTATION OF JESUS

In biblical thought "to tempt" means to test something or someone in order to determine or demonstrate worth or faithfulness. Temptation also refers to an attempt, often by Satan (see Demon, Devil, Satan), to incite a person to sin. The Gospels depict Jesus experiencing a range of temptations.

1. Terminology and Background
2. The Temptation in the Wilderness
3. Temptation in the Gospels

1. Terminology and Background.

The Greek verb for "tempt" is *peirazō* (Mt 4:1, 3; 16:1; 19:3; 22:18, 35; Mk 1:13; 8:11; 10:2; 12:15; Lk 4:2; 11:16; [Jn 8:6?]). It can be used in a positive sense, as when Jesus tests his disciples* (Jn 6:6), as well as in a negative sense, as when the Pharisees* try to entangle Jesus in his conversation (Mt 22:15-22). In Acts 15:10 and 1 Corinthians 10:9 *peirazō* is used of challenging God. The word is best known for its use of the devil tempting in order to cause sin (Mt 4:1 par. Mk 1:13 and Lk 4:2; see 2. below) so that the devil can be called "the tempter" (*ho peirazōn*, only in Mt 4:3 and 1 Thess 3:5). The noun "temptation" (*peirasmos*) is used of trials sent by God* or encountered while serving him (Lk 22:28; Acts 20:9). It is also used of trials or tests that do or may lead to sin (Mt 6:13 par. Lk 11:4; Mt 26:41 par. Mk 14:38 and Lk 22:46; cf. Lk 22:40) as well as the temptation of Jesus by the devil (Lk 4:13). The word is also used to describe a trial or test which causes a follower of Jesus to fall away or apostatize (Lk 8:13).

The Greek verb *dokimazō* ("prove" or "examine") can be used interchangeably with *peirazō* (2 Cor 13:5; 1 Pet 1:6-7). However, while *dokimazō* generally implies that the testing will have positive results (1 Thess 2:4; 1 Tim 3:10), *peirazō* came to signify the testing for good or evil (Mt 16:1; 19:3; 22:18), and even the hope or expectation of failure (Mt 4:1; 1 Cor 7:5; Rev 2:10).

In the LXX *peirazō* translates the strong active form of the verb *nasāh* (Gen 22:1; Ex 15:25; Num 14:22) and

the Greek *peirasmos* is used to translate the Hebrew noun *massāh* (Ex 17:7; Deut 4:34; 9:22; Ps 95 [94]:8). A sword and armor could be tried or tested (1 Sam 17:39), though almost always the testing has a personal object. People can test each other's reputation (1 Kings 10:1 par 2 Chron 9:1), they can "make a test of pleasure" (Eccles 2:1) and test another's beliefs (Dan 1:12, 14), or simply attempt or try to do something difficult (Deut 4:34; 28:56; cf. 7:19; 29:3). Daniel 12:10 uses *peirazesthai* of the eschatological tribulations which will act as a means of purification before the end (see Eschatology). Most often in the OT it is God who is depicted as testing the faithfulness and obedience of his own people to know whether or not they are true to him (Gen 22:1-19; [Heb 11:17-20]; Ex 15:25; Deut 8:2; 33:8; 1 Kings 22:21-23; 2 Chron 32:31). On the other hand, God is not said to test heathen people. None of the *peir*-group of words occurs in LXX of Job for "testing" (cf. 4:2; 9:23), but the theme of God permitting the testing of the faithfulness of his servant, here through Satan, is evident (Job 1-2). To pass the test is to remain obedient to God despite profound and incomprehensible suffering. In 2 Samuel 24:1, 10 the Lord is said to incite David to sin. However, the later rewriting of this story introduces Satan as the one enticing to sin (1 Chron 21:1). Similarly, the tendency to say that someone is tempted or is in temptation, avoiding the idea that God tempts directly, is a development in post-exilic thought (Jub 17:15-18).

Also frequent in the OT are references to God's people wrongfully putting him to the test, notably by questioning his care as at Massah (Ex 17:2, 7; Deut 6:16; 9:22; 33:8), by refusing to recognize and remember his obvious power (Num 14:22; Ps 78:40-43; 106:14), by asking him to prove himself (Is 7:12) or by disobeying him (Mal 3:15). To test God was the antithesis of trusting him and thus a very serious violation of God's honor.

In Hellenistic times *peirazō* was used to reflect God educating his people (Wis 3:5-6) and testing the obedience of his servants, of which Abraham* was a model of faithfulness (1 Macc 2:51-52) as he was in the rabbinic literature (*m. 'Abot* 5:3). The experience of testing also highlighted God's care in times of trial (Sir 33:1).

In the Dead Sea Scrolls* God's people are depicted as continually facing afflictions which may deflect them from faithfulness (CD 1:15; 1Q14 11:1; 1QH 4:12, 16; 1QS 3:24; 5:4-5; 4QpHos 2:5; 6QD 3:3).

In the rabbinic literature the theme is maintained that God tests and disciplines those whom he loves (Ps 11:5; Prov 3:12; 2 *Aḥoc. Bar.* 79:2; *b. Ber.* 5a). Further,