Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Gilberto A. Ruiz Date

Temple Commerce and John 2:13–22

By

Gilberto A. Ruiz
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Division of Religion
New Testament

Gail R. O'Day, Ph.D.
Advisor

Sandra Blakely, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Michael Joseph Brown, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Walter T. Wilson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

Temple Commerce and John 2:13–22

By

Gilberto A. Ruiz
M.T.S., Harvard Divinity School, 2005
B.A., Boston College, 2003

Advisor: Gail R. O'Day, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Graduate Division of Religion, New Testament
2013

Abstract

Temple Commerce and John 2:13–22
By Gilberto A. Ruiz

This study argues that attention to the Gospel of John with a focus on its economic context makes a significant contribution for its interpretation. Turning to John 2:13–22 to prove this thesis, this dissertation uses literary and historical analytical methods to examine Jesus' disruption of the commercial activity in the Jerusalem temple with close attention to the economic realities that affect its interpretation. This study explores textual and archaeological evidence relevant to the contexts of John's readers with the text of John 2:13–22 in order to analyze its interpretative effects. It does so with respect to one topic—temple commerce—in relation to Judea, Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. For each of these contexts the following components of temple commerce are investigated, because they are all present in John 2:13–22: commerce related to religious pilgrimage; the sacrificial animal trade; moneychangers and their role in temple commerce, which includes changing coins for the purchase of sacrifices and for deposit into the treasury; temples as sources and centers of trade and commerce; the economic effects of temple construction and maintenance. Reading John 2:13–22 in light of its economic context shows the passage to be a cohesive unit, in which John's explicit attention to the temple's economic aspects reinforces the passage's claim for Jesus' authority as God's Son. Moreover, the commercial elements of John 2:13–22 speak across cultural contexts, enabling audiences more familiar with temple commerce outside Jerusalem to come to the same conclusions regarding Jesus' authority as those familiar with the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple.

Temple Commerce and John 2:13–22

By

Gilberto A. Ruiz
M.T.S., Harvard Divinity School, 2005
B.A., Boston College, 2003

Advisor: Gail R. O'Day, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Graduate Division of Religion, New Testament
2013

Acknowledgements

There are many people I would like to thank. My advisor, Gail R. O'Day, was supportive of this project from the very beginning. She carefully read many drafts and provided outstanding constructive criticism, advice, and encouragement. I have benefited tremendously from her mentorship. I am also grateful to the other members of my committee: Sandra Blakely, Michael Joseph Brown, and Walter T. Wilson. They read my drafts closely, posed sharp questions, and supplied valuable sources. Luke Timothy Johnson and Richard Manly Adams, Jr., offered insightful feedback as respondents to a dissertation excerpt at a departmental colloquy.

Emory University faculty, especially Carl R. Holladay, Luke Timothy Johnson, Steven J. Kraftchick, and Vernon K. Robbins, made my doctoral education a truly enriching endeavor. My doctoral student colleagues made the whole doctoral experience more collegial, pleasant, and rewarding than I could ever have imagined. They all deserve mention here, but I am particularly indebted to Yoshimi Azuma, Richard Manly Adams, Jr., Eric D. Barreto, Edward P. Dixon, and Meghan Henning. Pescha Penso and Nancy Caro at the Graduate Division of Religion office and Myron McGhee at Pitts Theology Library provided helpful assistance during my time at Emory.

I owe a debt of gratitude to a number of individuals and institutions outside of the Emory community. I received generous financial and personal support from both the Hispanic Theological Initiative and the Fund for Theological Education. I especially thank Joanne Rodríguez, Ángela Schoepf, and Maria Kennedy of the HTI,

as well as my HTI mentor Sharon H. Ringe and HTI editor Ulrike Guthrie. The library staff at Columbia Theological Seminary, especially Erica Durham, Sara Myers, and Mary Martha Riviere, provided a productive and friendly work environment, and the Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Church community provided a rejuvenating spiritual home. Margaret Aymer of the Interdenominational Theological Center, Jacqueline Hidalgo of Williams College, Neomi DeAnda of Catholic Theological Union, and Jean-Pierre Ruiz of St. John's University were meaningful sources of support and professional development. Pheme Perkins and David Vanderhooft of Boston College and François Bovon of Harvard Divinity School were great teachers when I began my training in biblical studies, and George L. Rodriguez and David Masters of Monsignor Edward Pace High School introduced me to the academic study of the Bible as a career vocation. My colleagues at Rivier University, where I worked as an instructor during the 2012–2013 academic year, offered strong encouragement during the final stages of dissertation work.

I could not have done this without the love, support, and generosity of my family. My in-laws offered great encouragement, as did my brothers Gerardo and Guillermo Ruiz. My parents Ana Julia and Gilberto Ruiz have astonished me with their unfailing support for my education. I cannot thank them enough. He does not know it, but during our walks Marty helped me clear my head the many times it needed clearing.

Finally, to my wife Joanne and our daughter Briana: your love, patience, and companionship inspired me and kept me going. Thank you.

Temple Commerce and John 2:13–22

Table of Contents

1 Economics and Johannine Studies

1.1 Engaging Economics in the Gospel of John?

The Gospel of John is not customarily read in light of the economic realities of the Roman Empire. This continues to be the case even as more publications with economics as a focal point of New Testament interpretation appear. Emblematic of this state of affairs is the recently published *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*, a compilation of thirteen essays intended to represent "a healthy selection of the New Testament."[1] However, the only Johannine work to which an essay is dedicated is Revelation, and whereas Matthew, Mark, and Luke combined fill about five columns of the Scripture index, John fills about one-third of one column.[2] Clearly, the Gospel of John is not a text to which exegetes interested in the economic dimension of New Testament interpretation generally turn.[3]

---

[1] Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood, eds., *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 7.

[2] Ibid., 323–25.

[3] Cf. Timothy J. M. Ling's comments on the neglect of the πτωχοί in the study and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel: "The *ptōchoi* in the Gospel of John are apparently of little significance, if any, for the understanding of their place in the New Testament. Specialist treatments of 'Poverty in the New Testament' largely sideline, or even ignore, the Gospel's references. This lack of interest is also evident in broader treatments of the Johannine tradition" (*The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel* [SNTSMS 163; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 171). New Testament economic concerns are not exclusively tied to the poor or poverty, but Ling's comments apply to the treatment of economic issues in John more broadly.

Scholarly inattention to the economic aspects of the Fourth Gospel is also the case with Johannine studies in particular. At important points in the Gospel of John, monetary language and economic concerns appear in ways that merit further study, as we will see shortly (§1.2). While intriguing financial language and economic themes have been noted, no thorough study of economics in John's Gospel has yet appeared. The dearth of scholarly attention to the economic and, by extension, social and political aspects of John's Gospel stands out in relief when compared to the work undertaken in other branches of New Testament studies. Whereas scholars working on the Synoptics, the historical Jesus, the Pauline literature, the General Epistles, and Revelation have published numerous studies highlighting their socioeconomic and geopolitical dimensions, study of the Fourth Gospel has lagged in this respect.[4]

---

[4] See, for example, Warren Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2000); idem., *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2001); John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan L. Reed, *In Search of Paul: How Jesus's Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2004); John H. Elliot, *A Home for the Homeless: A Social-Scientific Criticism of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (with a new introduction; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); Neil Elliot, *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle* (Maryknoll, N. Y.: Orbis, 1994); idem., *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008); Richard Horsley, *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2009); idem., *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003); idem., *Hearing the Whole Gospel: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001); idem., ed., *Paul and Politics* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International/Continuum, 2000); idem., ed., *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International/Continuum, 2004); Brigitte Kahl, *Galatians Re-imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010); J. Nelson Kraybill, *Imperial Cult and Commerce in John's Apocalypse* (JSNTSup 132; Sheffield, England: Sheffield

Fernando F. Segovia aptly characterizes the state of Johannine research when he notes that Johannine scholarship "has certainly favored religious and theological matters to the detriment of encompassing political and economic affairs."[5]

1.2 John's Distinctive Attention to Monetary and Economic Matters and 2:13–22 as the Focus of this Study

The distinctive financial language and imagery of John 2:13–22 provide a good starting point for a more economically intentional approach to John. In contrast to the narrative of the temple incident in the Synoptic Gospels, in John Jesus directs his ire squarely at those offering mercantile services, not at those receiving said services.[6] Second, in John 2:15b Jesus pours out the coins of the moneychangers, a detail conspicuously absent in the Synoptic accounts. Third, the saying in John 2:16 consists of Jesus' own words, not a direct scriptural quotation (though it might point to Zech 14:21), and its content is overtly commercial: ἄρατε

Academic Press, 1996); Longenecker and Liebengood, *Engaging Economics*; Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); Davina C. Lopez, *Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul's Mission* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008); Joseph A. Marchal, *The Politics of Heaven: Women, Gender, and Empire in the Study of Paul* (Paul in Critical Contexts; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008); Elsa Tamez, *The Scandalous Message of James: Faith Without Works is Dead* (trans. John Eagleson; rev. ed.; New York: Crossroad, 2002); *idem.*, *Struggles for Power in Early Christianity* (trans. Gloria Kinsler; Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2007).

[5] Fernando F. Segovia, "Johannine Studies and the Geopolitical: Reflections upon Absence and Irruption," in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies* (ed. Tom Thatcher; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007), 283.

[6] Whereas Mark 11:15 and Matthew 21:12 state that Jesus casts out τοὺς πωλοῦντας and τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας, John only refers to τοὺς πωλοῦντας in 2:14, and the saying in John 2:16 is cast as being directed exclusively at those selling doves.

ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου (2:16).[7] Finally, there is commercial vocabulary present only in John's telling of the temple scene: κέρμα, κερματιστής, and ἐμπόριον.

The words κέρμα and κερματιστής serve as good indicators of how John's temple scene calls attention to the economic and financial details of the narrative in a way that the same scene in the Synoptics does not. First, as has already been mentioned, John actually specifies the presence of coins (κέρμα). Moreover, though John 2:15 does share the term κολλυβιστής with Mark 11:15 and Matt 21:12,[8] John also refers to the moneychangers using κερματιστής, a much rarer term for moneychanger.[9] The use of κερματιστής places an emphasis on the coin itself (κέρμα)

---

[7] In all three Synoptic Gospels, the saying is a quotation of Isa 56:7 immediately followed by a reference to Jer 7:11, and Jesus expressly presents his words as a scriptural quotation with an introductory formula (γέγραπται). In each of the Synoptics the saying is directed at a distinct group. In Mark it is directed at the general audiences in the temple over a period of time beyond the incident itself, as the imperfect verbs indicate (καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς). In Luke 19:45–46 he says it to the sellers, and in Matt 21:12–13 it might be directed at all present in the scene (as in Mark) or solely at the moneychangers and dove-sellers (thereby resembling John).

[8] Luke's much shorter account in 19:45–46 omits the reference to moneychangers altogether.

[9] It occurs only in John 2:14 in the New Testament. Of its twenty other known occurrences, fourteen are from sources dependent on its appearance in John (Gregorius Antiochus Rhet., *Epitaphia* 6.4; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.3.5; 10.23.3 [2x]; 10.p.5; 10.20.3; 10.33.3; 13.56.4; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 2.6–7; Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. Jo.* 1.13, 19; *Comm. Luc.* 72.41; Damascenus Studites, *Thesaurus* 5.74). Of the six remaining occurrences, four are from Byzantine sources too late to be of consideration here (Manuel Philes, *Carmina* 3.149.138; *Carmina inedita* 43.66; Nicetas Choniates, *Historia* Man. 1, pt. 7, pg. 204, line 13; Georgius Callipolitanus, *Carmina* 13.77). An instructive occurrence is found in the fifth-century lexicon of Hesychius of Alexandria. Though this lexicon is dedicated primarily to defining

in a way that κολλυβιστής does not. Intriguing economic details arise at other points in John's Gospel. For example, only John notes that Judas was in charge of the γλωσσόκομον, a term that occurs in the Septuagint (2 Chron 24:8, 10, 11) but not in any Greek writers before the common era, and only in John 12:6 and 13:29 in the New Testament. John's anointing scene (12:1–8) is tantalizingly similar to that in Mark (14:3–9) and Matthew (26:6–13), and yet he includes this money-related detail absent in theirs. At the Last Supper, Judas's responsibility for the γλωσσόκομον leads some of the disciples to interpret Jesus' instruction—ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον (13:27)—as meaning that Judas should buy what is necessary for the festival or give something to the poor (13:29). This confusion over Judas's actions is not narrated in the Synoptics, and both conjectures (buying for the festival, giving to the poor) are economic in scope.

In John 6:5–7, the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus tests Philip with a question about where to purchase bread for the people, to which Philip responds by

---

unusual and obscure Greek words, κερματιστής is not among its approximately fifty-one thousand entries. Rather, it is listed along with κολλυβιστής and δανειστής to define the term τραπεζίτης (*Lexicon* 1255.1), indicating it was viewed as interchangeable with κολλυβιστής and well-known enough to be used to define a less familiar term. Its remaining occurrence is from one of the few Greek fragments of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* (Pseudo-Caesario, *Quaestiones et responsiones* 108.85 = Psuedo-Clementines, *Recognitions* 9.24.14). Stemming from the first or early second century, this would be an occurrence close in chronological proximity to John 2:14. The author of the *Recognitions* was familiar with Synoptic tradition, and possibly John as well. However, the occurrence of κερματιστής in this Greek fragment does not occur in a passage discussing anything reminiscent of the Jerusalem temple, its practices, or Jesus' temple act, but rather in one describing the different customs of different countries.

protesting that two hundred denarii would not procure enough bread for everyone in the crowd to eat a little.[10] The two hundred denarii function to highlight the magnitude of Jesus' feeding the crowd, since it indicates that even this amount's worth of bread would be insufficient to feed the people, not necessarily because Jesus and the disciples do not have the two hundred denarii, but because that amount would not come close to feeding the crowd.

Additionally, John 8:20 identifies Jesus' teaching as taking place in the temple treasury (γαζοφυλάκιον). The good shepherd discourse names the μισθωτός (lit., "wage earner"; "hired hand" in the NRSV) as the one who does not care for the sheep and abandons them at any sign of danger (10:12–13). The language of wages also appears in John 4:36, where Jesus says ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει. The Bethany family is wealthy (they apparently own a tomb, 11:17; Mary buys perfume worth 300 denarii, 12:3–5); and two poor beggars are beneficiaries of Jesus' healings (5:1–18; 9:1–41).

In sum, economic and monetary language and imagery appear consistently enough at key moments in John's Gospel to merit scholarly attention. My own study will examine the temple incident as described in John 2:13–22 with close attention to the economic issues that affect its interpretation. My primary aim is to see how

---

[10] A similar interchange happens in Mark 6:35–37, but the exchange is more pointed and direct in John. See Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 210–12; Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (ed. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse; trans. Robert W. Funk; 2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 1:275–76.

John's text engages economic elements of its ancient contexts to convey its meaning. In particular, I will study John 2:13–22 in light of commerce related to the Jerusalem temple in the first century, that is, to the "temple commerce" assumed by the narrative context of 2:13–22, and related to the major temples associated with Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch, the contexts of John's earliest readers.

1.3 Structure of John 2:13–22

In terms of structure, John 2:14–22 is a diptych introduced by 2:13.[11] The introduction (v. 13) relates the Passover setting of this pericope and Jesus' travel to

---

[11] George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (2nd ed.; WBC 36; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers 1999), 38; Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001), 70; Lucius Nereparampil, *Destroy This Temple: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the Meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2:19* (Bangalore, India: Dharmaram Publications, 1978), 13–14; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (trans. Kevin Smyth et. al.; 3 vols.; New York: Crossroad, 1968–1982), 1:344.

Some commentators include 2:23–25 in their structures of John's temple scene. The connection of these verses to 2:13–22 is seen in how they reenact in a more generalized fashion the particular events of 2:13–22. John 2:23a corresponds to 2:13 in that they both describe the setting as Jerusalem in the Passover season. John 2:23b speaks of Jesus' acts (specifically, σημεῖα) in Jerusalem, while 2:14–16 narrates Jesus' particular act of disrupting the activity in the Jerusalem temple, which is referred to as a σημεῖον in 2:18. John 2:23b also contains the reactions of others to Jesus' acts, as 2:17–22 contains the reaction of the disciples and the Jews to Jesus' actions and words in the temple. John 2:24a contains Jesus' response to the people (he would not entrust himself to them), as 2:19 contains his response to the Jews (he offers them a sign by pointing to his death and resurrection). In 2:24b–25 the narrator explains to the reader Jesus' response to the people, just as the narrator does the true meaning of Jesus' words to the Jewish authorities in 2:21.

However, these verses also anticipate the Nicodemus episode in 3:1–21, and so I find it more helpful to view 2:23–25 as a bridge passage, like those elsewhere in this Gospel, containing language and themes that evoke the pericopes immediately before and after it, in this case the temple incident and the nighttime conversation with Nicodemus. The connection between 2:23–25 and 3:1–21 lies in the people's response to the signs Jesus was doing in Jerusalem. Though they come to believe in

Jerusalem for the occasion, framing the events of 2:14–22 within a Jewish festival context.

The first "panel" of the diptych (vv. 14–17) relates the dramatic act of Jesus disrupting commerce in the temple, while the second panel (vv. 18–22) centers on the question of Jesus' authority to perform such an act and contains more speech than the passage's first half, of which the logion of v. 19 is the most important statement. Much attention has been given to the logion in 2:19, but in fact both halves of the scene contain a saying of Jesus that has to do with the temple, of which the logion in 2:19 is the second. The first is in 2:16, which ends with Jesus' command to stop making the temple an οἶκον ἐμπορίου. So the progression of Jesus' actions in 2:14–16 culminate in his statement about the temple as ἐμπόριον (marketplace/trading center). In both halves of the passage Jesus speaks in the imperative (ἄρατε in v. 16b; λύσατε in v. 19b), and both parts end with a remembrance of the disciples—of Scripture in v. 17 and of Scripture and Jesus' words in v. 21—introduced in exactly the same way (ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι). Also, v. 17 contains a scriptural quotation and v. 21 contains a mention of the Scriptures more generally, and in both instances the Scriptures are associated with the disciples' remembrance.

Jesus' name (v. 23), their belief is inferior to that of the disciples in 2:11 and 2:22. Nicodemus' character in John represents a belief that stands between the outright rejection of the Jews and the authentic belief of the disciples. He is a Pharisee (i.e., an observant Jew, just as "the Jews" of the Fourth Gospel are) intrigued by Jesus, but he is unwilling to approach Jesus in broad daylight and commit himself fully to Jesus (3:1–2).

John 2:13–22 can thus be outlined as follows:

- 2:13: Introduction; setting – Jerusalem, as the Passover draws near
    - 2:14–17: Jesus' act of disrupting commerce in the temple
        - 2:16: the first temple saying (ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου)
            - 2:17: the disciples remember a verse of Scripture and apply it to Jesus (ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι)
    - 2:18–22: the question of Jesus' authority to disrupt commerce in the temple
        - 2:19: the second temple saying (λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν)
            - 2:22: the disciples remember and believe in Scripture and in Jesus' words (ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι)

Even though this passage divides itself neatly into two, well-balanced halves, scholarship on the interpretation of this passage often concentrates on the second half to determine its meaning, largely due to the logion in 2:19 and the narrator's interpretation of it in 2:21.[12] This emphasis is justifiable, since the narrator's explicit interpretation of Jesus' saying in 2:21 is indeed a clear indicator of this half's importance for the meaning of the passage. The most common interpretation of this passage holds that Jesus' temple act abrogates Jewish modes of worship and cult and that Jesus' body replaces or fulfills the Jerusalem temple.[13]

---

[12] E.g., André Marie Dubarle, "Le signe du temple (Jo. II, 19)," *RB* 48 (1939): 21–44; Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Paternoster, 2006), 108–16; Xavier Léon-Dufour, "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean," *RSR* 39 (1951–1952): 155–75; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*; Johanna Rahner, *„Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes": Jesus von Nazaret als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium* (BBB 117; Bodenheim: Philo, 1998).

[13] See §§3.1–2.

Yet scholarly focus on the pericope's second half as the interpretive key subsumes the significance of the events in the first half to the logia in the second half. To be sure, 2:19 and 2:21 play an important role in developing the distinctive Christology of the Fourth Gospel, but 2:16 is no less important to developing the Gospel's Christology, for it contains a saying in which Jesus identifies God as his Father. In addition, by failing to take the economic context of the passage into account, these interpretations emphasize a negative view of the Jerusalem temple's commerce that distorts the exegesis of 2:13–22. As chapters 2 and 3 will show, a fuller understanding of the Jerusalem temple's sacred economy provides a basis for reading the interplay between the passage's two halves in fresh ways, and not only in terms of Jesus as the replacement of the Jerusalem temple.[14]

1.4 Thesis: The Commercial Elements of John 2:13–22 Render an Integrated Interpretation of the Passage that Highlights the Role of this Pericope in Establishing Jesus' Authority at the Beginning of the Gospel of John

My thesis is that the commercial elements in John 2:13–22 help develop John's christological portrait by reinforcing the passage's claims about Jesus'

---

[14] My discussion here applies to Johannine scholarship of this passage, that is, exegesis of this passage expressly intent on delineating its meaning within the Fourth Gospel. Historical Jesus scholarship has turned to the temple incident as a key moment in the life of the historical Jesus, but generally give priority to the Synoptic depiction of the event. For example, E. P. Sanders uses John 2:13–22 only to confirm that the logion regarding the destruction of the temple (2:19) is firmly embedded in the tradition, so that "it was not dropped, but rather interpreted" by John as a reference to Jesus' body (*Jesus and Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 72–73), indicating that, "We seem here to be in touch with a very firm historical tradition" (ibid., 73).

authority and in doing so firmly integrate the two halves of the passage. Reading John 2:13–22 in light of its economic context shows the passage to be a cohesive unit, in which John's explicit attention to the temple's economic aspects reinforces the passage's claim for Jesus' authority as God's Son. Jesus halts temple commerce as a demonstration of his authority, and then points to his death and resurrection as the ultimate sign of it.

Jesus' actions against the commercial practices in the temple demonstrate Jesus' authority to speak and act on God's behalf, an authority that comes from his identity as Son of God. Moreover, the commercial elements of John 2:13–22 speak across cultural contexts, enabling audiences more familiar with temple commerce outside Jerusalem to come to the same conclusions regarding Jesus' authority as those familiar with the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple.

1.5 Previous Studies Reading John in Light of Economic Factors

While no comprehensive study relating John and economics has appeared, a few scholars have analyzed John's Gospel with respect to economic matters on a more limited scale. Their work has made inroads into the topic and provides context and insights into my own investigation.

1.5.1 Frederick C. Grant

Frederick C. Grant's *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (1926) is an important work to consider, even though its engagement with John is minimal.[15]

---

[15] Frederick C. Grant, *The Economic Background of the Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1926).

Grant presents a general survey of the economic development of Palestinian Judaism from the return from exile in the Persian period to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. Chapter 1 is a historical survey of this time period intended "to single out the facts in that historical development which are of economic significance."[16] Chapter 2 presents chief factors in the economic situation of first-century Palestine, with separate sections treating: the land and its products, labor, trade, finance, population, government and taxation, and religious dues.[17] The final chapter turns to the canonical gospels (and, briefly, to the Letter of James) to interpret the teachings of John the Baptist and Jesus in light of the economic climate of Palestine in the first century.[18] Grant's thesis "is that pre-Christian Jewish Messianism was nurtured and sustained by the disappointed hopes of a buoyantly optimistic nation."[19] Economic conditions were so bad, and the political climate so unfavorable, that powerless Palestinian Jews were compelled to imagine a complete reversal brought about by God and God's Messiah.[20]

Where do Jesus and his teaching fit in relation to this economic climate and the Messianic expectations it nurtured? Although the economic climate of the time contributed to civil unrest and Jewish messianic expectations that assumed a strong nationalistic bent, Jesus distinguished himself and his teaching by focusing on

---

[16] Ibid., 13–53 (15).

[17] Ibid., 54–110.

[18] Ibid., 111–41.

[19] Ibid., 9.

[20] Ibid., 9–10.

fundamental spiritual matters, evading political matters for something grander.[21] According to Grant, Jesus' major contribution to Jewish messianism was to spiritualize it, especially by his conception of the "kingdom of God" or "kingdom of heaven."[22] This does not mean that Jesus' teaching and his vision of the kingdom are without social and economic implications, but that their ethical and inner, spiritual dimensions take priority.[23]

Grant's mode of economic analysis is historical-critical. He cautions against underestimating the importance of economic matters in first-century Palestine, stating, "Political dissatisfaction or religious fanaticism alone do not seem to be sufficient to account for the immense and continual unrest of the people."[24] Grant sees political aspirations for independence and religious ideals for a theocracy instituted by God or God's messiah not as sources or causes of unrest but as desired solutions ("dreams of release") for the miseries being experienced.[25] According to Grant, the source of this unrest "was not political or religious, but economic."[26] Grant's survey of the economic data concludes that the primary, economic causes of this unrest were increasing over-population without sufficient relief and over-

---

[21] Ibid., 11–12.

[22] Ibid., 12–13, 116–118, 136–141. See also Frederick C. Grant, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (The Haskell Lectures 1940; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940).

[23] Grant, *Economic Background*, 139–40.

[24] Ibid., 54.

[25] Ibid., 54–55.

[26] Ibid., 55.

taxation stemming from an array of both civil and religious taxes (approaching between 30 and 40 percent of one's income).[27]

Grant shows the extent to which economics, politics, and religion are intertwined in the ancient world, and how these factors play out in the history of Palestinian Judaism.[28] He sees economics as a major cause of political unrest and religious fervor in first-century Palestinian Judaism, and he makes the point quite well that economic matters must be taken into account in order to have a fuller picture of the background against which to interpret the New Testament.[29]

Because he has the historical Jesus in view, Grant focuses on passages from the Synoptics, especially passages he perceives to be closely linked with early oral tradition.[30] In doing so, he too easily identifies this early tradition as a reliable portrait of the historical Jesus. Moreover, Grant wrote at a time when John's Gospel was widely considered an inadequate source for the historical Jesus, and so he discusses no passage from John at length.[31] The only moment when John comes into

---

[27] Ibid., 105.

[28] See also Frederick C. Grant, "The Economic Significance of Messianism," *Anglican Theological Review* 6.3 and 7.3 (1923–24).

[29] As he states at one point, "These facts of economic significance may be expected to throw some light upon a re-reading of the political history; and they are of course indispensible for an intelligent discussion of the data which confront us in the early New Testament period," (Grant, *Economic Background*, 15).

[30] He makes it a point of specifying the early source(s) from which the passages he discusses come, be it Q, Mark, or material special to the synoptic evangelists. See, for example, ibid., 125, 126, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135.

[31] A consequence of the first quest of the historical Jesus, this view has changed considerably. See Paul N. Anderson, *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for*

play is to confirm Grant's view of Jesus' apolitical nature in the Synoptic trial before Pilate and Herod (Mark 15:1–15; Matt 27:1–2, 11–26; Luke 23:1–25).[32] Additionally, Grant's emphasis on a Jesus who prioritizes individual ethics and spirituality leads him to overlook passages with economic implications that do not suit such a view of Jesus. He does not discuss any version of the temple incident, even though the economic content of any version of the scene and its multiple attestations should place the pericope within the scope of Grant's study.[33]

Like Grant, I seek to emphasize certain economic factors that constitute the background of John 2:13–22 in my reading of John. However, in contrast to Grant, my primary interest lies in the Gospel's own perspective, not in a reconstruction of the historical Jesus. And even though Grant seeks an apolitical Jesus, he must engage the question of politics when reviewing the canonical gospels in light of their economic background, since economics and politics are so intricately related. My

---

Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered (Library of New Testament Studies 321; London: T & T Clark, 2006); Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, Tom Thatcher, eds., *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views* (SBLSymS 44; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, Tom Thatcher, eds., *John, Jesus and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (SBL Early Christianity and Its Literature 2; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

[32] Grant contends that the charge of the Jewish authorities that Jesus claimed to be a king in John 19:12 "is only an implication, not a direct charge" and that Jesus' reply to Pilate in 18:36, despite its status as a unhistorical report, correctly interprets Jesus' view of the kingdom as "not of this world," (Grant, *Economic Background*, 136).

[33] Sanders argues that Jesus' activity in the temple is "the surest starting point" for investigating the historical Jesus (*Jesus and Judaism*, 61–76 [61]).

study too will have to continually address the ways in which temple commerce was deeply embedded in the politics of the Roman Empire.

1.5.2 Liberation Theology: Frederick Herzog, José Porfirio Miranda

Apart from a historical-critical study like Grant's, economics entered the study of John's Gospel in the classic literature of liberation theology. While this literature does not engage in economic analysis as a scholarly focus in its own right, liberation theology does show ways in which the study of John is broadened by assuming the Gospel has economic concerns.

Two works stand out for their sustained attention to articulating a liberation theology based on the Gospel of John: Frederick Herzog's *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel* (1972) and José Porfirio Miranda's *Being and the Messiah: The Message of St. John* (1977; originally published in 1973 as *El ser y el mesías*).[34] Whether or not one ultimately finds Herzog and Miranda convincing, they demonstrate the theological potential of exegesis of John's Gospel

---

[34] Frederick Herzog, *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Seabury Press, 1972); José Porfirio Miranda, *Being and the Messiah: The Message of St. John* (trans. John Eagleson; Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1977). Other works that read John's Gospel from the point of view of liberation theology include: José Míguez Bonino and Néstor Oscar Míguez, *That You May Have Life: Encounters with Jesus in the Gospel of John* (New York: The General Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church, 1991); Wes Howard-Brook, *Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship* (The Bible & Liberation Series; Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1994; José Comblin, *Sent from the Father: Meditations on the Fourth Gospel* (trans. Carl Kabat; Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979; originally published in 1974 as *O enviado do pai*); Rensberger, *Johannine Faith*, 106–34; Hugo C. Zorilla, *La Fiesta de Liberación de los Oprimidos: Relectura de Jn. 7.1–10.21* (San José, Costa Rica: SEBILA, 1981); idem., "The Feast of Liberation of the Oppressed: A Rereading of John 7:1–10:21," *Mission Focus* 13 (1985): 21–24.

that remains focused on material, political, and socioeconomic matters.[35] If Grant shows that attending to economic matters is necessary for a greater understanding of the New Testament within its historical context, Herzog and Miranda show that attending to economic matters is important for understanding the theological implications of the Johannine writings.

Rather than undertake an exegetical exposition of John's text, Herzog uses John's Gospel as his basis "to develop an outline of Christian theology and to identify priorities in its present task."[36] Herzog's theological reflections on John have implications for economic issues, insofar as included in liberation is social and economic justice. Herzog places economic concerns at the forefront of his reflections in his discussion of John 2:13–25. According to Herzog, this passage shows that ecclesiastically-sanctioned money-making obstructs loyalty to God and humanity's

---

[35] For an excellent summary and critical assessment of Miranda's *Being and the Messiah*, see Rensberger, *Johannine Faith*, 112–13, 126–29. For Rensberger's assessment of Herzog, see ibid., 111–12 (his most critical comments on Herzog are quoted in n. 36 below).

[36] Herzog, *Liberation Theology*, 22. By his own admission Herzog's reading "occasionally turns out not exegesis of the text, but even antithesis to the text. And yet it is reflection on the text" (ibid.). Rensberger's criticism of Herzog's project is thereby justified: "Sometimes the text does not seem to play even that prominent a role, and the neglect of exegesis means that we seldom get to hear what *John* has to say about liberation, only what Herzog believes *must* be said about it, connected somehow to the Johannine text. This is not to say that Herzog's work is without value, only that exegetical weakness and a too rapid transposition of John's message into terms of 'selfhood,' 'unconcealment,' and the like all too often leave us unable to say exactly what John's contribution to the subject is" (*Johannine Faith*, 112; italics his).

freedom, and therefore Jesus protests the temple's economic system.[37] Jesus' actions in the temple demonstrate that "Jesus rejects the alliance between money and religion," which leads him to reject ecclesiasticism in general.[38]

Herzog reflects further that Jesus does not stop at a negative critique of ecclesiasticism; he also provides an alternative possibility, seen in 2:19–21, namely that the human body functions as the real temple through which people can worship God.[39] Jesus offered his body as temple so that people "would become concerned about liberation in the body," respect themselves and their neighbors as temples of God, and reject the glamour of religious success and recognition and the alliance between religion and capital.[40]

Miranda uses the philosophies of Kant, Marx, and the existentialists to develop the case that all, including the poor and the oppressed, are complicit in and guilty of the oppression that results from capitalism and all other economic systems that involve profiting from the work of another, and that God is to be equated with the absolute imperative.[41] Miranda then turns to the findings of historical criticism to argue that the Jewish Scriptures too identify God as the absolute imperative (not with a doctrinal system), and that the Bible claims that the absolute imperative exists

---

[37] Herzog, *Liberation Theology*, 57–61.

[38] Ibid., 58.

[39] Ibid., 59.

[40] Ibid., 59–60.

[41] Miranda, *Being and the Messiah*, 1–30.

only in the outcry of the oppressed neighbor who is in need of and seeks justice.[42] Continuing his use of existentialist philosophy and the biblical perspective, Miranda then develops the point that reality exists in the contingency and changefulness of the present time, not in a timeless realm of eternal truths.[43]

Miranda studies John in this context, and states his central question as: "Did John perceive a distinction between dogma and ethics or did he consider them to be the same? In other words, are believing and loving two things or one? What is the relationship between truths and imperatives?"[44] Miranda presents John's solution to this question by stating that, "the sole object of John's faith, its sole 'truth,' is the contingent fact called Jesus Christ."[45] Miranda combines historical criticism and a close reading of the Gospel and Letters of John to develop and defend this point, arguing especially that accepting or rejecting the claim that Jesus is the Messiah is

---

[42] Ibid., 30–45. Miranda argues this point by illustrating, using historical criticism, that the God originally and primarily revealed to Israel "was the God of the Exodus, and his self-revelation was simply an obligatory intervention on behalf of the oppressed against their oppressors" (ibid., 30).

[43] Ibid., 47–70.

[44] Ibid., 74. According to Miranda, this is a problem posed by the Johannine writings themselves, as seen in the juxtaposition of John 5:24 and 1 John 3:14, the former emphasizing belief as the cause of attaining eternal life immediately (i.e., realized eschatology) and the latter emphasizing loving one's brother as the act that leads from death to life (ibid.).

[45] Ibid., 83. It is crucial for Miranda that this truth lies in a historically- and geographically-contingent fact of human history (not a nontemporal truth or doctrine) that has *already* existed in this world, for John presents what the Hebrew Bible claims is God's future activity as having already happened in Jesus (ibid., 81–84). John's essential truth-claim about Jesus is that *this* man from Nazareth "is the very same Messiah anxiously awaited for generations" (John 1:41–45; 20:31; 1 John 2:22; 5:1) (ibid., 84).

for John directly related to the doing of "good works" toward those in need.[46] For John, Jesus is God's Son not primarily because he is ontologically related to God in a heavenly realm of pure substances or essences, but because he manifests the absolute ethical imperative, and thereby reveals the God of the biblical writers. Jesus' disciples too reveal God when they perform good works, and the Gospel's claim that good works by Jesus' disciples are actually "greater works" than those of Jesus (14:12) only has meaning if these greater works are done in the present, real world.[47]

Though Miranda is more successful at demonstrating this exegetically,[48] Herzog and Miranda both contend that John's Gospel and its theological and ethical implications are decisively focused on the present world.[49] They insist that for all its theological sophistication and high Christology, John's intent and potential is to initiate transformation in the present, earthly realm, a transformation that involves the liberation of oppressed and marginalized peoples, the breaking of oppressive barriers and structures that prevent human beings from achieving their full human potential, and the achievement of social and economic justice on earth.

---

[46] Ibid., 135–53. Miranda appears to assume the same figure wrote both the Gospel and the Letters, or that the perspective of both the Gospel and the Letters is so closely aligned, that one can examine side-by-side a passage from the Gospel and from 1 John and introduce them as "[t]wo passages from John" (ibid., 74).

[47] Ibid., 112–155, 209–10. Rensberger summarizes Miranda nicely on this point: "John's message, according to Miranda, is that God is revealed in Jesus precisely in his doing of these 'good works,' so that God is known precisely and only in the keeping of the word, the commandment, of love for the neighbor" (Rensberger, *Johannine Faith*, 112).

[48] See Rensberger, *Johannine Faith*, 127–28.

[49] Miranda does not discuss John's temple scene.

But in assuming that John's Gospel has "this-world" concerns, the works of Herzog and Miranda raise exegetical questions. What are the Gospel's economic concerns? How does it develop them? The current study of John 2:13–22 takes a step back from liberationist hermeneutical approaches, seeking instead to examine the substructure that grounds John's economic concerns in order to determine and articulate John's stance towards the economic matters raised in this passage. While it is notable that the interpreters who first read John with economics in mind represent liberation theology or its interests,[50] I do not presuppose that the purpose of relating John's Gospel to its economic context is to discern its liberative potential. My primary aim is to address how the economic dimensions of the text affect its interpretation within its ancient contexts, whether or not such an investigation concurs with the views of a liberationist perspective.

1.5.3 Timothy J. M. Ling

In *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel* (2006), Timothy J. M. Ling emphasizes the religious dimension of economics in the New Testament's social and cultural context, first-century Judea in particular, as an entry-point to understanding John's Gospel. Ling's attention to the religious dimension of economic categories in

---

[50] In addition to the works listed in n. 34 above, see Robert J. Karris, *Jesus and the Marginalized in John's Gospel* (Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990); Stephen Motyer, "Jesus and the Marginalised in the Fourth Gospel," in *Mission and Meaning: Essays Presented to Peter Cotterell* (ed. Antony Billington, Tony Lane, and Max Turner; Carlisle, United Kingdom: Paternoster, 1995), 70–89 (discussed below, §1.5.6); Samuel Rayan, "Jesus and the Poor in the Fourth Gospel," in *Biblebhashyam* 4 (1978), 213–28.

first-century Judea is pertinent to my own study, even if his specific topic, πτωχοί in the New Testament and in the Johannine tradition, is not.

Ling situates his study within the field of social-scientific of the New Testament. He contends that positing a model of normative Mediterranean honor culture as the defining social context of the New Testament writings "has unnecessarily homogenised the social world and obscured cultural and historical diversity, especially the anomalous character of Judaea."[51] He also argues that the methodological assumptions of much New Testament social-scientific criticism "preclude the identification of the religious and moral dimensions of the social world."[52]

Ling attempts to rectify the scholarly tendency to assimilate or marginalize religious social actors by identifying the sociological category of "virtuoso religion" and showing that it is not necessarily applicable to the entire ancient Mediterranean world but is rather suited to first-century Judea in particular.[53] For Ling, it is the critical testing of the category of "virtuoso religion" in light of data that pertains to the geographically- and temporally-limited social world of first-century Judea that validates this category as a heuristic construct for this particular time and place. Ling's thesis is that there are forms of piety indigenous to first-century Judaea that are especially pertinent for understanding πτωχοί in the New Testament generally

---

[51] Ling, *Judaean Poor*, 8.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., 8–9, 62–97, 213–14. The category "virtuoso religion" describes forms of piety and religiosity that may lead to the formation of religious orders (ibid., 8–9).

and in the Johannine tradition specifically, and that these forms of piety better account for the Johannine literature's distinctiveness than do sectarian readings.[54]

Ling argues that first-century Judea does not fit any proposed model of a Mediterranean social world or agrarian society but rather reveals itself to be its own distinct social world. Marked by a relative absence of a significant Gentile population and limited cultural ideological pluralism, Judea's identity was thoroughly religious.[55] Giving due consideration to Judea's fundamentally religious sociocultural identity significantly affects our understanding of that society and its culture, since in social worlds "dominated by religion, as opposed to economics and politics, questions of legitimation are overlaid with theological considerations."[56] John's Gospel, by virtue of its references to and particular familiarity with Jerusalem and Bethany, presents the Judean social world from an insider's perspective, one that distinguishes John from the Synoptic tradition, which focuses more on Galilee.[57] Ling sees John's references to the πτωχοί as reflections of Judean piety and therefore as indicative of πτωχοί being primarily a religious category in John, and less so a socioeconomic one.[58]

---

[54] Ibid., 1.

[55] Ibid., 91–92.

[56] Ibid., 92.

[57] Ibid., 146–212; esp., 167–70.

[58] Regarding πτωχοί in the New Testament more generally, Ling contends that prior social approaches bypass the religious dimension of the category "poor" by emphasizing its economic and social dimensions (ibid., 99–110). Ling examines each occurrence of the πτωχοί motif in the New Testament, concluding, "The collocations

While many points of critique may be leveled against Ling's monograph,[59] and while it would be anachronistic to overemphasize a distinction between economics and religion in antiquity, Ling is correct to draw attention to the religious aspects of his topic, especially in a Gospel like John's. An examination of a passage like John 2:13–22—in which money and religion intersect so vividly—that does not attend to the religious issues at play will remain deficient. Ling's methodological instruction about the necessity of attending to the various cultural particularities of a given region is one my study intends to apply, as it will consider the economic realities present in John 2:13–22 in light of how these realities operated in first-century Palestine. I will especially focus, as Ling does, on the religious dimension of the economic features of John's temple scene within their narrative setting of first-century Judea.

1.5.4 Sjef van Tilborg

Sjef van Tilborg's *Reading John in Ephesus* (1996) studies "how John's text was read or could have been read in first century Ephesus," and demonstrates what a difference the interpretative social context of the Gospel can make for its

---

of the 'poor' are most credibly understood against the background of debates about the nature of the elect within first-century pietism, particularly within Judea" (ibid., 110–45 [144]). As such, there is an essential religious dimension to the category "poor," one that does not completely override its economic and social dimensions but that offers a fuller understanding of the reality designated by the term in the context of first-century Judean virtuoso religious practices (ibid., 131).

[59] See Bruce J. Malina, review of Timothy J. M. Ling, *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*, *RBL* (2007): n.p. [cited 1 July 2010]. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5587_5883.pdf.

interpretation.[60] Tilborg reads John's Gospel in light of texts and archaeological data from and about first-century Ephesus to ascertain how readers in ancient Ephesus could have understood the Gospel, carrying out what David Rensberger calls "a kind of archaeological reader-response criticism."[61]

Tilborg's study is a fascinating experiment. He compares texts from and relevant to first-century Ephesus with the text of John's Gospel to analyze the "interference" between the two.[62] He defines interference as "the exchange which spontaneously originates between reader and text when a typical similarity or dissimilarity is seen."[63] Even with its constant interaction with the extratextual context of first-century Ephesus, Tilborg's study is very much literary-critical in scope.[64] The two spheres of interference in question—"all texts about the history, culture, architecture, and social environment of first century Ephesus" and John's

---

[60] Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus* (NovTSup 83; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 3. Tilborg makes it clear that his study is not an attempt to argue for Ephesus as the provenance of John's Gospel (ibid., 2–3).

[61] David Rensberger, review of Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, *JBL* 117 (1998): 541. For a similar project with Paul as its subject, see Peter Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009).

[62] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 3.

[63] Ibid., 3–4. Tilborg explains that the word "interference" is therefore used "in its most neutral meaning, more or less analogous to the use of the word in the world of physics where 'interference' means 'the mutual influence which two systems exercise on each other if they come together' " (ibid., 4).

[64] Tilborg notes that the importance he places on studying how John was or could have been read in first-century Ephesus, irrespective of questions of provenance, "fits in with the paradigm-change within literary-theoretical research in which attention to the origin of a text and the sources which played a role in it has moved towards an interest in reader-reception" (ibid., 3).

Gospel—consist of "two language-acts which, on the basis of the detonative function of language, come into contact with each other via the reader and influence the process of giving meaning."[65] Tilborg systematically develops the interferences between John and first-century Ephesus "for the process of signification of John's text."[66]

Tilborg analyzes five areas of interference between John's Gospel and Ephesus: (1) names found in the Fourth Gospel and in inscriptions in Ephesus; (2) the titles of Jesus in John and the titles used for emperors and Artemis in Ephesus; (3) an array of social realities reflected in the Gospel and at Ephesus, including geography, work, social class, and economics; (4) group formations in Ephesus that resemble the disciples' forming a group around their teacher, Jesus; and (5) the high priests in John and the relation between high priests and the imperial cult in Ephesus. His procedure entails first laying out the evidence from John's text on these particular subjects, and then raising some initial observations as to how they function in the Gospel itself (without reference to Ephesus). He then presents the corresponding Ephesus-related evidence, and then follows this presentation with a discussion of the literary effect the similarities and dissimilarities between John's text and the Ephesus evidence could have for readers in first-century Ephesus.[67]

---

[65] Ibid., 4.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Tilborg finds that the Greek naming patterns in John's Gospel would have made it a (perhaps exotic) story from the past for readers in Ephesus, a story especially distant to elite, upper-class readers; that John's soteriological titles invite

His third chapter concerns this study most directly, since in it Tilborg examines John in light of the socioeconomic realities of a major ancient city. In the first half of the chapter Tilborg looks at John 2:13–22, and then moves to the social realities raised by John's text, presenting the corresponding Ephesus evidence for each of these social realities, and then discussing how the Ephesus evidence interferes with those same realities as they stand in John.[68] These realities, each of which has its own section in the chapter, include: work and ideas about work; free persons, servants, and slaves; income, expenses, professional activity, and social contacts (here he discusses indications of possessions and money in the Gospel); and people in authority.

To provide an example of how Tilborg applies his method, I will summarize his discussion insofar as it pertains to work and to the working population that constitutes "the middle group" of the social tripartite division that Tilborg finds in John's Gospel: (1) servants and slaves, (2) the working population, and (3) people in authority.[69] This group, which "is well represented in the text of the Johannine

---

the audiences in Ephesus to place Jesus within their own political and religious context; that readers in Ephesus would have made numerous connections between the social realities depicted in John's text and those in Ephesus; that religious group formations in Ephesus are reminiscent of the attachment of the disciples to Jesus; and that the presentation of Jesus as king in John's trial narrative would have recalled the process of installing new Roman emperors, making Jesus appear as a rival to the emperor (ibid., 23, 52–57, 59–109, 125–64, 213–19).

[68] Ibid., 75–109.

[69] Ibid., 79–86. This tripartite social division corresponds to a similar tripartite division in Ephesus that effects "a special interference" with John's Gospel (ibid., 86–109).

Gospel," designates "people who are free citizens; they provide for their own family through their work and they have reached a certain financial and social position in this way; but ultimately they are not part of the power structures of society."[70]

Though Tilborg contends that work "plays a minor role in the Johannine Gospel," he provides three separate lists of "concrete work situations and functions" in John, one for the functions and professions of people who play a role in the John's narrative, another for instances in which work is indicated, and a third for indirect indications of work.[71] John 2:13–22 appears in the first and second lists, the first specifying the sellers of cattle, sheep, and doves, moneychangers (κολλυβισταί), and small change providers (κερματισταί), and the second pointing out that John 2:20 mentions the forty-six years' worth of work building the temple, "which indicates an enormous activity."[72]

When raising the corresponding evidence from Ephesus, Tilborg admits that, "The mass of data forces us to make a stringent selection," since Ephesus in the first

---

[70] Ibid., 82.

[71] Ibid., 75–79.

[72] Ibid., 76, 77. Tilborg distinguishes between the κερματισταί of John 2:14 and the κολλυβισταί of 2:15, taking the former as evidence that money plays an important role in this scene (ibid., 83). He writes, "For the context the most remarkable thing is that…John still consistently speaks about κέρμα. He even coins his very own word for it which does not appear (so far) in Greek: κερματισταί: changers of small change" (ibid.; cf. n. 9 above). John 2:13–22 does not appear on the third list, which consists of instances in which work or types of professions are used metaphorically (as occurs in John 4, 10, and 15) or to identify the activity of the Father and Jesus (5:17; 9:4) (ibid., 78–79).

two centuries C.E. is a city of "enormous activity."[73] After some general comments about the nature of this activity, Tilborg lists and comments on interferences with the Ephesus evidence based on the lists he had composed from John's text.[74]

Regarding the evidence that corresponds to John 2:13–22, he notes that references to sellers of sacrificial animals are not found in existing inscriptions.[75] Yet the "presentation of facts" as we have them in John 2:13–22 "is in line with a phenomenon which is in use in antiquity in many cities: wide-ranging specializations of the sellers."[76] Found in inscriptions from Ephesus are sellers or dealers of fish (ὀψαριοπωλεῖται), nuts (πυρηνᾶδες), clothes (εἱματιοπωλοί), and wool (ἐριοπωλοί).[77] According to Tilborg, the sellers in John's temple scene "belong in this series," and the moneychangers and small change providers "are not far removed from this," as the Ephesus evidence reveals their counterparts in bankers (τραπεζεῖται) who rented three places in the public lavatories, so that they conducted their business next to the booth-keepers of the stoa of Servilius, wool-dealers, towel-weavers, basket-weavers, and other manual laborers.[78] After listing the *nummelarius* Calyx, mentioned in an inscription from the year 4 B.C.E., Tilborg concludes, "The words used in John's text

---

[73] Ibid., 90.

[74] Ibid., 90–91.

[75] Ibid., 91.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

are not found in the Ephesian inscriptions but the functions and the status are well-known."[79]

The Ephesus evidence increases in the case of the construction workers implied by John 2:20. While these are not explicitly mentioned in John's text, they appear often in the Ephesus evidence, which is no surprise, given the large amount of building activity in Ephesus during this period (discussed in §4.8.1).[80] Temple construction workers appear united in a sort of guild, as seen in a mid-second-century inscription that mentions the *ναουργοί τέκτονες* erecting a statue for their benefactor P. Vedius Antoninus and in an inscription that speaks of Septimus Severus restoring the rights of the *ναϊκὴ ἐργασία*.[81] The "builders of the temple" of Artemis have their own interests over against all other construction workers that, either directly as *τέκτονες* or indirectly as *ἐργεπιστάται*, appear abundantly in first-century Ephesus texts.[82] In the case of temple construction workers, "we can speak of a rather direct interference."[83]

To raise another familiar example, we can take a brief look at how Tilborg sees the disciples and their profession as fishermen in John. The Gospel initially does not offer information concerning the financial position of the disciples, but data appears in Philip's mention of the 200 denarii (6:7) and Judas's mention of the 300

---

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid., 92

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

denarii (12:5) that leads the reader to understand that these "are apparently large sums of money" for the disciples.[84] Even so, the disciples have enough money to keep a money chest (γλωσσόκομον) for alms received to be stored and used to make purchases (13:29) or give to the poor (12:5–6; 13:30); and so "alms go both ways"—the disciples both receive and give alms.[85] Finally, Jesus and the disciples have a natural access to boats (6:16, 22; 21:1–8), as do the people in the feeding story (6:23, 24).

The Ephesus evidence reveals that fishermen there have organized themselves into a guild as well, and of particular interest is an inscription that mentions a toll house whose construction is financed by a fishing cartel in first-century Ephesus.[86] Individual contributions to the toll house occur in kind (columns, pavement, stones, and so forth), with some contributions running quite high (4 columns; 2 columns and altars).[87] Monetary contributions noted in the well-preserved lists of names reach a sum of 938 denarii, averaging 24/25 denarii per family, with the highest

---

[84] Ibid., 82.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Ibid., 92–93. The names on this inscription reveal that the cartel was a mixed group, since 50% correspond to the Roman naming system, 46% to the Greek naming system, and at least two are slave-names (ibid., 92). Tilborg consults the commentary on this inscription in G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Linguistic Essays, with cumulative indexes to vols. 1–5 newly prepared by S. P. Swinn* (Macquarie University, N. S. W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1989), 95–114, to extract from it elements relevant for possible interference with John's text (ibid., 92).

[87] Ibid., 92.

contribution being 50 denarii, and the lowest 15 denarii.[88] Tilborg interprets the interference here as indicating "it will not have been seen as strange in Ephesus that the disciples-fishermen in John come in contact with rich to very rich people through Jesus; but one will have understood very well too that the disciples-fishermen see 200 and 300 denarii as a large sum of money."[89]

Tilborg repeats this procedure for each of the professions and types of work he finds in the Gospel, and indeed, this section is extensive.[90] In his conclusion to this section, he writes, "The most important effect of this research is that it shows how much the interference on this level is pulverized into an almost limitless number of small data…on almost every page of John's text there are interferences to be discovered."[91] These interferences are of varying importance, and Tilborg comments that, taken together, they call into question sectarian and insular understandings of the Johannine community.[92]

---

[88] Ibid., 92–93. Horsley states, "the total surviving monetary value indicated is just short of 1000 den.; and…the full sum cannot have been much more" (*New Documents*, 107; cited in Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 93n40).

[89] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 93.

[90] Ibid., 91–101.

[91] Ibid., 101.

[92] "In an indirect way these data offer a commentary on all the authors who read John's text as a report about a group which is closed in upon itself and is more or less sectarian. The proven interferences show that the book knows also another movement, which points in a carefree way to the external world, to innumerable social realities which have their own interest in giving meaning to the texts" (ibid.).

This study seeks to develop what Tilborg has begun.[93] Tilborg has made a valuable contribution to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. It is among the few studies to take seriously the economic data provided by the Gospel. It makes a concentrated attempt at understanding this data within the socioeconomic framework of a major city in the Roman Empire. Tilborg shows, among other things, the intimate connection between economic matters and social stratification, and between economic matters and religious practice in the ancient world. He also proves that there are insights to be had by relating John's Gospel to economic evidence of the Roman world. Socioeconomic analysis of John is not the sole object of Tilborg's study. It is the focus of one chapter, and so his initial insights on the topic merit further development.

Tilborg makes several methodological decisions that I intend to adopt and adapt. First, as is the case with Tilborg's, my study is aimed toward understanding the significance of John's text. All research undertaken seeks primarily to elucidate the text; any contribution to understanding the historical Jesus, the provenance of

---

[93] One review states that it is in the nature of Tilborg's book to spur future studies: "It is difficult to summarize [the results of Tilborg's reading], since the object of the study is to depict a wealth of similarities and dissimilarities rather than to prove any comprehensive hypothesis. Indeed, there is no conclusion to the monograph as a whole, and the chapters revolve around setting up comparisons of data from which relatively few broad generalizations emerge. It is genuinely a 'reading', evocative rather than demonstrative. Whilst some scholars may find this frustrating, others may find here the material from which many future theses will flow...most modern readers should find in van Tilborg's study ideas which provoke and lead to further inquiries" (Ronald A. Piper, review of Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, *BibInt* 7 [1999]: 464).

the Fourth Gospel, or any aspect of the ancient world, would be a by-product of carrying out the central purpose of more fully understanding John's narrative.

Second, Tilborg's process of using John's text as the starting point for investigating his primary source material will be followed here. As we will see below (§1.6.2), five features of the temple scene in John 2:13–22 will serve as the lens or controls for sifting through the relevant primary source material: (1) commerce related to religious pilgrimage; (2) the buying and selling of animal sacrifices; (3) money changing; (4) temples as sources and centers of trade and commerce; (5) temple construction. Since these features appear as important economic factors in the text, ancient evidence that relates to these will be sought to help us more fully understand the dynamics of John 2:13–22.[94]

Third, whether or not John's Gospel has its origins in first-century Judea, it very quickly became read in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria by readers embedded in different sociocultural contexts than that depicted in the narrative. Attention to how John 2:13–22 managed to communicate its message across sociocultural boundaries is worthy of study.

1.5.5 John and Empire Studies: Richard J. Cassidy, Warren Carter

---

[94] At one point Tilborg admits, "The mass of data forces us to make stringent selection" (*Reading John in Ephesus*, 90). The rationale for maintaining a rigorous focus on the economic features listed above is because they provide a litmus test of sorts for determining the relevance of a given piece of ancient economic evidence. If it does not somehow elucidate the presence of these features in John 2:13–22, then it can be set aside for the purposes of this study.

Tilborg's book is often grouped with the increasing number of studies that read John in light of its Roman imperial context.[95] Studies that read John in light of the Roman Empire often examine the relationship between Johannine Christology,

[95] In chronological order, they include: Heinrich Schlier, "Jesus und Pilatus. — Nach dem Johannesevangelium," in *Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge* (4th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1966), 56–74; idem., "The State according to the New Testament," in *The Relevance of the New Testament* (trans. W. J. O'Hara; New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 215–38; B. A. Mastin, "The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title θεός to Jesus (John XX.28)," *SE* 6 (1973): 352–65; François Vouga, *Le cadre historique et l'intention théologique de Jean* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977); David Rensberger, "The Politics of John: The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 103 (1984): 395–411; idem., *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*; Craig Koester, "The Savior of the World (John 4:42)," *JBL* 109 (1990): 665–80; Richard J. Cassidy, *John's Gospel in New Perspective: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1992); Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*; Gerhard A. Van den Heever, "Finding Data in Unexpected Places (or: From Text Linguistics to Socio-rhetoric). Towards a Socio-Rhetorical Reading of John's Gospel," *Neotestamentica* 32 (1999): 343–64; Seon-Jeong Kim, "The Johannine Jesus and Its Socio-political Context," *Yonsei Review of Theology and Culture* 6 (2001): 209–21; Michael Labahn, " 'Heiland der Welt': Der gesandte Gottessohn und der römische Kaiser—ein Thema johanneischer Christologie?" in *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und römische Herrschaft* (ed. Michael Labahn and J. Zangenberg; Tübingen: A. Franke, 2002), 147–73; Beth Sheppard, "The Rise of Rome: The Emergence of a New Mode for Exploring the Fourth Gospel," in *Summary of Proceedings: Fifty-Seventh Annual Conference of the American Theological Library Association* (Portland, Ore.: ATLA, 2003); Stephen D. Moore, " 'The Romans Will Come and Destroy Our Holy Place and Our Nation': Representing Empire in John," in *Empire and Apocalypse: Postcolonialism and the New Testament* (The Bible in the Modern World. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006), 45–74; Bill Salier, "Jesus, the Emperor, and the Gospel According to John," in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*, ed. John Lierman, (WUNT 2/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 284–301; Lance Byron Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (CBQMS 43; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007); Carter, *John and Empire*; Tom Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009).

imperial ideology, and the imperial cult;[96] use much evidence from Asia Minor;[97] and emphasize a select group of passages, especially the words of the chief priests and Pharisees in 11:48,[98] the trial scene (18:28–19:16a),[99] and the Passion Narrative.[100]

In general, only a few contain even limited discussions of the economic dimensions of the Roman Empire. For example, Richard J. Cassidy's *John's Gospel in New Perspective* (1992) devotes a section to the *fiscus judaicus* levied upon all Jews of the Roman Empire as punishment for involvement in or support of the Jewish Revolt of 66–73/4 C.E.[101] Cassidy is mainly concerned with the imperial cult and the persecution of Christians in Asia Minor, however, and this discussion of the Jewish tax plays a minor supporting role. It serves mainly to communicate something of the character of first-century Roman-Jewish-Christian relations, and to

---

[96] E.g., Carter, *John and Empire*, 176–203, 235–55; Cassidy, *New Perspective*, 10–16, 27–39; Koester, "The Savior," 665–80; Labahn, " 'Heiland der Welt,' " 147–73; Mastin, "The Imperial Cult," 352–65; Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology*; Salier, "Jesus, the Emperor," 284–301; Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar*; Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 165–219.

[97] E.g., Carter, *John and Empire*, 52–89; Cassidy, *New Perspective*, 17–26, 89–93; Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology*, 27–65; Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*.

[98] E.g., Moore, " 'The Romans,' " 45–74; cf. Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar*, 45–62.

[99] Carter, *John and Empire*, 289–314; Cassidy, *New Perspective*, 40–53; Rensberger, *Johannine Faith*, 87–106; Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology*, 153–84; Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar*, 63–85; Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 165–219.

[100] Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar*, 87–122.

[101] Cassidy, *New Perspective*, 6–10. Cassidy points out that it is a distinct possibility that this tax was forced on the early Christians as well, since they fit the profile of being either those who lived as Jews but were not (Gentile Christians) or were born Jewish but claimed not be Jewish (Jewish Christians), two groups mentioned by Suetonius as being subject to this tax (*Dom.* 12.2) (ibid., 9).

provide an example of an empire-wide phenomenon with which the author of John's Gospel was familiar.[102]

Similarly, Warren Carter's *John and Empire: Initial Explorations* (2008) only briefly treats economic factors.[103] Using a modified form of the models of agrarian-aristocratic-commercialized empires developed by Gerhard Lenski and John Kautsky, Carter provides general information about how approximately 97 percent of the population experienced "significant degrees of powerlessness and poverty," while the small elite class controlled most of the wealth, primarily in the form of land and labor.[104] Carter also mentions the presence of lucrative trade in the empire.[105] He lists and briefly explains methods of "economic control" by which Rome expressed its power, namely through taxes and tribute and ownership of resources, property, and trade.[106] Turning to Ephesus, Carter includes a short section on coins as a means by which Rome promoted its power and presence in a major city.[107] These economic factors help set the Roman imperial context of John's Gospel, but Carter does not delve into them at length.

---

[102] Ibid., 6, 81. In his book, Cassidy argues that the author of John knew and responded to certain realities of Roman imperial power.

[103] To be sure, Carter readily admits that his book is not exhaustive (*John and Empire*, xi–xii).

[104] Ibid., 53.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid., 56.

[107] Ibid., 64. Carter does not argue that Ephesus is the provenance of John's Gospel; he uses Ephesus because, whether or not John's Gospel originated there, at least the final form of the Gospel was read in Ephesus (ibid., ix).

Most of these studies examine imperial ideology (especially the imperial cult) and focus on politically charged scenes in John, generally overlooking the possibility that a key entry point into elucidating the relationship between John and the Roman Empire is economics and money matters. An in-depth study of money and economics in John's Gospel has yet to appear, as does one that situates John's use of monetary language and economic themes within John's imperial context.

1.5.6 Economics and Studies on John 2:13–22

When we turn to studies on John 2:13–22 specifically and the distinctive economic details of the scene, we readily observe certain trends. First, there is a general neglect of these distinctive details. Sometimes the unique vocabulary is noted, but rarely is it interpreted.[108] The same is true of Jesus' act of spilling the coins on the floor. It is acknowledged that Jesus' words in 2:16 differ from that in the Synoptic version of the incident, but the term οἶκον ἐμπορίου is never explicated, even though the term ἐμπόριον signifies a well-known and important component of the economy in the Roman Empire.

Second, when the commercial aspects of the passage feature in the interpretation of the scene, they are at times taken *a priori* to be elements of a corrupt temple cult, either inherently corrupt because money and greed are viewed as the source of evil, or corrupt because of assumed extortionist practices by the

---

[108] Among the few who interpret it is E. C. Hoskyns, who states John uses κολλυβιστῶν instead of κερματιστῶν in 2:15 for reasons of euphony, that is, to avoid a phrase like κερματιστῶν κέρματα ("Adversaria Exegetica: The Old and New Worship of God (John II. 13–22)," Theology 1 [1920]: 144).

temple merchants. Or, these commercial aspects are viewed as closely connected with the sacrificial animals in the scene and so are read as the passage's rejection of the temple cult and its attendant replacement or fulfillment in Jesus.

These trends have a long interpretative history. When the patristic writers mention the financial aspects of this passage, it is invariably to decry the evils of greed and business. Origen, for example, assumes that the merchants in the temple are greedy and that the trading in the temple is neither an acceptable part of religious worship nor an acceptable way for these traders to make their livelihood (*Comm. Jo.* 10.134–37). Coins are a symbol "of things thought to be good" but which in reality are not (*Comm. Jo.* 10.142).[109] This negative view towards all things mercantile predates Origen. It surfaces in the interpretation of Heracleon, who sees the moneychangers as "those who give nothing away free," the foreigners in the temple as procuring sacrifices "for the sake of their own profit and greed," and Jesus' act of driving everyone away with a whip as foreshadowing the crucifixion, which destroys "the gamblers, the merchants, and all evil" (Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.210–15).[110]

John Chrysostom follows suit in viewing the mercantile activity as detestable (*Hom. Jo.* 23). Augustine has a more nuanced view, maintaining that selling for sacrifices is not so grievous a sin and reminding his audience that the sacrificial cult

---

[109] Translation is from Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (trans. Ronald E. Heine; 2 vols.; FC 80; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989-1993), 1:288.

[110] Ibid., 1:302.

was intended to prevent idolatry (*Tract. Ev. Jo.* 10.4.2). Nevertheless, the selling remains a sin for Augustine, who wonders what Jesus would have done had he found a more grievous sin being committed in the temple (*Tract. Ev. Jo.* 10.4.2). The trend of seeing the mercantile activity in the temple in such negative terms—as excessive materialism that must be removed or "cleansed" from temple worship by a Jesus who opposes external matters in favor of interior religiosity—remained a staple of biblical interpretation.[111] The focus on sin and evil may be exaggerated, but these patristic authors, especially Augustine, linked Jesus' critique of commerce with his authority and recognized the focus on commerce in John's version of the temple scene.

C. H. Dodd's work on this passage is an exception to these tendencies, perceptive in its treatment of the economic language used in the scene. Referring to the versions in Mark and John, he describes the pericope as relating Jesus' action of clearing out "intrusive traders" from the temple court and thus accepts the usual negative view of these traders.[112] He notes John's unique use of κερματιστής, stating that John's κερματιστής is "a word which seems so far not to have been found outside the N.T. and literature influenced by it."[113] Based on the appearance of the verbs κατακερματίζω and κερματίζω in papyri of the first and second centuries (κατακερματίζω in a papyrus dated to 60 C.E.; κερματίζω in a second-century papyrus), Dodd observes that "the non-occurrence of the noun is probably

[111] See the scholarship review in Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61–63.

[112] Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 156–57.

[113] Ibid., 157 n. 1.

accidental," a suspicion confirmed by the uses of κερματιστής that have been found since Dodd's publications appeared.[114] Dodd also notes that "the animals rushing through the crowded court, and the floor littered with the small change (κέρματα) from the overturned tables" are details absent in Mark by which "John, in fact, makes more of the drama of the scene."[115]

More important are Dodd's comments on Jesus' saying against trade in his Father's house in John 2:16. Dodd understands that since the account as presented in Mark and in John is essentially a story of action, the different sayings that accompany the action have particular relevance for determining the action's meaning in each version of the scene.[116] This exegetical insight leads Dodd to pay attention to the economic language in John's version of the scene. Dodd illustrates that Jesus' words in John 2:16 contribute to John's distinctive interpretation of the incident.[117] Dodd maintains that Jesus' words in 2:16 allude to Zech 14:21, which concludes the book of Zechariah and ends a chapter describing the coming of the day of the Lord. Dodd interprets the saying as indicating that John "intends to represent the

---

[114] Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 157 n. 1. See n. 9 above.

[115] Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 157.

[116] "In both, the action is accompanied by a saying of Jesus—a different saying in each. In neither is the saying the kind of general maxim, interesting for its own sake, in which 'pronouncement stories' often culminate; it is strictly relative to the particular situation and fully intelligible only in that relation—part of the story, therefore, rather than an article of teaching introduced by the story" (Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 157).

[117] Ibid., 159–60.

expulsion of traders from the temple as a sign that the Day of the Lord is here."[118] This is different from Mark's use of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11, through which Mark interprets the temple incident as the dawning of a day in which profaners of the temple who suppose themselves protected from God's judgment by its sanctity are denounced, and in which true worship of God will become universal, drawing in all nations.[119]

Tilborg and Ling are important conversation partners here. After establishing that readers in Ephesus would have understood Jerusalem as a city to which Ephesus can be compared, Tilborg develops in detail two points of interference between the Jerusalem temple and readers in Ephesus, using John 2:13–22 as the intertext for his literary and archaeological data.[120] The first is that Jewish inhabitants of Ephesus are vividly reminded of the Jerusalem temple each year because of the temple tax, since Ephesus appears to have been a collecting center for the Jewish temple tax.[121] Because they paid a temple tax even after the Jerusalem temple's destruction (the *fiscus judaicus* to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome), the memory of the Jerusalem temple remained strong in their minds, and any stories about that temple would have stoked that memory.[122]

---

[118] Ibid., 160.

[119] Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 158–59.

[120] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 59–75.

[121] Ibid., 67.

[122] Ibid., 68.

The second sphere of interference is between the Jerusalem temple and the temple of Artemis that was such a prominent component of Ephesus's identity. Tilborg finds two major points of connection between these temples. The first is that while ναός is used to refer to all other temples (with one exception), the temple to Artemis is the only one referred to as both a ἱερόν and a ναός and thus it shares this double name with the Jerusalem temple in John 2:13–22 (ἱερόν in 2:14, 15; ναός in 2:19, 20, 21).[123]

The second point of connection between the Jerusalem temple and Artemis's concerns the sacrificial and monetary practices in Artemis's temple, which I will discuss in more detail in chapter 5.[124] Tilborg raises the following observations about sacrificial and monetary practices in the temple of Artemis. First, the monetary practices in the temple of Artemis cannot exclude the possibility that οἶκον ἐμπορίου in John 2:14 be translated as "trading centre."[125] Second, monetary matters concerning the Artemis temple are vastly more represented in the data than is the sacrificial cult, making it clear that money plays an important part in the temple of Artemis.[126] In fact, Artemis's temple was considered "the bank of Asia," leading Strabo to describe Ephesus as "the largest emporium in Asia this side of the Taurus"

---

[123] Ibid., 69–71. The exception is a temple to a deity, possibly Sarapis. Since the inscription related to this temple is dated to the third century C.E., Tilborg maintains that this inscription cannot serve as an intertext for John's Gospel (ibid., 71).

[124] Ibid., 71–75.

[125] Ibid., 71.

[126] Ibid., 71–74

(*Geogr.* 14.1.24; [Jones, LCL]).[127] Third, readers in Ephesus would have understood the commerce in Artemis's temple to be all the more condemned since the scale of its commerce is considerably more vast than that of the Jerusalem temple, and they would have understood that access to God is through the ναός of Jesus' resurrected body, not through the ναός of Artemis (or any other ναός for that matter).[128]

Ling cites John 2:13–22 to support the observation that "money and the Passover do appear to be significantly related in the Gospel."[129] Ling points out that Jesus drives out the moneychangers at the Gospel's first Passover in 2:13–22; that at the second Passover in John 6 Jesus challenges the crowd and the disciples to trust not in money (v. 7) but in him who provides food that truly satisfies (v. 35); and that at the third Passover in John 13 there is an ironic confusion on the part of the disciples who believe that Judas is giving something to the poor (vv. 1–30).[130] For Ling, this relationship between money and Passover is to be understood in terms of Johannine Christology: "The Temple has become a market (2:16), but no money can buy the bread of life (6:35); the true gift to the *ptōchoi* at Passover is not money but rather Jesus himself (13:29)."[131]

Ling's point that John's Christology provides a link for understanding economic matters in John is one developed by Stephen Motyer in his essay "Jesus

---

[127] Ibid., 73–74.

[128] Ibid., 74–75.

[129] Ling, *Judaean Poor*, 174.

[130] Ibid., 174–75.

[131] Ibid., 175.

and the Marginalised in the Fourth Gospel" (1995). Motyer sees the Gospel's encouragement of care for the poor as a directive for the Johannine community to address the poverty widespread as a consequence of the unsuccessful Jewish revolt.[132] But for Motyer, the poverty experienced by Jews in Palestine after 70 involved more than the loss of property. It consisted of a demoralizing cognitive dissonance marked by "a deep sense that Israel's theological foundations had been undermined, allied secondly to a sense of corporate social marginalisation."[133] John addresses this crisis by "offering a Jesus who is the Temple in himself, rebuilt in three days (2:19), who provides forgiveness and restoration apart from the Temple, who catches up and fulfils [sic] all the festivals of Judaism," and who handles the needs of the people more effectively than the Jerusalem Temple ever did.[134]

Motyer's primary insight is to tie the topic of Jesus and the poor and marginalized to John's distinctive, pervasive Christology. As we noted (§1.3 above), attention to the neglected economic aspects of John's temple scene in a similar fashion—as tied closely to John's christological portrait—could provide the basis for understanding the first and second halves of John 2:13–22 as a cohesive unit.

This brief survey illustrates that those studies which have attended to the nuances of the economic issues raised by John 2:13–22 yield new insights for understanding this passage and other parts of John's Gospel, if not the Gospel as a

---

[132] Motyer, "Jesus and the Marginalised," 87; cf. Karris, *Jesus and the Marginalized*, 32, 106.

[133] Motyer, "Jesus and the Marginalised," 87.

[134] Ibid., 88.

whole. They each provide separate, independent insights, be it that the focus on commerce influences the eschatological depiction of Jesus in the passage (Dodd), that the monetary aspects provide links with non-Jewish temples (Tilborg), that there is a connection between money and the role of Passover in the Gospel of John (Ling), or that John's Christology provides the frame for interpreting the Gospel's interaction with economics (Ling, Motyer).

Yet none of these individual insights have been the basis of a focused interpretation of commerce and economics in John 2:13–22. It is such an investigation that I now begin, one which seeks to illustrate that the commercial elements of John 2:13–22 develop the passage's claims about Jesus' authority, and that these same commercial elements facilitate an integrated interpretation of the pericope accessible to diverse audiences over a wide ancient context.

1.6 Method and Plan of Study

1.6.1 Economic Evidence as a Resource for Interpreting John 2:13–22

I will use economic evidence as available in relevant textual, archeological, and comparative sources, to advance the interpretation of John 2:13–22.[135] For the

---

[135] Peter Oakes differentiates three possible relationships between economics and biblical interpretation, each of which has benefits and pitfalls. The first relationship is one in which an overall analytical economic framework is brought to the text as a primary framework for analysis and interpretation, whether or not the text deals overtly with economic matters. The second approach uses the text as a source for gathering economic evidence to help reconstruct the history and sociology of non-elite people, especially their socioeconomic history. The third approach, which applies to the present study, uses economic evidence to contribute to interpretation. Oakes lists archaeological, textual, and comparative evidence as three

purposes of this study, we can narrow down considerably the economic matters that will be treated. Since the aim of this study is the interpretation of the Johannine text, the text of John 2:13–22 determines the economic subject matter that will be the focus of this study. I will focus on economic matters brought up by the text itself and then correlate them to corresponding economic factors present in the contexts where this text was written and read.

1.6.2 Determining the Types of Economic Evidence Relevant for the Interpretation of John 2:13–22 and Defining Temple Commerce

More than anything, our investigation must be centered on the temple and its economy. This point of departure finds its basis in the passage itself. Despite the attention given in scholarship to the logion in 2:19, both halves of the scene contain a saying of Jesus that has to do with the temple. The first of these sayings, in 2:16, ends with Jesus' statement that the temple is being made into οἶκον ἐμπορίου. This detail provides the basis through which we can see how economic evidence illuminates this passage. Because by his words and actions Jesus interrupts the temple's functioning as a place of commerce, there is warrant to investigate the

---

types of economic evidence available as a resource for interpretation. Comparative evidence is evidence drawn from a different geographical, temporal, and/or social context than that of the text under investigation. Some types of evidence fall into multiple categories, as do inscriptions, for example. See Peter Oakes, "Methodological Issues in Using Economic Evidence in Interpretation of Early Christian Texts," in *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception* (ed. Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 13–27.

confluence of temples and commerce in the ancient world for the exegesis of John 2:13–22.

Temples were centers of thriving economic activity in antiquity. Major temples spurred and partook in commercial activities related to temple worship. People came to temples from near and far, especially for festivals, and spent money in the course of carrying out cultic rituals. Animals and other items for sacrifices were bought and sold for temple worship, with the aid of moneychangers to handle the diverse coinage in circulation. Temples were storehouses of large amounts of money and other valuables, and carried out some of the duties that banks do today. Routine temple functions created a demand for a variety of goods that had to be supplied somehow. Temples had to be constructed and maintained, and sometimes expanded or renovated, realities that affected the local economies around them. In short, major temples were economic institutions in their own right.

These same aspects of temple commerce apply to the Jerusalem temple, and a better understanding of them is fruitful for the interpretation of John 2:13–22, where they feature prominently or are presumed: (1) commerce related to religious pilgrimage (2:13); (2) the sacrificial animal trade (2:14, 16); (3) moneychangers and their role in temple commerce, which includes changing coins for the purchase of sacrifices and for deposit into the treasury (2:14, 15); (4) temples as sources and centers of trade and commerce (2:16); (5) the economic effects of temple construction and maintenance (2:20). Thus the economic evidence that I will explore in this study is that which deals with these particular dimensions of an ancient

temple's sacred economy. Throughout this study, phrases like "temple commerce," "temple economics," "economy of the sacred," and "sacred economy" designate the cultic-economic matrix that encompasses ancient temples, or more simply put, the commercial or economic activities related to or associated with temples and temple worship in antiquity.

This study, then, will read John 2:13–22 in light of the first-century temple-economic practices that the passage suggests. Who bought animal sacrifices and other items for temple worship? What was their ultimate aim in making these purchases? Who facilitated these transactions? What coins were used? What roles did moneychangers have in the sacred economy? What lead to the wealth of temple treasuries? How did temple treasuries function within their religious, social, and economic contexts? How did temple construction and maintenance contribute to the local economy? Investigating these factors of temple commerce will (a) provide a more cohesive interpretation of the passage; (b) demonstrate that executing a reading of John engaged with ancient economic factors is a fruitful endeavor; and (c) explain the ramifications of such a reading for other parts of John's Gospel.

1.6.3 The Sites of Economic Evidence for the Interpretation of John's Gospel

1.6.3.1 First-century Palestine

I will now discuss the ancient contexts from which evidence pertaining to these commercial elements will be drawn.

Since the Jerusalem temple provides the narrative setting of John 2:13–22, attending to the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple in the first century is

crucial to developing an exegesis of the passage that situates it in its economic context. Whether it was composed before or after 70,[136] John's Gospel reflects a

[136] The consensus is that John's Gospel is a post-70 document, but John A. T. Robinson—the preeminent proponent of a pre-70 dating for John (*Redating the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976], esp. 254–311; *The Priority of John* [ed. J. F. Coakley; Oak Park, Ill.: Meyer Stone Books, 1987])—presents a defensible reading of 2:13–22 that assumes the temple was still standing at the time of its composition. Citing the position of Dodd and others on the temple logion in 2:19, he writes, "The saying about the destruction of the temple, which in this gospel (2.19) is not a threat *by Jesus* to destroy the temple (as the false witnesses at his trial in the synoptists asserted) but a statement...that 'if this temple be destroyed' he would rebuild it 'in a trice', is related to the events not of 70 but of 30. It is seen as a prophecy not of what the Romans would do in the rebellion but of what God would do in the resurrection" (ibid., 276; italics his). Robinson also notes that the reference to the temple's having been under construction for forty-six years in 2:20 coheres accurately with the date at which Jesus is presumed to be speaking according to John's chronology, and he finds further support for his pre-70 dating in that fact that in John's temple scene "there is no presentiment of its destruction, as there is in the comparable comment on the temple buildings in Mark 13.2. But though the context would seem almost to cry out for such foreboding, it may still be said that there is no reason why it had to be mentioned" (ibid., 277).

Even as a number of his conclusions remain questionable and a number of his arguments are arguments from silence, Robinson raises methodological concerns worthy of attention (see D. Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels* [2nd ed.; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2001], 74–76; idem., review of *The Priority of John*, in *JBL* 108 [1989]: 156–58; Gerard S. Sloyan, *What Are They Saying About John?* [rev. ed.; New York: Paulist, 2006], 45–48). For our purposes, Robinson's insistence that John's account of Jesus' actions in the temple be read on its own terms, not under the influence of the Synoptic Jesus' relationship to the temple, is valuable. The tendency to harmonize the canonical Gospels' attitudes toward the temple leads scholars to misread the relationship between the Johannine Jesus and the temple in terms of replacement (see §3.2).

Because the Gospel has a distinctive awareness to Judean life and religion before 70 (regardless of when it or any of its editions were composed), in chapter 3 I will study 2:13–22 in its narrative setting, which features a still standing and still functioning temple. I will also examine, in chapter 4, this passage as it "interferes" with contexts that post-date the temple's destruction and feature readers far removed from Judean life before 70.

profound knowledge of pre-70 Palestine.[137] Archaeology has confirmed various historical, social, and geographical details in those narratives unique to the Fourth Gospel (e.g., the five porticoes of the pool of Beth-zatha mentioned in 5:2), and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls revealed that John's dualistic and abstract language is not out of place in pre-70 Palestine.[138] What were once dismissed as inaccurate depictions of life in first-century Palestine can be readily accounted for by appeals to the theological and apologetic tendencies of the Gospel.[139]

The Fourth Gospel's familiarity with pre-70 Palestine (especially Judean geography and customs) necessitates that we engage the distinctive economic elements of John's temple scene in its own narrative setting. To this end, chapter 2 will survey the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple as it pertains to festival pilgrimage, the sacrificial animal trade, moneychangers, commerce and trading, and construction and maintenance.

1.6.3.2 First- and Early Second-century Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria

Tilborg aptly demonstrates how a social setting different from the text's own narrative setting has the potential to influence ancient readers' interpretations of a narrative in a variety of ways that may or not be intended by the author. In doing so he raises the problem of the distance between the narrative setting of the Fourth Gospel and its readers. When constructing the scene for John 2:13–22, the evangelist

---

[137] Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29–29A; New York: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1:xlii; Ling, *Judaean Poor*, 167–70.

[138] Brown, *John*, 1:xlii–xliii.

[139] Ibid., 1:xliii.

may well have had the Jerusalem temple in its Palestinian setting in mind, but it does not inevitably follow that his audiences envisioned this temple setting when hearing the scene.

Though the Fourth Gospel appears to have a deep knowledge of the Jerusalem temple and its sacrificial cult, it is not necessarily the case that John's ancient readers outside of Palestine were as or at all familiar with the layout and practices of the temple in Jerusalem. Perhaps many members of his audiences had never even been to Jerusalem and seen its temple, certainly not after 70. When picturing Jesus entering the temple in Jerusalem and disrupting its temple commerce, they in all likelihood had in mind their local temple to a specific deity or emperor as the model for how temple commerce functions. Certain aspects of John 2:13–22 that make sense within their narrative context may appear strange or puzzling to John's readers unfamiliar with the social setting it describes, while others might transfer without difficulty.

Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria are known to be places where the Gospel of John was read at an early stage, at least by the middle of the second century.[140] While all three have been proposed as locales where the Gospel was composed (in whole or in part),[141] it is John's first readers and auditors, not its authorial provenance, that concern me here. Reading the Gospel (or, more accurately, hearing it) in these places years after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, readers were

---

[140] See §4.2.

[141] Brown, *John*, 1:ciii–civ.

likely less familiar with Judea and its temple than was the Fourth Evangelist. Therefore, when envisioning the temple scene, their point of reference for how temple commerce functions might not be the Jerusalem temple but rather the great temple to Artemis in Ephesus, for example. How would readers unfamiliar with John's narrative setting and yet still very familiar with temple commerce in different regions possibly understand Jesus' disruption of temple commerce in John 2:13–22? An exegesis of this passage that takes into account the urban, polytheistic settings in which it circulated may uncover additional ways the economic elements of 2:13–22 contribute to the narrative dynamics of the passage.

Like Tilborg's work, this study takes on the challenge of asking how the different spaces of meaning-making affect the interpretation of the text. John 2:13–22 is the text that is the focus of this study, and its unique economic language and imagery is our entry point into the matter. Does the economic evidence from each of these environments lead to a different understanding of this temple scene, perhaps with some overlap? Or is the meaning of the passage within its narrative setting not substantially affected when it crosses provincial borders? What, if anything, do the answers to these questions tell us of the passage's relationship to Christian audiences in disparate parts of the Roman Empire? Building on the exegesis developed in chapter 3, chapter 4 will address these questions.

1.6.4 Plan of the Dissertation

The present chapter outlined how both longstanding and emergent reading approaches to the Gospel of John have for the most part neglected or caricatured its

economic dimensions; reviewed those studies which have distinguished themselves by treating some dimension of the Gospel and economic factors; and identified the methodological approach of the current investigation into John 2:13–22. As noted, this study will carry out an exegesis of John 2:13–22 that pays special attention to the unique commercial language and imagery of the scene in light of the archaeological, textual, and comparative evidence relevant to temple commerce in first-century Judea and first- and early second-century Asia Minor Egypt, and Syria.

Chapter 2 presents the economic background of John 2:13–22 by examining the temple commerce of the Jerusalem temple in the first century. Chapter 3 provides an exegesis of John 2:13–22 within its narrative setting of pre-70 Judea. Chapter 4 will raise the relevant economic evidence pertaining to John's readers in first- and second-century C.E. Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria and will address the meaning-effects such economic evidence has for readers in those contexts, using economic evidence derived mainly from the temple of Artemis in Ephesus but also from the Serapeum in Alexandria and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch.[142] A concluding chapter will discuss the implications of this investigation for the interpretation of other parts of John's Gospel (including other passages with unique economic features) and for Johannine scholarship more generally.

[142] I explain my rationale for focusing on these particular temples in §4.2.

2 Temple Commerce in First-Century Judea

2.1 The Economic Context of John 2:13–22

As indicated in the preceding chapter, this chapter investigates features of temple commerce raised by John 2:13–22: (1) commerce related to religious pilgrimage, in this case pilgrimage to the Jerusalem temple for Passover (2:13); (2) the buying and selling of sacrificial animals (2:14, 16); (3) moneychangers (2:14, 15); (4) the temple as a source and center of trade and commerce (2:16); and (5) the economic effects of the temple's construction (2:20).

2.1.1 A Note on Sources

The information presented in this chapter is drawn from a critical use of textual sources, archaeological data, and scholarly studies that pertain to the Jerusalem temple and its sacred economy.[143] I include sources that pre-date (e.g.,

---

[143] Significant scholarly surveys of the sacred economy of Judea and its temple include: Jostein Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins 25; Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1999); S. Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; 2 vols.; CRINT 1; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976), 2:631–700; Emilio Gabba, "The Social, Economic and Political History of Palestine, 63 BCE–CE 70," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism, Volume 3: The Early Roman Period* (ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 94–167; Grant, *Economic Background*, 54–110; K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), esp., 93–121; Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* (trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), esp. 1–144; Jack Pastor, *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine* (Routledge: London, 1997); S. Safrai, "The Temple," in S. Safrai and Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, 2:865–907; and Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in*

selections from the Pentateuch) or post-date (e.g., the rabbinic literature) the first-century C.E., as they are conventionally used to illuminate the first-century Judean context.

All types of sources raise methodological concerns for the reconstruction of Second Temple Judaism.[144] The rabbinic source I cite most is the Mishnah, which is dated to ca. 200–220 C.E. Occasionally I cite the Tosefta, which is dated between 220–300 C.E. Though rabbinic sources "certainly contain older material," there

---

the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135) (rev. and ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black, Martin Goodman; trans. T. A. Burkill et al.; 3 vols.; rev. English ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987). Ze'ev Safrai, *The Economy of Roman Palestine* (London: Routledge, 1994), treats the later period of 200–400 C.E. Nevertheless, his study contains material useful for the economy of first-century Judea. E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), while not devoted exclusively to the sacred economy of Palestine, contains a presentation and analysis of first-century Judaism that is directly relevant to the topic; see pages 47–189 in particular. Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (BZNW 107; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 115–82, contains much useful information on the significance of the temple in Jewish life and thought and discusses its economic importance on pages 147–51. Treating primarily the Solomonic temple, but still presenting information relevant to the Herodian temple are: Marty E. Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006), and Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 380–82, 404–05; repr. of *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (trans. John McHugh; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961); trans. of *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (2 vols.; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1958–1960).

[144] See the following articles, which constitute most of the first chapter ("Sources") of S. Safrai and Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*: S. Safrai, "Hebrew and Aramaic Sources," 1:1–18; M. Stern, "The Greek and Latin Literary Sources," 1:18–37; M. de Jonge, "The New Testament," 1:37–43; M. Stern, "Papyri," 1:43–45; M. Avi-Yonah, "Archaeological Sources," 1:46–62. See also Sanders, *Judaism*, 5–12; Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 1:17–122 (§3); Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 1–16.

remains the question of whether this older material reflects common first-century practice.[145] Whenever possible, I combine use of rabbinic literature with evidence from earlier sources to show that the phenomena attested in the Mishnah and Tosefta is attested in earlier sources. In such instances, the earlier sources probably more accurately reflect how the phenomena in question were practiced in the first century.[146]

Josephus's writings are indispensable for reconstructing Judaism in first-century Palestine. As E. P. Sanders puts it, Josephus is "[t]he principal source for the history of the period, and for its social, political and religious issues."[147] Sanders credits Josephus with being a good historian: "Josephus had his weaknesses and biases, but his general merit as a historian is considerable."[148] As a historian born in 37/8 C.E. in Jerusalem, whose writings cover the life and history of Jews in Palestine, Josephus provides crucial information about the Jerusalem temple and the commerce associated with it.

As is well known, Josephus holds various agendas that influence his historical writings. In *Jewish War*, Josephus seeks to illustrate the superiority of Rome and the

---

[145] Sanders, *Judaism*, 10–11, 458–90 (10).

[146] I will use parenthetical references when referring to the Mishnah, Tosefta, or later rabbinic literature whose evidence is corroborated by earlier sources. When I refer to sources that post-date the Mishnah and Tosefta whose evidence is not corroborated by earlier sources, I will use the standard abbreviation "cf." to indicate the secondary nature of this evidence.

[147] *Judaism*, 5.

[148] Ibid., 6.

futility of rebellion against it, and to lay blame for the Jewish revolt on misgovernment by a few Roman administrators and on a small cluster of disorganized and conflicting groups that (according to Josephus) do not represent Jews at large, since Jews desired loyalty to Rome. In *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus writes to present Judaism as "an ancient and noble culture and religion, of no pernicious effect on civilization as a whole, but rather an elevating and benevolent force" whose adherents "are not overly inclined to revolution."[149] *Against Apion* is also pro-Jewish in a similar manner. *The Life* is Josephus's apology for himself with themes and content that overlap with *Jewish War*. Awareness of Josephus's biases and tendencies, together with knowledge of ancient historiographical conventions and corroboration from other pertinent sources, facilitates the critical use of Josephus, which is essential for understanding temple commerce in first-century Palestine.[150]

2.2 The Economic Impact of Pilgrimage to Jerusalem During Passover

Many kept the Torah commandment to appear before God three times a year, for the Festivals of Unleavened Bread (which was eventually combined with Passover), Weeks (Pentecost), and Booths (Tabernacles) (Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16). Pilgrims included women, children, and Jews who lived outside of

---

[149] Ibid.

[150] For a brief but excellent assessment of Josephus as a historical source for first-century Palestine, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 5–7.

Palestine.[151] The influx of pilgrims who came to Jerusalem for the Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles as an expression of their piety fueled the Jerusalem economy. The numbers and spending patterns of pilgrims increased commercial activity in Jerusalem for each pilgrimage feast, Passover being the most profitable of these feast days.

2.2.1 Population Increase During Passover

While it is impossible to determine the population of first-century Palestine or any of its regions or cities, an abundant array of sources attests to significant population increases in Jerusalem during the Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles resulting from the influx of pilgrims to the city.[152]

---

[151] Though the injunctions to appear before God three times a year are required only of adult males, many women and children made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem as well (*Ant.* 11.109; Luke 2:41–42; see n. 14 below). Diaspora Jews, including women (*J.W.* 5.199), went to Jerusalem to fulfill these commandments, but they did so less often (as little as once in their lifetime) and in fewer numbers than Jews in Palestine. Of course many never went at all. See Allen Kerkeslager, "Jewish Pilgrimage and Jewish Identity in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt" in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (ed. David Frankfurter; Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 134; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 106–07; Sanders, *Judaism*, 129–31.

[152] For discussions of the problems involved, and various population estimates of Jerusalem and Palestine, see M. Avi-Yonah, "Historical Geography," in S. Safrai and Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, 2:105–10; Magen Broshi, "Estimating the Population of Ancient Jerusalem," *BAR* 4, no. 2 (June 1978): 10–15; idem., "Methodology of Population Estimates: The Roman-Byzantine Period as a Case Study," in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June – July 1990* (ed. Avraham Biran, Joseph Aviram, and Alan Paris-Shadur; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 420–25; Joachim Jeremias, "Die Einwohnerzahl Jerusalems zur Zeit Jesu," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina–Vereins* 66 (1943): 24–31; repr. in *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 335–41; Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 6–8; W.

According to Josephus, Archelaus's troops killed 3,000 worshippers in the Passover of 4 B.C.E. as they sacrificed lambs (many others escaped) (*J.W.* 2.10–13; *Ant.* 17.213–218), and at least 10,000, but perhaps over 30,000, were killed in a stampede in the temple on the fourth day of a Passover celebrated between 48 and 52 C.E. (*J.W.* 2.223–227; *Ant.* 20.105–112).[153] From the numbers Josephus provides, it is possible to calculate that there were at least 1,200,000 Jews at the fateful Passover of 70 C.E.[154] Josephus also reports that a census during Nero's reign (54–68 C.E.) proceeded by counting the number of lambs slaughtered and then estimating there would be about ten people present per lamb, since pilgrims customarily gathered in

---

Reinhardt, "The Population Size of Jerusalem and the Numerical Growth of the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. Richard Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 237–65; Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 436–42; Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 2:1–20 (§22.1). Methodological difficulties have not prevented scholars from estimating the number of pilgrims in Jerusalem during festival periods. See D. Chwolson, *Das letzte passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes nach den in Übereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangelium Johannis* (St. Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des sciences, 1892), 47–54 (esp., 53–54), and Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 77–84. S. Safrai remains skeptical over the possibility of arriving at an accurate estimate ("The Temple," 2:901–02).

[153] According to some manuscripts of *J.W.* 2.227, more than 10,000 people died in the stampede, while other manuscripts claim it is over 30,000. The parallel passage *Ant.* 20.112 alleges the sum of casualties totaled 20,000.

[154] This is a calculation made by Jeremias, who adds the 1,100,000 killed in the siege of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 6.420) to the 97,000 taken prisoner (*J.W.* 6.420) and to the 3,000 who fled to the forest of Jarden (*J.W.* 7.210–215) (*Jerusalem*, 78; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.13). Sanders does not attempt such speculative calculations, preferring to let the individual numbers indicate the large number of people in Jerusalem for Passover in 70 C.E.: in *J.W.* 5.567–569, two different refugees offer separate estimates of the number casualties among the poor, one placing that number at 115,880 and the other at 600,000; in *J.W.* 6.420 Josephus lists the total number of casualties at 1,100,000; and in *Hist.* 5.13, Tacitus lists the number of people besieged in Jerusalem at 600,000 (*Judaism*, 126).

quorums of ten or more (often as many as twenty) to partake in the Passover lamb. This census determined there were at least 2,556,000 worshippers in Jerusalem, a figure that does not include people who for reasons of impurity or Gentile identity could not share in the lamb but came to Jerusalem nonetheless (*J.W.* 6.422–27).[155] Josephus estimates there was a similar size crowd of no less than 3,000,000 at the Passover of 65 C.E. (*J.W.* 2.280).[156]

---

[155] Josephus actually states 2,700,000, but the product of the numbers he provides (a minimum of ten diners for 255,600 lambs) is 2,556,000. Some textual witnesses list the total lambs counted as 256,500, but the difference of 900 is marginal for our purposes. The point is made either way that multitudes were in Jerusalem during Passover. In an obviously exaggerated talmudic account of a census taken in the same manner, 1,200,000 kidneys of the Passover lambs are counted, meaning there would have been at least 12,000,000 Jews in Jerusalem (*b. Pesaḥ. 64b*). *J.W.* 6.422–27 and *b. Pesaḥ. 64b* probably refer to the same Passover (S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period," in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* [O. Michel, S. Safrai, R. Le Déaut, M. de Jonge, J. van Goudoever. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969], 16).

[156] When raising specific crowd estimates, Josephus does not specify whether or not they include women and children. The convention in antiquity was for crowd estimates to refer only to adult males, as when ἀνήρ is used to specify that Jesus fed about 5,000 men apart from the women and children (Matt 14:21; see also Mark 6:44; Luke 9:14; John 6:10). In his discussion of the census taken during Nero's reign, Josephus mentions the groups partaking in the Passover lamb consisted of no less than ten men (ἀνήρ) (*J.W.* 6.423). However, when referring to crowds without providing an estimate Josephus regularly uses vocabulary that allows for the presence of women and children. In *J.W.* 2.10–13 and *Ant.* 17.213–218, for example, λαός (*J.W.* 2.10), πλῆθος (*J.W.* 2.11, 12, 13; *Ant.* 17.216), πληθύς (*Ant.* 17.214, 217), and ὅμιλος (*Ant.* 17.215) may presume women and children among the festival crowds, though Josephus adheres to the convention by specifying men when enumerating the people killed by Archelaus's cavalry (*Ant.* 17.218; but cf. its parallel *J.W.* 2.13, which lacks ἀνήρ). *J.W.* 2.223–227 also contains inclusive diction when referring to the crowd (e.g., πλῆθος [2.224, 227]) but leaves unclear whether Josephus intends to limit the 30,000 killed in the stampede to men. In *J.W.* 2.280 the crowd attending Passover is referred to with the inclusive δῆμος. Josephus elsewhere writes of entire villages being vacated for the Passover festival, specifying that women and

On multiple occasions, Josephus specifies that these figures include Passover pilgrims in addition to residents of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 2.10; 6.421, 427; *Ant.* 17.214). The 3,000 Passover worshippers killed by Archelaus's cavalry include "a vast crowd streamed in from the country for the ceremony" (*J.W.* 2.10 [Thackeray, LCL]), including pilgrims traveling from outside the country (*Ant.* 17.214). Regarding the 1,100,000 killed in the siege of Jerusalem and the 97,000 taken prisoner (*J.W.* 6.420), "the greater number were of Jewish blood, but not natives of the place [Jerusalem]; for, having assembled from every part of the country for the feast of unleavened bread, they found themselves suddenly enveloped in the war" (*J.W.* 6.421 [Thackeray, LCL]).[157] Passover pilgrims also include non-Jews (ἀλλοφύλοι) of whom "a large number...assemble from abroad" (*J.W.* 6.427 [Thackeray, LCL]). That Josephus refers to the presence of Passover pilgrims to account for these large figures indicates that Passover was known for attracting large amounts of travelers to Jerusalem. Josephus exaggerates with nearly all the numbers he provides, but even

---

children left as well (*Ant.* 11.109). The architecture of Herod's temple anticipates the presence of many women and children, both Jewish and non-Jewish, as the largest space on temples grounds was the Court of the Gentiles, which did not restrict entry to women, children, and Gentiles (*J.W.* 5.190–194; *Ant.* 15.410–417). Additionally, Jewish women could enter the Court of the Women, as Josephus points out (*J.W.* 5.198–99). So even if Josephus's numbers refer only to adult male pilgrims, Josephus is well aware that the crowds that filled Jerusalem during pilgrimage festivals included women and children.

[157] Here Josephus points out that the overcrowding resulting from the mass pilgrimage produced pestilence and exacerbated the effects of famine (*J.W.* 6.421).

allowing for such exaggeration, the reality of Jerusalem being exceptionally populous during Passover remains.[158]

Other literary evidence substantiates the large scale of festival pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Philo writes of myriads of people traveling from myriad cities (μυρίοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μυρίων ὅσων πόλεων) all over the known world to the temple for its festivals (*Spec. Laws* 1.68–69), something that Acts assumes and emphasizes (2:9–11). Josephus presumes that thousands of people attended even Pentecost, the smallest of the pilgrimage festivals (*J.W.* 2.42–43; *Ant.* 17.254; cf. Acts 2:9–11), as well as the second most popular pilgrimage feast, Tabernacles (*J.W.* 2.515; *Ant.* 13.372–73).[159] Sources from earlier and later periods than Josephus, Philo, and Acts corroborate the presence of large festival crowds. Indicative of a large number of worshipers, *Let. Aris.* 88 mentions that on festival days many thousands of animals are sacrificed. As

---

[158] Indeed, Josephus states that Cestius instructed the chief priests to take the census because he "was anxious to convince Nero, who held the nation in contempt, of the city's strength" (6.422 [Thackeray, LCL]). Grant accepts that Josephus exaggerates his numbers but maintains he could publish them "without much fear of contradiction and with a certain amount of plausibility" (*Economic Background*, 84). Sanders writes that whether they come from Josephus or other sources, "These numbers obviously do not lead to accurate figures...There is no doubt, however, that the city of Jerusalem was populous in peacetime, that thousands of pilgrims came to the festivals, and that hundreds of thousands died in the war, many of them in Jerusalem...It seems to me not unreasonable to suppose that some hundreds of thousands celebrated Passover at Jerusalem" (*Judaism*, 126–27). Sanders estimates that in addition to the Jews already in Jerusalem, and not counting the many pilgrims coming to Jerusalem from the Diaspora, anywhere between 250,000 to 400,000 Palestinian Jews may have made the trip to Jerusalem from Passover on any given year (ibid., 127). "While we can never know how many people were present at one time, it seems to me reasonable to think of 300,000 to 500,000 people attending the festivals in Jerusalem, especially Passover" (ibid., 128).

[159] Sanders, *Judaism*, 139–40.

late as the end of the third century C.E., the rhetorician Menander of Laodicea acknowledges the large multitude of pilgrims from other countries who gather in Palestine for "the festival of the Hebrews" (*Declamations*).[160] The Passover ritual was designed to accommodate the large crowds (*m. Pesaḥ.* 5), and daily temple rituals were adjusted for the same reason.[161] The Herodian temple, especially its outer

---

[160] Translation is from Menahem Stern, ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984).

[161] *M. Pesaḥ.* 5 describes the ritual for slaughtering the Passover lambs. Because the crowds were so large, those offering sacrifice were divided into three groups, each of which took turns entering the temple courtyard to slaughter their lambs according to the customary ritual practice (*m. Pesaḥ.* 5:5–7, 9–10). In the case of the first two groups, "the Temple Court was filled" (*m. Pesaḥ.* 5:5), but the numbers of the third group "were but few" (*m. Pesaḥ.* 5:7) (all translations of the Mishnah are from Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933]). The entire process took long enough for the Levites to recite the Hallel psalms (113–118) between two and three times (*m. Pesaḥ.* 5:7; cf. *m. 'Abot* 5:5, which assumes overcrowding in the temple could have been a problem). While he accepts the Mishnah's view that not every Passover sacrifice could happen simultaneously, Sanders argues it would not have been possible for all the sacrifices to take place inside the inner courts of the temple in three distinct sessions due to the number of worshippers, priests, and sacrificial lambs and the space needed to accommodate them. Instead, "Either each group spread out over the entire temple area, including the Court of the Gentiles, or people came forward to the inner courts continuously, rather than in three distinct groupings" (*Judaism*, 136). Admitting there is no way to decide between these two possibilities, Sanders finds the latter more likely. At any rate, what is important for our purposes is that Sanders's suspicion of the Mishnah's description of the Passover ritual results from the size of the crowds. According to Sanders, even the Mishnah's description of Passover would not have accommodated the amount of people with the amount of space available in the inner courts of the temple. Both the Mishnah and Sanders's historical reconstruction must account for the thousands of worshippers in Jerusalem for Passover. Whatever the exact procedure, the Passover ritual was carried out in a manner that accommodated thousands of people slaughtering thousands of animals (according to Sanders's estimation, 300,000 people sacrificing 30,000 lambs). See *Judaism*, 136–37. On

court, was designed to provide space to large groups of people, including festival pilgrims (*J.W.* 6.238–39; *Ant.* 17.155; John 18:20).[162]

That large crowds traveled to Jerusalem for festivals is clear. A look at some of the ways pilgrims spent their money confirms the importance of the pilgrimage festivals for Jerusalem's economy.

2.2.2 The Economic Impact of Pilgrimage Piety

S. Safrai has come to several conclusions about Jerusalem pilgrimages that taken together indicate the importance of the pilgrimage festivals for the economy of Jerusalem.[163] First, Jews who made the pilgrimage remained in Jerusalem for the entire duration of the festival (one day for Pentecost, eight days for the combined festivals of Passover and Unleavened Bread, and eight for Tabernacles), even though there is no explicit ruling mandating this (cf. *m. Zebah.* 11:7 as understood in *y. Zebah. 97a*; *t. Sukkah* 4:17; *Tg Ps.-J. Deut. 16:7*; Luke 2:43).[164] Many, especially from

---

changes made to the daily rituals as a result of the influx of festival crowds, see n. 50 below.

[162] Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 143.

[163] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 12–21; idem., "The Temple," 898–904. See also idem., "Early Testimonies in the New Testament of Laws and Practices Relating to Pilgrimage and Passover" in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels—Volume One* (ed. R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 41–51.

[164] "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 14–15; idem., "The Temple," 903–04. According to S. Safrai, the duration of Passover was seven days, but in first-century Jerusalem, the pilgrimage feast in question combined the one-day Feast of Passover (celebrated on the 14th of Nisan) with the seven-day Feast of Unleavened Bread (commencing on the 15th of Nisan) for a total of eight days. After the fall of the temple, only the Feast of Unleavened Bread was celebrated and it eventually became referred to as

the Diaspora, arrived before the feast began to cleanse themselves ritually or simply to spend additional time in Jerusalem.[165]

S. Safrai agrees with the general picture provided by the ancient literary evidence that for any given pilgrimage feast, thousands of pilgrims made the journey to Jerusalem.[166] Those from nearer lands achieved a much greater representation than those from the Diaspora, with most pilgrims coming from within Palestine.[167]

"Passover" (Baruch M. Bokser, "Unleavened Bread and Passover, Feasts of," *ABD* 6:761–65; Sanders, *Judaism*, 132–33).

[165] S. Safrai, "The Temple," 903. Arriving early for the purposes of ritual purification was especially the case with pilgrims who journeyed from outside Palestine (*Ant.* 11.109; *b. Hag. 6b*; *b. Pesaḥ. 89a*). Regarding the combined feasts of Passover and Unleavened Bread, Sanders writes, "We cannot be sure how long people stayed in Jerusalem...those who had corpse impurity had to come at least a week early in order to be purified, and the two festivals combined lasted eight days. Many pilgrims probably stayed for the entire two week period. They had other sacrifices to present; and, besides, once they had made the trip they naturally wanted to enjoy the benefits of the city" (*Judaism*, 138).

[166] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 15–17. While S. Safrai acknowledges that the descriptions in Philo, Josephus, and the Mishnah "enable us to imagine a concourse of considerably more than twenty thousand, and perhaps even more than a hundred thousand," he maintains the amount of pilgrims would have fallen far short of the millions Josephus and the rabbinic sources claim ("Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 17). Elsewhere S. Safrai writes in terms of "tens of thousands" making the trek to Jerusalem for each of the pilgrimage festivals ("The Temple," 2:898, 899).

[167] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 18–19; "The Temple," 900–01. Judea and Idumea provided the largest number of pilgrims, the former being said to have had the bulk of its cities' populations take part in the pilgrimage feasts (*J.W.* 2.43, 515; *Song. Rab.* 7). Josephus mentions that "a countless multitude" came from Galilee, Idumea, Jericho, and Perea for Pentecost, noting that it was "the native population of Judea itself which, both in numbers and ardour, was pre-eminent" (*J.W.* 2.43 [Thackeray, LCL]). In the fall of 66 C.E., Cestius and his troops found the city of Lydda in Judea deserted of all but fifty people, "for the whole population had gone up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles" (*J.W.* 2.515 [Thackeray, LCL]). A wide range of sources attest to pilgrims from Galilee and speak of their great

Despite the mass scale of pilgrimage to Jerusalem, S. Safrai maintains that very few people, even among the most conscientious keepers of commandments, went for every pilgrimage feast.[168] Many, including revered figures like Tobit, Jesus, and talmudic sages, are depicted as making the journey either occasionally, every few years, or at most once a year.[169] Of course the distance that one lived away from Jerusalem affected the number of times one would make the journey. S. Safrai concludes that even though the command to pilgrimage appears as a requirement in the Torah, the majority of Jews interpreted it as "a command which has no limit," a positive action to be encouraged but not required.[170] It was among the

---

devotion to the temple (*Life* 269; *J.W.* 2.43, 223–232; *Ant.* 20.118; *y. Ma'aś. Š. 5.56a*; *Eccl. Rab. 1*; *t. B. Bat.* 10:12; *m. Yoma* 6:3; Luke 2:41–51; cf. Luke 13:1).

[168] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 17–19; "The Temple," 900.

[169] Luke 2:41–42 reports that Joseph and Mary make the pilgrimage annually, for Passover. The Synoptics give the impression that Jesus went up to Jerusalem once during his adult life. John's depiction of Jesus distinguishes itself by depicting Jesus as making almost every festival. In John, Jesus is in Jerusalem for at least two Passovers, possibly three. Jesus' first Passover in Jerusalem is mentioned in 2:13 and 2:23. In 5:1, Jesus is said to go up to Jerusalem for a ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles in 7:10, and he remains in and near Jerusalem for the remainder of John's Gospel, most of which is set during Jesus' final Passover (11:55–20:29). An additional Passover occurs while Jesus is in Galilee (6:4). For one Passover (two, if the feast mentioned in 5:1 is a Passover), Jesus travels to Jerusalem explicitly on account of it being Passover (2:13), as he does also for the Feast of Tabernacles (7:1–10). Jesus also goes to the temple for the Feast of Dedication, though it is not a pilgrimage feast (10:22–23), and is there for a number of Sabbath days as well (at least three: 5:9–10, 16, 18; 9:14; 19:31). Given S. Safrai's point that most Jews limited the number of the pilgrimage festivals they attended, John's Jesus stands out for his adherence to festival piety. S. Safrai notes that while John describes Jesus visiting Jerusalem several times, John's Gospel provides "no evidence that Jesus was following an established halakah, obliging a pilgrimage three times a year" ("The Temple," 900).

[170] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 19–20; "The Temple," 899–900.

"immeasurable things" one could do to express one's devotion to God (*b. Pesaḥ. 70b*; *Tanh. Exod.* 29:1; *m. Pe'ah* 1:1; *b. Hag. 6a–b).*[171] Moreover, pilgrims who came to Jerusalem complied with ritual prescriptions and expressed their religious devotion in ways that effectively caused them to contribute money to Jerusalem, especially by purchasing sacrifices and giving alms.[172]

These points underscore the dramatic economic effect the pilgrimage feasts had on Jerusalem. Pilgrims came by the thousands and stayed for days at a time, spending their money on voluntary and obligatory pilgrimage customs like purchasing sacrifices and almsgiving. Pilgrims also spent money for daily necessities.

---

[171] S. Safrai, "The Temple," 899–900; idem., "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 19–20. S. Safrai cites some rather late sources, but Josephus's summary of the biblical commandment to make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem illustrates that this legislation tended to be interpreted laxly, as in *Ant.* 4.203, which requires pilgrimage only from Jews in Palestine. On pilgrimage participation, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 129–30, where he notes, "Palestinian Jews on average attended one of the three festivals each year. The requirement to attend three times a year was either ignored or evaded by exegesis; some laws became 'dead letters', though we cannot now establish just how or when...The spread of the Jewish population throughout Palestine...required a certain amount of benign neglect of the festival laws" (130).

[172] S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," 20–21; idem., "The Temple," 903. S. Safrai describes streams of later rabbinic and targumic tradition that interpret the biblical command not to appear before the Lord "empty-handed" (Exod 23:15; Deut 16:16) as either referring only to sacrifices or obliging pilgrims to bring alms in addition to sacrifices, in some instances emphasizing the charitable almsgiving. He notes that the New Testament evidence assumes almsgiving was practiced regularly when visiting the temple (John 13:25–29; Acts 3:2–10; cf. Matt 21:14), but neglects to mention passages that assume the buying and selling of animal sacrifices (Mark 11:15; Matt 21:12; John 2:14; cf. Luke 19:45). S. Safrai mentions that pilgrims to the temple also partook in activities that that did not necessitate spending money, such as joint study of Torah (e.g., Luke 2:46–47) or public discourse and teaching of Torah (e.g., John 6–7; Acts 5:24–42).

Tobit 1:6–8 provides an example of one such pilgrim and describes three types of contributions the pilgrim makes to the Jerusalem economy. The first is the בִּכּוּרִים (ἀπαρχή) (Tob 1:6–7a), the tithe of "the first fruits of the crops and the firstlings of the flock, the tithes of the cattle, and the first shearings of the sheep" (1:6), which had to be delivered in kind to Jerusalem (Exod 23:19; 34:19–20, 26; Deut 18:3–4).[173] The second tithe Tobit mentions (1:7b), accumulated in the fourth and sixth year of a seven-year cycle, was a tenth of agricultural produce and possibly of cattle as well. It did not have to be delivered in kind, but it held one important restriction: it had to be consumed in Jerusalem (Deut 14:24–26; *Jub.* 32.10–14; *Ant.* 4.205). Those who lived within a day's journey could bring their second tithe to Jerusalem and consume it there (*Ma'aś. Š.* 5:2). Those coming from afar converted their tithe into money and spent it within the city limits of Jerusalem (Deut 14:22–26; *Ma'aś. Š.* 5:2), as Tobit claims to have done (1:7b).[174] The third type of contribution Tobit mentions is a tithe of alms (1:8), which according to Deut 14:28–29 was set aside once every three years for Levites, resident immigrants, orphans,

[173] On the biblical background to tithing in its ancient Near Eastern context, see Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 93–98; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 380–82, 404–05. For tithing practices in the Second Temple period, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 146–51.

[174] According to the Mishnah, if too much produce was cultivated one day's journey from Jerusalem, it was permissible to sell it and use that money for spending in Jerusalem (*Ma'aś. Š.* 5:2).

widows, and proselytes. One of the textual traditions of Tob 1:8 indicates that this tithe was allocated every year.[175]

The account in Tobit is idealized, but even this idealized portrait of a devout pilgrim is useful, since it provides clues into the economic practices of the pilgrim.[176] Tobit shows how pilgrims spent their money and resources in Jerusalem as part of their religious duties. Instructions for the second tithe encourage pilgrims to convert this tithe into money and spend it as a means to share in God's presence: "With the money secure in hand, go to the place that the LORD your God will choose; spend the money for whatever you wish—oxen, sheep, wine, strong drink, or whatever you desire. And you shall eat there in the presence of the LORD your God, you and your household rejoicing together" (Deut 14:25b–26).[177] The Mishnaic tractate *Ma'aś. Š.* makes rulings on the purchase of a sundry amount of items in Jerusalem using second-tithe money (1:3–5, 7; 2:1–4 [cf. *m. Pesaḥ.* 7:3]; 3:2, 10, 12–13; 4:7–8). Using second-tithe funds as "spending money" in Jerusalem was an integral component of the pilgrimage experience with a long tradition of its own. This practice stimulated

---

[175] For a discussion of the tithing practices reflected in Tob 1:6–8 and its different recensions, see Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 111–15. At any rate, almsgiving appears to have been an integral component of the Passover pilgrimage (cf. John 12:4–6; 13:29; *Ma'aś. Š.* 5:6, 5:9; 5:10).

[176] See S. Safrai's description of the actions of visitors to the temple ("The Temple," 2:876–78). "The overwhelming impression from ancient literature is that most first-century Jews...respected the temple and the priesthood and willingly made the required gifts and offerings" (Sanders, *Judaism*, 52; see ibid., 52–53).

[177] Referring to this passage in Deuteronomy, Sanders writes, "We may accept that the pilgrim families followed this advice; their trip to the temple was their main feast of the year and was an occasion for 'splurging' " (*Judaism*, 129).

nearly all the trades in Jerusalem, and Jerusalem could expect dramatic increases in economic activity at least three times a year, especially at Passover, on account of pilgrimage to the temple.[178]

Pilgrims to Jerusalem represented a wide swath of the socioeconomic spectrum. On the lower end of the social scale, we have the example of the artisan Joseph and his wife Mary making an annual pilgrimage for Passover (Luke 2:41). On the higher end, royal political leaders like members of the Herodian family came as

[178] Sanders notes that the purpose of allowing the second tithe produce to be converted into money and spent in Jerusalem "was to support Jerusalem financially" and was "an entertaining and popular thing to do" (*Judaism*, 147, 150). He points out that during the three pilgrimage festivals, "the temple did a very large percentage of its annual business" (ibid., 112). Jeremias describes this reality as follows: "If we had a way of drawing a statistical graph of the number of visitors to Jerusalem from abroad, it would show well-defined curves which remained fairly constant each year. We would record against February and March that 'the tourist season' began...Jerusalem saw most foreigners in the dry months, approximately March to September. On three occasions during these months the number of visitors increased by leaps and bounds to a prodigious height, at the three great festivals when pilgrims came from all over the world: Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles (Deut. 16.1–16). The annual peak was reached at Passover" (*Jerusalem*, 58). The hospitality and the catering trades especially would have witnessed a spike in business during festivals. On lodging options and the hospitality offered to pilgrims, see S. Safrai, "The Temple," 903–04; Sanders, *Judaism*, 129 (cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 101–02). On the effect of pilgrims on the catering industry, see Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 102–03; Sanders, *Judaism*, 129. Historians of Second Temple Judaism provide contradictory estimates of Jerusalem's population during this period (see n. 10 above). If the lower estimates reflect the historical reality more accurately, then the upswing in populations during festival times would have had all the more a dramatic effect on the local economy.

well (Luke 23:7).[179] Gentiles made the pilgrimage as well (cf. Acts 8:27), despite the restrictions on participation in Jewish rituals they could expect.[180]

Regardless of socioeconomic status, pilgrims spent their money in Jerusalem in the ways described above. During the pilgrimage seasons, the temple was a wellspring of revenue for the city.[181] Josephus describes the situation precisely when he states the Passover pilgrims "feasted for seven days, sparing no expense" (*Ant.*

---

[179] Whether royal political leaders primarily came to express their piety is uncertain. Whatever reasons they may have had to come to Jerusalem at Passover, the comprehensive nature of the Passover pilgrimage necessitated that they be present in Jerusalem during this sensitive time, even if their preference would have been to remain in their home palace. We do have examples of members of the royal elite coming to Jerusalem expressly to practice their religiosity, but these accounts do not specify that such visits occurred during Passover or the other pilgrimage feasts. Such examples include Queen Helena of Adiabene (*Ant.* 20.49–50) and Queen Bernice, daughter of Agrippa I and sister to Agrippa II (*J.W.* 2.310, 313). Queen Helena's pilgrimage to Jerusalem turned out to be "very advantageous for the people of Jerusalem." She took with her "a large sum of money" which she used to acquire and transport food from Alexandria to Jerusalem in response to an oppressive and deadly famine, and later secured that her son King Izates deliver more funds to the leading men of Jerusalem (*Ant.* 20.49–53 [Feldman, LCL]).

[180] On Gentiles worshipping in the temple, see Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 145–46.

[181] S. Safrai aptly summarizes: "The pilgrimage exerted a considerable influence on the life of the city. First of all, the economic influence of the pilgrimage was notable: the pilgrims spent a great deal of money during their sojourn in the city for their expenses as well as for charity. The city had prepared to provide accommodation for the pilgrims, many of whom, particularly those from the Diaspora, remained in the city for a lengthy period. It was especially during the pilgrimages that Jerusalem was the centre of Jewish life; in its streets could be heard the many languages and dialects of Diaspora Jews and their various currencies were used in commerce" (cf. Acts 2; *t. Šeqal.* 2:13). Pilgrimage was a meaningful and rewarding religious activity for which Jews "prepared themselves, sometimes during a period of years, for the day when they would visit the Temple courts; they were obliged to amass a substantial amount of money to defray the expenses of the journey and of the prescribed sacrifices of the pilgrimage" ("The Temple," 2:899).

11.110 [Marcus, LCL]).[182] Merchants of various trades were attracted to the temple as a place to make a profit during these lucrative periods, including sellers of sacrificial animals and moneychangers.

2.3 The Sacrificial Animal Trade

Sacrifice was an essential component of temple worship.[183] Throughout each festival day of Passover, worshippers brought individual sacrifices to the temple for the priests to offer on their behalf (cf. *m. Beṣah* 2:4). They could offer their own animals (cf. *m. Ḥal.* 4:11), buy animals from merchants in or near Jerusalem who may have been affiliated with the temple treasurers (cf. Lam R. 2.5 on 2.2, Son. 2.4, 162; *y. Ta'an. 4.8, 69a.42*), or possibly purchase sacrifices directly from the temple treasurers (*m. Šeqal.* 5:3–4). Jesus directs his actions in the temple in John 2:14–16 toward merchants of three kinds of animals: cattle (βοῦς), sheep (πρόβατον), and doves (περιστερά). The market for these sacrificial animals helped establish the temple as a major factor in the economy of Jerusalem and Judea.[184]

2.3.1 The Demand for Cattle

The term βοῦς 2:14 can refer to a bull, a cow, or an ox and is often found in the collective neuter or plural. Cattle, though primarily used for farming (e.g., Sir

---

[182] Philo describes the pilgrimage experience as one of cheerfulness and rest (*Spec. Laws* 1.69–70; cf. *Ant.* 15.50). Perhaps an implied component of such a description is the feasting and attendant spending mentioned more explicitly by Josephus.

[183] For a description of sacrificial practices in the Jerusalem temple in the first century, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 103–18.

[184] Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel*, 119–39.

38:25–26; cf. *b. Naz. 31b*), were an acceptable temple sacrifice (Lev 1:3–9).[185] But of the three animals listed in John 2:14, cattle were the least in demand because of their high cost. Even so, animal merchants must have found it profitable to supply some cattle for purchase as sacrifices. Someone who opted to purchase cattle would have paid handsomely, as purchasing cattle for sacrifice was a marker of high status and prestige and may have been done on a grand scale to mark special occasions.[186] Moreover, each month at the new moon two βόας were offered (*Ant.* 3.237–38), keeping the demand consistent, if not extraordinarily so. Among the pilgrimage

---

[185] S. Applebaum writes, "The ox and the cow were valued first and foremost as plough animals, and the Jewish sages would have concurred with Hesiod that the ox is the farmer's best friend. But the need of sacrifices must have been a permanent incentive to run cattle and sheep for sale in Jerusalem" ("Economic Life in Palestine," 1.2:655). Commentating on agricultural practice in 200–400 C.E. Palestine, Ze'ev Safrai states, "It is likely that the average farmer had at least a cow or ox for agricultural purposes and perhaps even a donkey"(*Economy of Roman Palestine*, 168; cf. ibid., 173).

[186] According to Philo, members of the embassy to Gaius claim to have offered "entire hecatombs" on behalf of Gaius on three special occasions (on Gaius's succession to the empire, on his recovering from a serious disease, and in hopes of his being victorious in battle with the Germans) (*Embassy* 356). Josephus reports that to celebrate the rebuilding of the temple, Herod sacrificed three hundred head of cattle (βοῦς); the others present also offered sacrifices, "everyone according to his ability" (*Ant.* 15.422). Augustus's son-in-law Marcus Agrippa offered a hecatomb (100 cattle) as part of his visit to Jerusalem (*Ant.* 16.14). Though Josephus's numbers are suspect, that cattle were offered exclusively by the wealthy elite reflects the historical reality. Much later sources tell the rag-to-riches story of Hillel, who only after becoming a celebrated teacher with as many as eighty followers was able to afford a sacrificial ox (see Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 116). Cf. Lev. R. 3.5 on 1.16 (Son. 39); *Sib. Or.* 3.576, 626.

festivals, Booths stands out as the one that featured the highest sacrifice of cattle, seventy in total (Num 29:12–34; *Ant.* 3.246).[187]

2.3.2 The Demand for Sheep

Feast day or not, every day began and ended with a communal whole-offering of a lamb at the temple altar (Exod 29:38–42). Since two lambs were sacrificed as communal whole-offerings each day, at least 708 or 710 lambs would be needed during the lunar year. In addition to this daily sacrifice, each month at the new moon seven lambs were offered (*Ant.* 3.237–38). Additionally, any number of sheep could be brought forth as individual sacrifices (Lev 1:10–13). Like cattle, sheep were expensive, but the daily demand for sheep necessitated a steady supply of sheep for sacrifice in Jerusalem.[188]

2.3.3 The Demand for Doves

Doves were required for certain purification offerings (Lev 15:14, 29; Num 6:10) and were a cost-effective option for obligatory (Lev 5:7; 12:6–8; 14:22; *Ant.* 3.230) and voluntary (cf. Lev 1:14, 29) offerings that could have been fulfilled by sacrificing cattle or sheep (Lev 1:14–17).[189] The poorer majority of worshippers, and

---

[187] Sanders, *Judaism*, 140.

[188] Though τά πρόβατα in John 2:14, 15 is regularly translated as "sheep," the term can also refer to goats, as it does in Exod 34:3 LXX, where it translates the Hebrew צאן. Elsewhere it translates שֶׂה, which can refer either to a lamb or a kid. In the first century, people offered lambs for the most part, since they were cheaper and more available than kids. See Sanders, *Judaism*, 504 n. 22; 511 n. 38.

[189] "While the 'norm' for sacrifice was a quadruped, accompanied by flour, oil and wine, in many or even most cases birds were substituted...the 'norm', (quadruped, flour, oil, wine) governed the community sacrifices but relatively few

even those in the artisan and merchant classes, offered doves as their sacrifice of choice on account of their affordability (Lev 1:14–17; 5:7–10; *Ant.* 3.230; *m. Ker.* 6:8; cf. Luke 2:22–24).[190] Of the three animals mentioned in John 2:14, doves were by far the most in demand, and a large supply of doves was needed in Jerusalem to meet this demand.

2.3.4 The Increase in Demand for Sacrificial Animals at Festivals

Demand for daily sacrifices increased during festival periods, heightening the economic impact of the sacrificial animal trade. Philo's comment in *Moses* 2.159 reflects this reality: "Many sacrifices were necessarily brought every day, *and particularly at general assemblies and feasts*, on behalf both of individuals and all in

---

individual sacrifices. Only a well-to-do individual would offer a quadruped as a sin offering" (Sanders, *Judaism*, 110).

[190] Affordability was an important quality of doves. Leviticus 5:7 expressly designates doves as a sacrifice the poor can make. *M. Ker.* 1:7 relates R. Simeon b. Gamaliel's attempt to establish a maximum price for sacrificial doves after the price of birds had risen to a gold dinar (= 25 silver dinars) for a pair. R. Simeon proceeds to teach in the temple with the aim of getting the price reduced. He manages to get the price reduced by ninety-nine per cent, to a quarter-denar each (one one-hundredth of the former price). According to Jeremias, R. Simeon's actions stem from his concerns that the high prices would prevent the poor from offering sacrifice (*Jerusalem*, 34). One stream of scholarship argues that the Jerusalem priesthood sought to profit from the sale of sacrifices and exploited the masses to do so (e.g., Richard Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple," in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* [ed. Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge: James Clark and Co., 1988], 72–89). Against this view, Sanders argues priests sought to encourage temple worship, a goal "best served by holding down the direct costs of doing so" (*Judaism*, 89–92 [90]). Establishing low-cost birds as an acceptable sacrifice is key to meeting this goal and parallels the practice of most ancient temples (ibid., 90). Cf. *m. Ḥag.* 1:2, in which the Houses of Hillel and Shammai debate how much should be spent on sacrifices brought for the first day of a pilgrimage festival; the amounts in question are rather small (Sanders, *Judaism*, 405).

common, and for a multitude of different reasons" (Colson, LCL; italics added).[191] Passages from the Mishnah also indicate an increased demand in sacrifices during festivals.[192] Temple procedures changed during the pilgrimage feasts to accommodate the increase in individual sacrifices that took place.[193]

A sharp increase in the sale of sheep for sacrifices occurred during Passover, lambs being the special sacrifice of Passover. Jerusalemites and pilgrims from abroad gathered in groups consisting of between ten and twenty people to purchase and offer lambs (*J.W.* 6.423–433; *m. Pesaḥ.* 8:7; 9:8; *Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 12:4*; cf. *t. Pesaḥ.* 4:3). Josephus claims 255,600 lamb sacrifices were counted in one first-century Passover (*J.W.* 6.423–427; cf. *b. Pesaḥ. 64b*), an exaggerated figure.[194] Based on his

---

[191] Cf. *Let. Aris.* 89, which states that feast days witness the sacrifice of thousands of animals.

[192] *M. Šeqal.* 7:14 expresses the extent to which cattle in the vicinity of Jerusalem was eligible for sacrifice, especially as Passover approaches; *m. Pesaḥ* 6:4 describes making a festal offering of sheep, lambs, goats, or oxen during the first two days of Passover; *m. Šeqal.* 7:3 mentions the abundance of sacrificial meat in the temple courtyard at the time of a festival; and *m. Yoma* 5:6 remarks that the blood from animal sacrifices in Yom Kippur was enough to engender a market for fertilizer derived from blood that would drain into the Kidron valley (cf. *m. Middot* 3:2; *m. Meilah* 3:3).

[193] To allot time for these sacrifices as well as for the prescribed rites of the feast day in question, the ashes from the sacrificial altar left from the previous day's sacrifices were removed at the first night watch (instead of just before dawn), the temple gates were opened to the people at midnight, and the daily worship ritual began earlier than its usual dawn start time (*Ant.* 18.29; *m. Yoma* 1:8). *M. Pesaḥ.* 5:1 states that during Passover the daily afternoon whole offering was slaughtered and offered at least an hour earlier, suggesting that during Passover many more animals were purchased for individual sacrifice than usual.

[194] See §2.2.1 above, esp. n. 13. "Josephus (*BJ* 6.424) exaggerates grossly when he speaks of 255,600 (variant reading 256,500) Passover victims, but certainly the figure ran into many thousands" (Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 57).

own estimate of the population of Jerusalem during Passover (somewhere between 300,000 to 500,000 people) and the practice of partaking in the Passover lamb in groups of between ten and twenty to a lamb, Sanders considers it reasonable to expect that "each spring there had to be a surplus of some 30,000 male lambs to provide meat for the Passover meal."[195] These Passover lamb sacrifices would be in addition to the public sacrifices carried out by the temple priests on behalf of the people. In *Ant.* 3.237–257, Josephus enumerates in some detail the amount of sheep and cattle that were offered as public sacrifices in the temple on a daily, monthly, and seasonal basis. There he states that as part of the regular temple liturgy, each day during Passover two bulls (ταῦροι), one ram, and seven lambs are sacrificed (*Ant.* 3.249).

2.3.5 Meeting the Demand for Sacrificial Animals

Meeting the demand for the sacrificial animals mentioned in John 2:14 sustained the livestock and pigeon-rearing industries throughout Palestine and its neighboring territories.

While Judea was reasonably self-sufficient in terms of agriculture and other goods, this was not the case with sheep and cattle, which were imported from other parts of Palestine and its neighboring regions.[196] *M. Menaḥ* 8 and *t. Menaḥ* 9 list

---

[195] *Judaism*, 121, 136 (121). For Sanders's population estimates of Jerusalem during pilgrimage festivals, see *Judaism*, 126–28 and n. 16 above.

[196] On the agricultural self-sufficiency of Judea, see Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 669–70; cf. Grant, *Economic Background*, 55–64, 72–75. Judean pasturage was better suited for sheep and goats than for cattle, and indeed sheep

places from which livestock for the temple was imported, and so testifies to the temple's importance for the economy of ancient Palestine and its neighbors.[197] Sheep came from Hebron, in Idumea, and calves from the Sharon, the coastal plain between Joppa and Lydda.[198] The high demand for cattle and sheep stemming from the temple thus supported a regional trade in these sacrificial animals.[199]

---

grazing took place in the Judean hill country, south of Jerusalem. The statement in *Let. Aris.* 112–113—"There are cattle of all kinds in great quantities and rich pasturage for them" (R.H. Charles)—is an exaggeration, as is Philo's remark "the men of the nation are noted particularly as graziers and stock-breeders, and keep flocks and herds of goats and oxen and sheep and of every kind of animal in vast numbers" (*Spec. Laws* 1.136 [Colson, LCL]). Given the needs of the temple, flocks of sheep and goats were much larger and more numerous than herds of cattle (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:655; Sanders, *Judaism*, 121), though northeastern Palestine (particularly Golan, Bashan, and Hauran) did produce cattle. Jeremias accurately reflects what can be gleaned from the sources when he writes, "Transjordan produced beasts for slaughter, especially rams, the coastal plain produced calves, the Judaean hill-country produced sheep, goats and doves" (*Jerusalem*, 47). Regarding Perea, Applebaum writes, "The livestock branch certainly bulked large in these parts, sending many head to Judaea in the Second Temple period" (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:647)." *M. B. Qam.* 7.7, which contains a rabbinic decree prohibiting the raising of small cattle, does not apply to the first century ("Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:655; Sanders, *Judaism*, 463–64; 510 n. 33; 540 n. 26).

[197] Grazing sheep for wool was an important industry in Judea independent of the temple (Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 165–69), but sheep grazing in Judea was certainly more profitable before the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., since a large number of the sheep grazed in Judea made their way to the temple (*t. Menaḥ.* 9:13).

[198] Acts 9:43 mentions that while in Joppa Peter stayed in the home of a tanner named Simon, whose trade depended on the availability cattle hide. One haggadah tells of 3,000 head of sheep and other cattle being imported from the Bedouin areas by an Idumean notable to Jerusalem for sacrifice (*y. Ḥag. 2, 78a*), which while presenting an unverifiable number "doubtless represented a regular trade" (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:670). As noted above, *m. B. Qam.* 7:7, which contains the rabbinical prohibition against importing sheep and

Doves were bred on the Mount of Anointing, which is near Jerusalem (*m. Menaḥ* 8; *t. Menaḥ* 9:13; *b. Menaḥ 87a*; *y. Ta'an.* 4, 69a; cf. *J.W.* 5.505). Temple treasurers oversaw the supplying of doves because they were required on numerous occasions, because the requirements for their suitability as sacrifices were stringent, and because so many were needed since they were the sacrifice of choice for the majority of worshippers. *M. Šeqal.* 5:1 specifies a temple official who was in charge of the bird offerings, and later rabbinic literature admits that the high priests sold doves at a profit (*Lam. Rab.* 2; cf. *m. Ker.* 1:7). Even though the evidence is in such late sources, Sanders acknowledges there probably was a priestly administrator who oversaw the procurement, sale, and inspection of doves.[200] Since having the temple supply doves insured their purity, Diaspora Jews and Gentiles seeking to offer doves purchased them from dove merchants associated with the temple. *M. Ḥal.* 4:11, which relates an instance in which a Babylonian Jew's firstborn animals were not accepted as a tithe for reasons of ceremonial purity, illustrates the risk one took by bringing animals from afar. For most pilgrims, the sensible option was to purchase animals from the temple treasurers or merchants in Jerusalem.[201]

---

goats from Syria, applies to post-70 C.E. conditions (ibid.; Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 168–69; see n. 54 above).

[199] "The extremely heavy demands on domestic livestock occasioned by the Temple sacrifices doubtless explain the import of cattle and sheep into Judaea from the neighboring areas" (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 670).

[200] *Judaism*, 83.

[201] See Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 72–89. This same system was essential for such non-animal sacrifices as meal-offerings, fine flours, oils, and wine,

The columbaria or dove-farming installations found mostly in the *shephelah* ("lowlands") of Judea provide archaeological evidence of the scope and importance of the dove industry and its connection to the temple.[202] Not only were there many such installations, but their niches often display a high level of workmanship.[203] Yet many of the dovecotes were abandoned, "some on quite short notice and even in the middle of their preparation."[204] The archaeological record suggests that raising doves in Palestine ceased by the mid-third century C.E. at the latest.[205] The simplest explanation for the dramatic and rapid decline in dove-rearing is the destruction of the temple.[206] Before then, the temple's demand for doves had sustained an entire industry of dove-rearing. Once the temple cult ceased, so did this industry.

---

which could get spoiled during travel or were otherwise highly susceptible to impurity (S. Safrai, "The Temple," 881).

[202] Eliezer D. Oren, "Herodian Doves in the Light of Recent Archaeological Discoveries," *PEQ* 100 (1968): 56–61; Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 174–77. This interpretation of the columbaria installations is one of two major propositions regarding their use. The other explanation identifies these structures with burial installations. Z. Safrai points out the difficulties with this view (ibid., 174–75).

[203] Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 174, 176. In Judea, for example, were about 500 installations containing 160,000 niches. Rabbinic tradition recalls dovecote structures with admiration (*b. Ḥul. 139b*).

[204] Ibid., 174.

[205] Ibid., 176.

[206] Ibid., 177–79. As Z. Safrai points out, dove-rearing is not in itself an economically efficient business, and was likely sustained simply because of the temple's demand for sacrificial doves. He estimates that the *shephelah* of Judea had produced 800,000 doves a year. Only a minimal amount of meat was consumed in ancient Palestine, and so these doves were bred mainly for cultic use in the temple (ibid., 177).

All three animals mentioned in John 2:14 thus represent trades that influenced the economy beyond Jerusalem, to that of Palestine and its neighbors. When the demand from the temple for sacrificial animals ended in 70, entire industries felt the effect. The silence of our sources makes it difficult to determine the involvement of temple personnel in the provision of these animals. Sanders lists four possibilities, the latter two of which presume worshippers purchased animals from sellers not associated with the temple:

> (1) The temple could have authorized reliable sellers of sacrificial victims to sell only animals and birds that priests had previously inspected. In this case, the seller would have to give the buyer some kind of chit, indicating that the victim was unblemished. (2) The victims could have been sold in the temple area itself. If so, they would probably have been inspected in advance, but no chit would have been necessary. (3) The gatekeepers could have directed worshippers who brought birds, lambs or kids into the temple to an inspection area manned by priests in the Court of the Gentiles. (4) Possibly worshippers took their victims straight to the priest who would sacrifice them, who inspected them on the spot.[207]

Scholars generally opt for either of the first two options. Sanders considers the second option very unlikely in the case of livestock but totally acceptable in the case of birds, because while a series of religious, practical, and economic concerns arise by having herds and cattle on temple grounds, keeping birds on temple grounds

---

[207] Sanders, *Judaism*, 86. Sanders immediately dismisses the fourth option on account of its practicality: "This would have slowed proceedings down greatly, and it would not have guaranteed that 'the most highly approved' priests carried out the inspection [which *Spec. Laws* 1.166 states took place]." He considers the third option worthy of consideration with respect to quadrupeds, though he admits there is no direct evidence to support it, noting that *Let. Aris.* 93 refers to "those whose business it is" to choose spotless victims but gives no details.

does not give rise to these problems.[208] Moreover, buying and selling associated with travel to the temple took place in shops outside the temple wall, and this well could have included the buying and selling of sacrificial animals.[209]

---

[208] Sanders, *Judaism*, 87–88. The religious concerns have to do with the noisiness and cleanliness of the animals. Quadrupeds "would have greatly increased the noise and commotion in an area whose sanctity and austerity were prized" and "would have fouled the area" by their biological necessities, which would contradict Philo's testimony on the atmosphere in the temple (*Spec. Laws* 1.74–75). Jeremias argues "that in the Court of the Gentiles, in spite of the sanctity of the Temple area, there could have been a flourishing trade in animals for sacrifice, perhaps supported by the powerful high-priestly family of Annas" (*Jerusalem*, 49), but the evidence he cites is late or otherwise tenuous.

The practical concerns have to do with providing large amounts of straw and fodder necessary to keep flocks and cattle, as well as cleaning out their litter and transporting on a daily basis these animals up and down the steps of the arch that led into and out of the temple. "When we add these practical problems to the fact that everyone would have seen the pasturing of herds and flocks in the temple as a profanation, we may dismiss the Royal Portico or the Court of the Gentiles as the market for quadrupeds" (ibid., 87–88).

The economic concerns have to do with the limited amount of times it was necessary to sacrifice cattle, given the nature of the biblical legislation on sacrifices and the fact that cost prohibited most worshippers from offering a bovine. According to Sanders, the few times cattle were sacrificed make it hardly worth making them "available for purchase by the general public. If pastured in the Royal Portico, they would have consumed an enormous quantity of fodder, they would have fouled a great deal of straw, and they would have served no purpose. As they trudged up and down the steps each day, waiting for a wealthy person to offer one as a burnt offering, they would have been in danger of breaking a leg or otherwise being blemished, which would have rendered them invalid" (ibid., 88). Sanders thus finds John's temple scene to be particularly improbable on the point that Jesus drives out cattle in addition to sheep and goats.

Birds avoid all of these problems because they were used routinely and in large numbers, and can be kept in baskets or bowls, "so they do not foul the floor," leaving "no reason to reject the general view that sacrificial doves and pigeons were sold in the Royal Portico" (ibid.).

[209] Sanders, *Judaism*, 69, 87. Victor Epstein suggests animal markets were normally located in the Kidron valley or on the Mount of Olives, but that the high priest Caiaphas had allowed certain animal vendors to sell their animals in the

Because it would have been against the law for priests to raise these animals, Sanders finds it "most unlikely that the temple or individual priests actually owned the birds, sheep and goats and sold them to pilgrims."[210] He finds it "equally unlikely" that priests were middlemen who bought sacrificial animals from people who raised them and then sold them to the worshipping public, since "[e]ngaging in direct trade of animals would have led to specific accusations – about which the literature is silent."[211] Sanders concludes:

> Probably the temple licensed dealers and inspected what they sold. Conceivably the temple charged for the licenses and for the space in the Royal Portico used by bird-sellers and money-changers, but there is no evidence either way. Pilgrims probably bought quadrupeds from dealers outside the walls of the city. While we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that the animals bore, in effect, certificates of blemishlessness, it is more likely that their suitability was confirmed when the pilgrim got his animal to the temple.[212]

Sanders's conclusion makes the best use of the evidence from the Second Temple period, though it agrees with the evidence of the temple scenes in the Gospels only on the sale of doves in the temple and the presence of moneychangers.[213] At any

---

temple in order to hurt the business of the animal merchants outside the temple who had wronged him ("The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple," *ZNW* 55 [1964]: 42–58). *M. Šeqal.* 7:2 mentions cattle dealers, but does not specify where they were located.

[210] Sanders, *Judaism*, 88.

[211] Ibid.

[212] Ibid., 88–89.

[213] The scholarly reconstructions of Richard Bauckham, Joachim Jeremias, and Emil Schürer, among others, rely too heavily on late rabbinical documents. These reconstructions often maintain that the temple had a monopoly on the sale of animals and items for sacrifice, especially birds. On account of the stringent nature

rate, for our purposes what is important is that, as Sanders states, the temple "played some role" in the sacrificial animal trade, an indirect one in the case of sheep and cattle and a more direct role in the case of sacrificial birds.[214]

The economic activity spurred by the temple's sacrificial animal trade helped drive the economy of first-century Palestine, and merchants came to Jerusalem to supply the temple and its visitors with animals for sacrifice. To facilitate the purchase of sacrifices, moneychangers came to the temple, joining the animal vendors in this bustling economic center and exemplifying another element of temple commerce evident in John 2:13–22.

2.4 Moneychangers

Moneychangers in the temple during Passover, like those mentioned in John 2:15, facilitated sales transactions and the collection of the temple tax.[215] That these

---

of the requirements for birds to be suitable for sacrifice and mishnaic texts that imply close oversight over the sale and supply of sacrificial birds (*m. Šeqal.* 5:1; *m. Ker.* 1:7), Bauckham argues the temple had a monopoly on the sale of sacrificial doves without having the same high level of oversight over the buying and selling of sacrificial sheep and cattle ("Jesus' Demonstration," 72–89). While Bauckham reads *m. Ker.* 1:7, where the price of doves appears to have been artificially set at an unreasonably high price until a rabbinic ruling reduces the price dramatically, as indicative of the temple having a monopoly over the sale of doves, Sanders argues that *m. Ker.* 1:7 "indicates that the sale of birds was subject to the law of supply and demand (and therefore was not monopolistic)" (*Judaism*, 89). Later Sanders notes that while dove-sellers and moneychangers were located by the temple as a convenience, people were not forced to buy sacrificial birds from the temple traders or to use the temple moneychangers to pay the temple tax. Thus, "none of the temple traders had a monopoly," despite the close ties between temple personnel and temple traders that Sanders's reconstruction holds (ibid., 185–86 [185]).

[214] *Judaism*, 85.

[215] Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel*, 96–118.

functions necessitated the services of moneychangers further illustrates the Jerusalem temple's status as a major economic institution.

2.4.1 Facilitating Sales

Foreign coinage was standard in Judea during the NT period. Judea possessed no right to mint its own coinage, and it also lacked the precious metals necessary for minting. Foreign coins from disparate sources and of different weights and sizes circulated throughout Judea, especially in cosmopolitan cities like Jerusalem, with the result that "simple commercial exchanges often required the services of a moneychanger" (cf. *m. 'Ed.* 1:9–10).[216]

The purchase of sacrificial animals was one such commercial exchange.[217] In Jerusalem, moneychangers sat at the gate of the city or of the temple and made their services available for a fee of something between two and eight percent of the total transaction (*m. Šeqal.* 1:7).[218] Given the high number of sales in sacrificial animals, not to mention the many other sales transactions, moneychangers in Jerusalem could

---

[216] John W. Betlyon, "Coinage," *ABD* 1:1076–1089 (1086). For the diversity of coinage that circulated in Jerusalem, see Donald T. Ariel, "A Survey of Coin Finds in Jerusalem (Until the End of the Byzantine Period)," *LASBF* 32 (1982): 273–326.

[217] From Mark 11:15, Matt 21:12, and John 2:14–16 one gets the impression the moneychangers were stationed near the sacrificial animal merchants, readily available to participate in their transactions.

[218] Betlyon, "Coinage," 1:1086; Haenchen, *John*, 1:183. In *m. Šeqal.* 1:7, R. Meir states the surcharge consists of a silver maah, which is 1/24, or 4.2%, of a sela, while the sages say it consists of half of a silver maah, which would be 2.1% of a sela. Under certain circumstances described in *m. Šeqal.* 1:6, two surcharges are levied, in which case the total surcharge would be either 4.2% or 8.4%, depending on whether the prescription of the sages or of R. Meir is being followed. Regardless of questions surrounding the accuracy of the figures given in the Mishnah, moneychangers charged a small fee for their services.

earn a good living during festival time. That texts like Mark 11:15, Matt 21:12, John 2:14–15, and *m. Šeqal.* 1:3 assume their presence in the temple confirms that the temple and the economic activity it generated attracted the bankers and financiers of antiquity.[219]

2.4.2 Facilitating the Collection of the Temple Tax

Jews could pay the annual temple tax during their pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[220] Those who made the journey brought coins from their host countries and accumulated during travel. Moneychangers facilitated the collection of the temple tax

---

[219] Moneychangers did more than just exchange currencies. They functioned as bankers and financiers, supplying credit, safekeeping others' money, paying interest on money held by them, and acting as a channel of payment between two parties or business partners (Betlyon, "Coinage," 1:1086; Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 291–92, 293–95). Hanson and Oakman caution against overemphasizing the role of moneychangers as the bankers of the ancient world: "The need to convert between the various systems led to the prominence of money changers, whose 'tables' (the Greek word *trapezai* is often translated misleadingly as 'bank') offered only rudimentary banking functions by our standards" (*Palestine*, 114).

[220] Though its institution is attributed to Moses (Exod 30:11–16; cf. Exod 38:25–26; 2 Chr 24:6, 9), the temple tax was established in the post-exilic period to defray the costs of public sacrifice, which before the exile had been paid for by the king (Ezek 45:17–25). Generally, the temple tax was collected within a given community and then delivered to Jerusalem on its behalf (*m. Šeqal.* 2:1; cf. Matt 17:24). Jews brought their contributions to regional storehouses from which trustworthy people would deliver them in bulk to Jerusalem (*Spec. Laws* 1.78; *Ant.* 14.110–13; 18.311–313; cf. *m. Šeqal.* 2:1; 2 Chr 24:8–11). According to the Mishnah, in the temple for collecting the temple tax and other offerings were thirteen money chests (שׁוֹפָרוֹת), one of which was for "New Shekel dues" (for the present year) and another of which was for "Old Shekel dues" (for those who owed the previous year's tax payment) (*m. Šeqal.* 2:1; 6:5). The Mishnah maintains that money chests for collecting the temple tax were also located in the provinces (*m. Šeqal.* 2:1). *M. Šeqal.* 7:1 describes in detail what to do when money is found between the various chests in the temple. If this was a persistent problem, it reflects the reality that the temple was a place through which considerable amounts of currency circulated.

by changing coins into Tyrian shekels, the only coinage acceptable for paying the temple tax. They also took pledges from those not paying the tax that year (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3).[221]

Moneychangers met the pilgrims before they reached the temple, setting up their tables in the provinces on 15 Adar (February–March) (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3), which immediately precedes Nisan (March–April), when Passover is celebrated. They set up their tables in the temple on 25 Adar (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3), and so began collecting the tax twenty days before the Passover feast commenced.[222]

The temple thus had an efficient and successful system in place for collecting the tax, and moneychangers were a key part of this system.[223] Moneychangers who

---

[221] On Tyrian shekels, see Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel*, 98–101; Ya'akov Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage* (2 vols.; Dix Hills, N.Y.: Amphora, 1982), 2:8–9.

[222] Collecting the tax shortly before Passover had the advantage of securing funds for the daily whole-offering by the start of each liturgical year, an indication that temple treasurers managed the temple's intake efficiently and according to the cultic needs for worshipping God. *M. Šeqal.* 1:3 does not claim that the moneychangers collected the tax while in the temple. Rather, they exacted pledges: "On the fifteenth of that same month [Adar] they set up money changers' tables in the provinces. On the twenty-fifth [of Adar] they set them up in the Temple. Once they were set up in the Temple, they began to exact pledges" (cf. *m. Šeqal.* 2:1; *y. Ta'an. iv., 69a*). It makes sense for taxes to have been fully collected and accounted for by 25 Adar, so that they can be ready for use by the start of the liturgical year on 1 Nisan. While this is the picture one gets from the Mishnah, it may not have worked out that way in reality. In fact, the same tractate describes structures that were in place in the temple for tax payments that came in late (*m. Šeqal.* 6:5). As Bauckham points out, "[W]e cannot really be sure that payment of tax did not continue at a considerable rate after 1 Nisan" ("Jesus' Demonstration," 172 n. 19).

[223] Bauckham suggests that in the temple "the moneychanging was not a piece of private enterprise...but a facility organised by the temple treasury," and that "[i]n all probability the moneychangers were priests or Levites on the temple staff" ("Jesus' Demonstration," 75; see also Israel Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the*

charged a fee could expect to profit from changing the pilgrims' money into the required Tyrian coinage, given the success the temple had in collecting this annual tax and thereby increasing the temple treasury's holdings.

2.4.3 The Temple Tax as One Source of Income for the Temple

Collected as Passover approached (*m. Šeqal.* 1:1; 1:3; cf. Matt 17:24) and required from nearly all male Jews, the half-shekel temple tax contributed to the large sums stored in the temple treasury.[224] As Sanders succinctly puts it, the temple

---

Gospels [First and second series; New York: Ktav, 1967], 1:86). While impossible to verify, it would make sense for temple officials to have a high degree of control over the collection of the temple tax. The temple was very organized with administrating its finances (keeping a roster of treasurers dedicated to this task; see n. 101 below) and the temple tax was an important component of its income. *M. Šeqal.* 1:6, which rules that in certain cases the surcharge for changing one's money into shekels could be waived, supports Bauckham's hypothesis as well. If these stipulations were at all followed in the first century, why would independent merchants waive the surcharge that constitutes their income? The temple treasury, on the other hand, would benefit from waiving the surcharge, since it would act as an incentive for people to contribute when they were not legally bound to do so (as *m. Šeqal.* 1:6 presumes). Bauckham's supposition cannot be proven, but at any rate, as was the case with the dove-merchants, there developed a close relationship between moneychangers in Jerusalem and the temple.

[224] According to Exod 30:13–15, the tax had to be paid by every free male of at least twenty years of age (cf. *Ant.* 3.193–196; 18.312–313; *J.W.* 7.218), whether rich or poor (Exod 3:15). Josephus claims that, according to Moses, men over the age of fifty were not subject to the temple tax (*Ant.* 3.196). The Mishnah specifies Levites, Israelites, proselytes, and freed slaves as required to pay the tax (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3). Minors whose fathers had begun to pay before they reached the age of twenty could not desist from paying (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3). The temple tax was not levied on women, slaves, and minors (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3), but if they did pay (and it appears they often did), their payments were not refused (*m. Šeqal.* 1:5). Payments from Gentiles or Samaritans were not to be accepted (*m. Šeqal.* 1:5). Whether priests should pay the temple tax was a question debated between the sages and the priests (*m. Šeqal.* 1:4). Pledges were not taken from priests who did not pay, "in the interests of peace" (*m. Šeqal.* 1:3; cf. *y. Šeqal. 5, 49a*).

tax was "one source of income alone" which "provided a great deal of money."[225] The tax was one half-shekel, which was worth two drachmas (*Ant.* 3:194–195; *J.W.* 7.218) and thus amounted to two days' pay for a day laborer, given that one drachma was roughly equivalent to one day's pay (Matt 20:2).[226] The tax was to be paid in silver didrachmas of Tyre (i.e., Tyrian shekels; *m. Bek.* 8:7; cf. *m. Šeqal.* 2:4;).[227]

---

[225] *Judaism*, 84. The account in Cicero, *Flac.* 28.66–69 confirms this. According to Cicero, Roman administrators confiscated 100 Roman pounds of gold at Apamea, 20 pounds at Laodicea, and 100 pounds at Adramyttium, all of which was taken from temple tax money destined for Jerusalem. Compulsory tithes and taxes were not the only sources of income for the temple. Temple personnel may have sold animal and non-animal sacrifices that were subject to impurity (*m. Šeqal.* 5:1, 3–4). The temple occasionally received funding from political rulers (Ezra 6:1–10; 2 Macc 3:3; *Ant.* 12.133–44; cf. *Embassy* 23.157), and it consistently received voluntary offerings from rich and poor (Mark 12:41–42; Luke 21:1–2). Whether or not in the Hellenistic and Roman periods the temple received income from land or other property that it owned (as was common in antiquity) is a matter of scholarly debate (see Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 148 n. 149). According to Philo, the temple did receive revenue from land holdings (*Spec. Laws* 1.76), while the rabbinic literature notes that when dedicated to it was a piece of land, a home or some other property (including slaves), the temple received its monetary or land-produce equivalent (*t. Šeqal.* 2:15; cf. *m. Šeqal.* 4:6). Of course, not all contributions could be accepted by the treasury (cf. 1 Macc 10:38–46; Matt 27:5–6). On the Jerusalem temple's income, see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 403–04; Sanders, *Judaism*, 146–57; Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 82–120; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 147–49.

[226] The tax originally amounted to a third of a shekel (Neh 10:32–33), but the later Priestly Code set the tax at half a shekel (Exod 30:13–15; cf. *Ant.* 3.193–196; 18.312–313; *J.W.* 7.218) (Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel*, 102–105). In Matt 17:24–27, one coin (a στατήρ, i.e. presumably a stater of Tyre, which amounted to 1 tetradrachm and thus amounted to two half-shekels) pays the temple tax for Jesus and Peter.

[227] Tyrian coinage was used mainly because its high silver content (90–92 percent) most closely complied with the sages' requirement that all temple payments be made in pure silver. The insistence on the use of Tyrian coinage "gives a good idea of the temple's 'clout,' " given that "the temple's requirement reversed the doctrine that bad money drives out good and also overcame the general dislike of coins with images of peoples or deities" (Sanders, *Judaism*, 243). Jewish demand for

Temple tax payments reached Jerusalem consistently and in large amounts. Jews from all over the world paid it (*Let. Aris.* 33, 40, 42; *Spec. Laws* 1.77–78; *J.W.* 7.218; *Ant.* 18.312; cf. *Embassy* 156; 291; 311–16; *Ant.* 14.214, 227), not considering it a burden, but rather an integral part of religious expression, since it enabled them "to *participate* in the daily sacrificial worship of the temple by helping to finance it."[228] Ultimately, it was viewed as a tax paid to God (Exod 30:11–16; *Ant.* 18.312),

---

Tyrian silver coins led Jews in Jerusalem to mint these coins once Tyre stopped minting them in 19/18 B.C.E., at which point Roman silver provincial tetradrachms with a lesser silver content (80 percent) replaced their popular usage. From 19/18 B.C.E. until 65/66 C.E., Tyrian shekels were struck in Jerusalem, a practice initiated by Herod to comply with the requirements set forth for the temple tax (cf. *Ant.* 17.189; Zonanas, *Annales* [PG 5:16]; *m. Šeqal.* 2:4). The inferior Roman tetradrachms did not replace the Tyrian shekel as the method of payment, as would have been the expected outcome. The graven image of the god Melqart (equated with the Greek Heracles) on Tyrian shekels posed no problem for the majority of Jews and the temple authorities. See Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:8–9.

[228] Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 73 (italics his). Diaspora Jews on their part sent hefty contributions to the temple as taxes and tithes (Cicero, *Flac.* 28.66–69; *Spec. Laws* 1.76–78; *Embassy* 156, 314–15; *J.W.* 5:187, 416; *Ant.* 14.110–113; 16.27–28; 18.312–313), demonstrating the tax's importance as a means by which all Jews, even those who lived far away from the temple, could participate in temple worship (Magen Broshi, "The Role of the Temple in the Herodian Economy," *JJS* 38 (1987): 34–35; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 57; E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* [SJLA 20; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 124–26; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 150). For receipts found in Egypt that show the tax was collected from Jews throughout the world, see E. P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 49–51; 297–99. Diaspora Jews sent so much money, that Rome respected and guaranteed their privilege to do so (*Ant.* 16.160–73; Broshi, "Role of the Temple," 34; Smallwood, *Jews Under Roman Rule*, 126), even as leading citizens of the Greek cities of Asia Minor protested this practice because it depleted their currency circulation in difficult economic times (see Cicero, *Flac.* 28.66–69; A. J. Marshall, "Flaccus and the Jews of Asia (Cic. Pro Flacco 28.67–9)," *The Phoenix* 29 [1975]: 139–54). Gabba attributes Roman approval of the practice as partly due to the fact that contributions to the temple in effect transferred wealth from outside the bounds of the empire to within its boundaries

and the people were willing to pay the tax because it directly contributed to the worship of God through the sacrificial cult and the wellbeing of God's "house."[229] Even Jewish groups with strained relationships to the temple paid the tax,[230] and inscriptional evidence suggests that religious dues were paid even in situations of considerable duress.[231] As long as the temple stood, Jews from around the world paid their temple dues and thereby participated in temple worship.

Sanders recognizes the importance of the temple tax for Jews throughout the ancient world: "The general payment of the temple tax by Jews throughout the empire is certain. It is taken for granted in Matt. 17.24 as well as in Josephus. The best testimony to the fact that Jews generally paid it is that after each of the two

---

(e.g., *Ant.* 18.311–13), increasing the empire's wealth without much effort on the empire's part ("Social, Economic and Political History," 124). On the impact of taxes and contributions from the Diaspora on the economy of Judea (specifically during the Herodian period), see Emilio Gabba, "The Finances of King Herod," in *Greece and Rome in Eretz-Israel: Collected Essays* (ed. A. Kasher, U. Rappaport, G. Fuks; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1990), 167.

[229] Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration," 73. Nehemiah describes the purpose of the tax as being "for the service of the house of our God" (10:32). It facilitated the worship of God by funding daily public sacrifices and the maintenance of the temple and its cult (*m. Šeqal.* 4).

[230] The Qumran Jews accepted the Mosaic command in Exod 30:13–15 to pay the tax, though they interpreted it as requiring payment only once in a lifetime, at the age of twenty (4Q159). The Gospel of Matthew argues that Jesus-followers are not bound to pay the temple tax, but should do so anyway in order not to cause offense (17:24–27).

[231] See Margaret Williams, "The Contribution of Jewish Inscriptions to the Study of Judaism," in *CHJ* 3:89–90; Yigael Yadin and Joseph Naveh, eds., *The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions* (vol. 1 of *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965: Final Reports*; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), #441–44.

revolts Rome ordered that it continue to be paid, but for other purposes (*War* 7.218; Dio Cassius 66.7)."[232] Elsewhere Sanders writes, "That [the temple tax] was paid is one of the things about first-century Judaism that is most certain."[233]

Though most Jews paid the tax willingly, considerable segments of the Jewish population who were ambivalent toward or even resented paying the temple tax. However, Sanders argues biblical scholarship tends to overstate the oppressiveness of taxation in first-century Palestine, recommending that "[t]he common perception of the economic situation should be moderated; the situation was bad enough, and it does not need to be exaggerated."[234] The sheer amount of Jews who paid annually combined with the low amount of this flat tax (Sanders estimates that it amounted to 2% of a lower-end subsistence farmer's income) undermines claims that the tax was an oppressive burden on the people.[235] If the tax was viewed as oppressive, in all likelihood it would have been after the Jewish war, when the Romans turned it into the *fiscus judaicus* to finance the temple to Jupiter in Rome as punishment for the revolt and applied the tax to women and children as well as men (*J.W.* 7.218). Even

---

[232] Sanders, *Judaism*, 52.

[233] Ibid., 156; cf. Ådna, *Jerusalemer Tempel*, 109. William Horbury argues the tax was not a firmly established practice but rather was a late innovation which was being disputed at the time of Jesus, with Jesus and the Qumranites criticizing the tax ("The Temple Tax," in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* [ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984], 265–86). Against this position, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 513 n. 16.

[234] See *Judaism*, 157–69 (159); cf. Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 139.

[235] *Judaism*, 167. Bauckham, for example, views the tax as oppressive ("Jesus' Demonstration," 73).

then, its oppressive nature would have been seen not so much by the amount of the tax as by its use to fund the temple of a Roman deity.

The success of the temple tax as a source of income and a means by which all Jews can participate in temple worship is apparent in *Ant.* 14.110–13. Josephus, finding it necessary to justify the temple's accumulation of wealth, does so with reference to tithes and taxes paid to the temple:

> But no one need wonder that there was much wealth in our temple, for all the Jews throughout the habitable world, and those who worshipped God, even those from Asia and Europe, had been contributing to it for a very long time. And there is no lack of witnesses to the great amount of the sums mentioned, nor have they been raised to so great a figure through boastfulness or exaggeration on our part...Now there is no public money among us except that which is God's... (Marcus, LCL)

Josephus emphasizes the large number of people, including non-Jewish proselytes and God-fearers (καὶ σεβομένων τὸν θεὸν) who were not obliged to pay, who contribute to the temple from all over the world.[236] His assertion that "there is no public money among us except that which is God's" shows the extent to which the money in the temple treasury was viewed as belonging to God. In light of all the evidence—that large sums of money are known to have been in the temple; that payment of the temple tax is well-attested by literary sources, including those produced by Jews with an ambivalent or hostile attitude toward the temple and its leadership; and that thousands of pilgrims journeyed to Jerusalem each year for religious reasons, including paying their tithes and taxes—Josephus can be taken as

---

[236] Relying on Strabo, in this same passage Josephus notes Jews from Asia Minor had accumulated 800 talents bound for the temple (*Ant.* 14.111–13).

trustworthy on his claim that the temple held much wealth. Nonetheless, his claim that the Jews had no governmental funds is an exaggeration intended to emphasize the Jews as a holy people.[237]

2.4.4 The Wealth of the Temple Treasury

The influx of contributions to the temple resulted in its status as a treasury that stored large amounts of wealth in the form of cash and precious furnishings.[238] The surplus wealth of the temple treasury was "always considerable"[239] and itself contributed to the Jerusalem economy.[240]

The wealth of the temple treasury is well documented. Tacitus (ca. 56–120 C.E.) notes the particular wealth of the Jerusalem temple, mainly due to the annual half-shekel temple tax (*Hist.* 5.8.1). As early as 63 B.C.E., when he conquered

---

[237] Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 93–94.

[238] Sanders, *Judaism*, 83–85; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 148–49. The temple had storage chambers where intake from its several sources of income was stored (*J.W.* 5.200; 6.282; John 8:20; *m. Šeqal.* 3:1; 5:6; cf. Matt 27:5–6). The storage facilities of the second temple are generally referred to with the word לִשְׁכָּה, which the Septuagint translates as γαζοφυλάκιον in Ezra and Nehemiah, and as παστοφόριον in Chronicles (Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes,* 140). Γαζοφυλάκιον is the term used in the Maccabean literature and in the New Testament (Mark 12:41, 43; Luke 21:1; John 8:20). The storage cells were designed and constructed in a manner that restricted entry into them (Ehud Netzer, *The Architecture of Herod, the Great Builder* [with the assistance of Rachel Laureys-Chachy; TSAJ 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006], 149), which has implications for how we understand John 8:20 (see §5.4).

[239] Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 125.

[240] Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 147–51. Applebaum suggests temple income benefited the economy of the Roman Empire as a whole, since currency coming in from beyond the bounds of the empire partly offset the currency which flowed out from the empire to pay for luxury imports from the far east and east Africa ("Economic Life in Palestine," 2:678, 683).

Jerusalem and entered the Holy of Holies, Pompey found 2,000 talents in the temple, in addition to other luxurious items (*J.W.* 1.152–54; *Ant.* 14.71–78; Cicero, *Flac.* 28.67; cf. Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 37.16.4).[241] The temple still had ample resources as late as ca. 64 C.E., when, after many years of expenditure on construction, maintenance, and the sacrificial cult, funds could be used for keeping 18,000 laborers employed (*Ant.* 20.219–22). Even after most of the temple's wealth had been plundered by rebels or destroyed (*J.W.* 5.562–565; 6.157, 264, 282), the chief treasurer Phineas was able to use treasures stored in the temple to buy his freedom (*J.W.* 6.390).[242] Philo and the Mishnah also refer to the temple's extravagance and its surplus of funds (*Spec. Leg.* 1.71–78; *m. Šeqal.* 2:5; 4:3–4), and the temple hierarchy included priests who served as treasurers administering these funds (*J.W.* 6.390; *Ant.* 15.408; 18.93; 20.194; *m. Šeqal.* 5:2; *t. Šeqal.* 2:15).[243]

---

[241] Pompey did not raid the temple's wealth at this point, but his awareness of these funds probably influenced the amount of tribute (over 10,000 talents) he demanded from Judea for his expedition.

[242] Sanders, *Judaism*, 84. Josephus finds the temple's wealth at the time of its destruction in 70 C.E. worth noting (*J.W.* 6.282).

[243] Given the wealth of the temple, Sanders considers the office of chief temple treasurer to be "especially important" (*Judaism*, 83). The temple treasurers (גזבר; γαζοφύλαξ) were key members of the temple hierarchy who had to remain in Jerusalem year-round. These priest-treasurers distributed temple funds, inspected purchases, and supervised the redemption of vows, gifts, and contributions to the temple, including the temple tax and its administration (*m. Šeqal.* 2:1; *t. Šeqal.* 2:15; *m. Menaḥ.* 8:7; cf. *bar. b. Beṣah 29a*). The Mishnah claims there were always three chief treasurers (*m. Šeqal.* 5:2), but earlier sources do not specify how many there were (*Ant.* 15.408 and 18.93 mention "treasurers" in the plural, while *J.W.* 6.390 and *Ant.* 20.194 seem to imply there was only one chief treasurer). Jeremias helpfully catalogues the responsibilities of the treasurers known from the Mishnah (see *Jerusalem*, 167). *T. Šeqal.* 2:15 ends its description of the duties of the temple

Because of its substantial wealth, the temple treasury attracted raiders. These include: (1) in 169 B.C.E. Antiochus Epiphanes raided the temple and took from it gold, silver, expensive vessels and other items used in worship, and a reported 1,800 talents (1 Macc 1:21–24; 2 Macc 5:15–16, 21; *Ant.* 12.246–250; *Ag. Ap.* 2.83–84);[244] (2) in 54 B.C.E., M. Licinius Crassus, future governor of Syria, robbed the temple as a means to finance his Parthian expedition. He took the 2,000 talents left there by Pompey, 8,000 talents worth of gold, and a beam of gold that Josephus claims was worth "many ten thousand" shekels (*J.W.* 1.179; *Ant.* 14.105–09);[245] (3) following

---

treasurers with the statement, "[in short] all the [financial] transactions of the Temple were carried out by them" (trans. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 166–67; cf. Neusner's translation: "And all the work of [supervision of acts of] consecration was done by them"). Given the significance and responsibilities of the position, the temple treasurers presumably had ties with or were themselves members of the priestly aristocracy that ran the temple, a status that sometimes drew allegations of benefitting from nepotism and of associating with corrupt high priestly families (*b. Pesaḥ. 57a*; *t. Menaḥ.* 13:21). Sanders cautions against exaggerating the corruption of the priestly aristocracy, however (*Judaism*, 319–32, esp. 323–27, 330–32).

[244] Josephus comments that Antiochus "only came to [the temple] when he wanted money" (*Ag. Ap.* 2.83). The history of pillaging or otherwise appropriating the temple's treasures by no means begins with Antiochus Epiphanes; see Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 93, 220 n. 45; Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 128–29; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 149 n. 154.

[245] Scholars maintain Josephus's figures regarding the temple's treasures are exaggerated, even as they agree the temple had great wealth, especially as a result of the temple tax (Sanders, *Judaism*, 84; E. Mary Smallwood, *Jews Under Roman Rule*, 36 n. 50). However, the evidence pertaining to the large contributions coming from the Diaspora leads Pastor to conclude, "that the figure of 2,000 talents is not all that legendary" (*Land and Economy*, 220 n. 46–47; see §2.4.3 above). Why the temple funds did not increase between 63 B.C.E. when Pompey entered the temple sanctuary and 54 B.C.E. when Crassus seized the 2,000 talents is puzzling, with varying solutions proposed (Gabba, "Finances of King Herod," 168; Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 93, 220 n. 48). Sanders speaks of the 2,000 talents as a "cash reserve" (*Judaism*, 83).

Herod's death in 4 B.C.E., Sabinus robbed the temple treasury of 400 talents in a skirmish that erupted during Pentecost (*J.W.* 2.45–54; *Ant.* 17.258–64); (4) at some point in the years 26–36 C.E., Pontius Pilate looted the treasury, and used the money to build aqueducts from Etam to Jerusalem for the hygienic maintenance of the Temple area. This was a legitimate use of temple funds (*m. Šeqal.* 4:2), yet the people still demonstrated in protest (*J. W.* 2.175; *Ant.* 18.60–62);[246] (5) before the Jewish revolt in 66 C.E., Gessius Florus embezzled 17 talents from the treasury on the pretense that the emperor requested them (*J.W.* 2.293–97).[247] That one ruler after another was attracted to the wealth of the temple treasury suggests its value, as well as its impact on the economy of Jerusalem.[248]

---

[246] It appears that until 41 C.E. the Roman governor of Judea, as did the Herodian kings earlier, had power of supervision over the temple's treasures and their employment (Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 137).

[247] Downplaying the common perception that Jews in Palestine had been steadily leaning toward revolt for some time, Sanders considers Florus's taking of temple funds to be one of two incidences that led to revolt (the other being the bird sacrifice conducted by a group of Gentiles in front of the synagogue in Caesarea) (*Judaism*, 40–41; *J.W.* 2.289–308). That Sanders can argue for such a view illustrates the importance the money in the temple treasury held for Jews, not to mention how intertwined were the temple's economic, political, and religious elements.

[248] "Repeated attempts to confiscate the temple's money and plunder the temple and its treasury testify to the amounts of money and the various treasures kept under the temple's protection" (Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 148–49). According to Josephus, the amount of gold plundered by the soldiers who sacked the Jerusalem temple was enough to affect the gold market in Syria, decreasing the value of gold in Syria by fifty percent (*J.W.* 6.317). Not mentioned in the list above is an accusation claiming the Hasmoneans "plundered the sanctuary of God" (*Ps. Sol.* 8:11), which if true, would have occurred during the Hasmonean period (ca. 140–116 B.C.E.). It is unclear whether this accusation is well founded, though Sanders surmises that it "probably referred to some occasion on which one of the Hasmoneans felt in need of extra money, as did two of the later Roman

2.4.5 The Economic Impact of the Temple Treasury

The liturgical needs of the temple led to commercial expenses, and thus funded by the temple treasury, affected and largely benefitted the economy of Jerusalem and its environs, both directly and indirectly.[249] Temple money was spent on all the duties and needs of the temple, including its upkeep, paying its employees, donating to the poor, and running the sacrificial cult, with all the purchases of animals and other offerings that it entailed (*m. Šeqal.* 4:1–3; 5:6; *m. Menaḥ* 8:1, 6; cf. *y. Ketub. 105a*).[250] *M. Šeqal.* 4:1–3 emphasizes the close connection between the

---

administrators [Pilate and Florus]" (*Judaism*, 160). *T. Levi* 14.5 and CD 16:13–16 accuse priests of plundering the sanctuary, but Sanders questions the veracity of these accusations (ibid., 185).

[249] See Broshi, "Role of the Temple," 34–36; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 134–38. "The great financial resources of the Temple represent an extremely important factor for an overall evaluation of the economic situation of the Herodian kingdom, and later of the Roman province" (Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 124). Even Applebaum, who argues the economic situation in first-century Palestine was bleak, acknowledges the importance of the temple in the Judean economy: "The contributions derived from Diaspora Jewry, whether in the form of the half-shekel payment, or of various other contributions, including money brought in by the yearly pilgrimages, must therefore have played a vital rôle in keeping the Jewish economy on an even keel, but here again, it was chiefly Jerusalem that benefited" ("Economic Life in Palestine," 2:679).

[250] Employees receiving annual support from the temple included 7,000 priests and Levites, a staff of physicians, scribes, maintenance workers, butchers, weavers, metal-workers, incense-makers, bakers of the shewbread, and during the renovations done in the decades prior to 66 C.E., 10,000 labourers and 1,000 priests trained to conduct aspects of the reconstruction (*Ant.* 15.390; *m. Šeqal.* 5:1) (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 683).

temple treasury and Jerusalem, stating temple funds were to provide for "all the city's needs" (*m. Šeqal.* 4:2).[251]

Because the temple had facilities for storing vast amounts of wealth, it engaged in certain practices commonly associated with banks today.[252] It accepted large sums as private deposits for safekeeping. These deposits did not accrue interest but were stored on the expectation of divine protection (2 Macc 3:4–40, esp. 3:3–30; 4 Macc. 4:1–14; *J.W.* 6.282; *Ant.* 14.111–13; *m. 'Arak.* 9:4).[253] The money in the

---

[251] On the needs met by funds in the temple treasury, see Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 150.

[252] On the architecture of the temple's treasury rooms, see Dan Bahat, "The Herodian Temple," in *CHJ* 3:57–58; Th. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem, von Salomo bis Herodes: Eine archäologish-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus* (2 vols.; Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970–1980), 2:1097–1105 (followed by Sanders, *Judaism*, 63; 501n45); Netzer, *Architecture of Herod*, 149. The temple functioned more as a treasury or depository than it did as a full-fledged bank, hence Applebaum's succinct reference to the Jerusalem temple as a "deposit bank" ("Economic Life in Palestine," 683) and Carol Meyers's careful description: "The Temple, with its treasures and its treasuries, was a national bank *of sorts*" ("Temple, Jerusalem," *ABD* 6:361; italics mine). See also Stevens *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 137; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 149. There is no evidence that the temple offered loans.

[253] See E. J. Bickerman, "Héliodore au Temple de Jérusalem," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (ed. Amram Tropper; 2 vols.; new ed.; *AGJU* 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 2:168; Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 140–44; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 149. As sacred sites protected by the deity or deities that resided in them, temples were believed to be secure places to store treasure. See *J.W.* 6.282, for example, which indicates that when war threatened, the wealthy took their valuables from their homes and stored them in the temple (Sanders, *Judaism*, 504 n. 14). Belief in the divine protection of the treasures stored in the temple persisted even though "not everyone respected every god or God, and the temple in Jerusalem was plundered more than once" (Sanders, *Judaism*, 83). The temple's design and structure also contributed to the expectation that money and valuables stored in the temple would remain secure (*Ant.* 14.113; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 149; see n. 96 above). As Stevenson states regarding ancient temples in general, "[S]ince divine

treasury was reserved for institutional and civic purposes, a restriction that caused tension between the temple authorities and their imperial leaders.[254] Emilio Gabba accordingly observes, "The sums deposited in its treasury therefore represented, in a certain sense, unproductive capital."[255]

Even still, the treasury's significance as a secure repository should not be underestimated. Jerusalem Jews could count on it to sustain them economically if necessary. This is most clearly seen in *Ant.* 20.219–22, which tells of how treasury funds were used to secure employment for 18,000 workers left unemployed upon the completion of the temple's reconstruction.[256] Not only did this action benefit these

---

awe alone would not bar the impious or the greedy, temples were among the most formidable structures of the city with their thick walls, strong locks, trusted key-bearers and guards" (*Power and Place*, 72–73).

[254] Pilate's act of using temple funds to build new aqueducts for the temple (*J.W.* 2.175–77; *Ant.* 18.60–62) is best seen as his forcing the temple to use its own funds for their intended purposes (*m. Šeqal.* 4:2) (Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 3:124–25; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 16 n. 30; cf. Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 142). It is possible that the issue may not have been the fact that Pilate used the money to build aqueducts, which was an acceptable use of temple funds, but that Pilate took sacred money or a particular category of sacred money (Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 150). "One must not assume that all money and treasure kept in the temple was viewed as a monolithic entity. There were private deposits, money set aside for maintenance and performance of the temple and cult, money for civic use, and various gifts, votive offerings and adornments. It may be, perhaps, that Pilate used money specifically marked for sacred functions" (ibid., 150 n. 161).

[255] "Social, Economic and Political History," 3:125.

[256] "But nothing shows better the significance of this invisible resource than the initiative of Jerusalem's leading citizens in using the sacred treasures to give new employment to the 18,000 workers unemployed after the completion of the Temple and to avoid the treasures possibly falling into Roman hands (an initiative welcomed in part by King Agrippa II). The Temple supplies an extraneous and often overlooked, but still highly favourable factor in the social and economic life of

temple workers, it also kept the funds deposited in the temple secure from being appropriated by Roman governors (*Ant.* 20.220).[257]

The episode in *Ant.* 20.219–22 provides some clues as to how the temple functioned as a depository.[258] First, the temple had been the site of substantial private deposits, as indicated by (1) the potential for Roman officials to be interested in the sums being stored, and (2) by the fact that the sums could be used to provide employment for 18,000 workers for an indefinite period. Second, those who made deposits in the temple were generally people of means and influence who had Agrippa's ear and "felt qualified to make suggestions regarding construction on the Temple complex."[259] Third, in this case the depositors had a real say in how their

---

Jerusalem and Judaea, especially in the period when it is coupled with Herod's great projects for public works" (ibid., 3:125). In contrast, Martin Goodman views the "unproductive capital" of the temple treasury negatively as a cause of social and economic tension: "The problem was, in sum, that outsiders tended to spend lavishly in Jerusalem but not to invest in the local economy, and they ignored production in the countryside altogether. Furthermore, some of the locals' wealth lay as unproductive capital in the Temple treasury, awaiting the all too frequent attentions of rapacious Romans such as Crassus. The result was an economy potentially out of balance" (*The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome, A.D. 66–70* [London: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 53).

[257] That the temple routinely operated at a surplus and contained so much wealth was thus sometimes problematic, creating dilemmas and leaving the temple funds liable to government seizure. Steps were taken to keep people's money as secure as possible, with the hopes of circumventing an incident like Florus's taking of 17 talents (*J.W.* 2.293–97; cf. Pilate's actions in *J. W.* 2.175; *Ant.* 18.60–62).

[258] See Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 156.

[259] Ibid. While the temple may have accepted the deposits of the poor, most of the money deposited for safekeeping belonged to the rich of Jerusalem and of wider Judea. Despite its mention that "there were some deposits belonging to widows and orphans" in the temple treasury, we have warrant to be suspicious of 2 Macc 3:10, since the claim serves the interest of maligning those seeking to

money could be managed while stored in the temple, even though Agrippa had control over these funds.[260] Fourth, this passage confirms that temple funds could just as easily be used for public works as they could for maintaining and operating the temple and its cult (*m. Šeqal.* 4:1–3). Fifth, Roman governors could mandate use of these funds, a prerogative Pilate had used not too long before. In fact, Rome had ultimate control of the treasury, and Agrippa's control of it is explicitly granted by Rome (*Ant.* 20.222). Finally, as Pastor suggests, "other than their fear of the Romans' avarice, it is clear that the initiators of the proposal were anxious about having thousands of unemployed men in the Jerusalem area."[261] The support on the part of the upper classes for the continual employment of these laborers has less to do with a concern for the general wellbeing of these laborers than it does with their own security concerns in increasingly hostile times.[262]

---

confiscate the temple's deposits in the story. At any rate, even if the poor made deposits in the temple, their deposits would have been outnumbered by those made by the wealthy. Moreover, that in 2 Macc 3 Heliodorus's proposed raid on the deposits in the temple roused the people of Jerusalem "may indicate that there was more than widows' pensions involved" (ibid., 46). Cf. Josephus's description of the wealth in the temple treasury in *J.W.* 6.282: "They further burnt the treasury-chambers, in which lay vast sums of money, vast piles of raiment, and other valuables; for this, in short, was the general repository of Jewish wealth, to which the rich had consigned the contents of their dismantled houses" (Thackeray, LCL). An analysis of the use of money in first-century Palestine lead Hanson and Oakman to conclude that storage was among the uses of money available only to the elites and their agents (*Palestine*, 116).

[260] The people protested Pilate's appropriation of temple funds, further indicating an expectation on their part that they had a say in how money deposited in the temple treasury would be used (*J.W.* 2.175; *Ant.* 18.60; see n. 112 above).

[261] Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 156.

[262] Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 155.

So though the temple did not engage in all of the activities that constitute banking, it did store wealth derived from the temple's sources of income and from the wealthy who deposited money for safekeeping. Part of this wealth was expected to serve the needs of the city, and Jerusalem Jews could count on this wealth in times of trouble. S. Applebaum surmises that the temple's income from abroad may have, however approximately, matched Palestine's foreign expenditures and even helped to offset the Roman Empire's import expenses.[263] Sanders agrees with Applebaum on this point, noting, "The cost of the temple lay less heavily on the shoulders of Palestinians than most people recognize."[264]

This section on the moneychangers in the temple began by discussing their role in assisting with the sale of sacrificial goods and animals and the collection of the temple tax. Collection of the temple tax increased the temple's wealth, which in turn helped establish the temple as an important treasury that met various financial needs of Judea and its people and attracted attention from Roman rulers. Thus in their role as facilitators of the sale of sacrificial goods and of the collection of the temple tax, the moneychangers lie at the surface of the temple's identity as an economic institution that is indeed layered and multifaceted.

2.5 The Temple as a Center of Trade

The Jerusalem temple was an economic institution of some magnitude. It attracted substantial economic activity to Jerusalem, its worship rituals sustained

---

[263] "Economic Life in Palestine," 678.

[264] Sanders, *Judaism*, 164.

certain trades in Judea, and its own income and expenditures made it a vital economic engine of the holy city. It drew in merchants and moneychangers who would profit from the presence of worshippers visiting the temple (especially for its pilgrimage festivals); temple personnel were directly or near-directly involved in the buying and selling of sacrificial animals (especially doves) and the exchanging of money; and temple personnel used funds in the treasury derived from such sources of income as the temple tax to purchase the materials and hire the labor necessary to maintain the temple cult, to expand and renovate the temple and pay for its upkeep, to perform public works for the city, and to protect (with varying success) the people's money from the threat of outside forces. The temple treasurers oversaw or outright executed routine commercial transactions that kept commerce related to the Jerusalem temple flourishing for as long as the temple stood.[265]

To the information about the temple's purchase of large quantities of sacrificial animals from throughout Palestine (see §2.3 above, esp. §2.3.5), we can add that it bought: high-quality flour from Mihmash (northeast of Jerusalem), Zenoah (southwest of Jerusalem), and Haphraim (Lower Galilee); barley and the shewbread from Bikat Beth Makalah, Sarafand, and Bikat Ein-Soker; wine from

---

[265] "The cultus provided the main source of income for the city. It maintained the priestly aristocracy, the priesthood and the Temple employees. The vast expenditure from the Temple treasury (one need think only of the rebuilding of the Temple) to say nothing of the many ceremonial activities of the devout such as sacrifices and vows—provided numerous opportunities of money-making for the trade and commerce of the city" (Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 138). Magen Broshi notes that the pilgrimage industry and the economic activity it stimulated turned Jerusalem into "an important commercial centre" ("Role of the Temple," 34).

Qeruhim or Qerothim, Hattulim, Beth Rimmah, Beth Laban, Kephar Segana, and other parts of Palestine; and oil from Tekoa, Regev, and Gush Halav (*m. Menaḥ* 8:1, 6). The temple must also have bought large quantities of wood, incense, and cloth, and vessels and basins as needed.[266] Produce, wine, and oil within a day's walk to Jerusalem was grown and processed in a manner intended to guarantee its purity and make it eligible for sale as offerings worshippers could bring to the temple (*m. Ḥag.* 3:4; *Ma'aś. Š.* 5:2). Temple treasurers sold or oversaw the sale of sacrificial items that were highly susceptible to impurity (*m. Šeqal.* 5:4).[267]

The celebration of Passover and its attendant influx of pilgrims especially increased demand in Jerusalem for items such as vegetables, spices, wine, and other goods that were prescribed for keeping Passover.[268] Wine must have been purchased in large quantities for the Passover ritual, since even the poorest had to drink at least four cups' worth (*m. Pesaḥ.* 2:6; 10:3; cf. *Lam. Rab.* 2.5 on 2.2 [Son. 2.4, 162]; cf. *y. Ta'an. 4.8, 69a*).[269] Unleavened bread too could have been found for sale in the markets of Jerusalem (*m. Pesaḥ.* 2:5).

While demand for temple supplies increased during Passover and other festivals, even during non-festival periods the quantity of goods that was needed to

---

[266] Sanders, *Judaism*, 81, 85.

[267] S. Safrai, "The Temple," 881; see §2.3.5 above.

[268] These include lettuce, chicory, pepperwort, endives, and dandelion, and the ingredients for making *ḥaroset*, a puree made of crushed fruits, spices, wine, and wine vinegar (*m. Pesaḥ.* 2:6; 10:3) (Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 46).

[269] Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 46.

keep the temple running was enormous. The temple treasurers managed these goods efficiently, and as a result the temple regularly ran at a surplus.[270] The Mishnah hints that surplus temple supplies were traded outside the temple as necessary (*m. Šeqal.* 4:3; cf. *m. Yoma* 5:6).[271] There must also have been times when a deficit had to be addressed, and so it is reasonable to conclude that trading was an economic activity the Jerusalem temple undertook as a means to manage both surpluses and shortages.[272] The temple's demand for goods may have influenced the market price of certain goods in Jerusalem, or at least there was a close relationship between temple authorities and the administrator of the city market (2 Macc 3:4; *m. Šeqal.* 4:9). Materials used for the temple's reconstruction and maintenance, and for its routine needs, were imported from the world over.[273]

---

[270] Discussed above (§2.4.5) is an incident in which an excess of funds in the temple treasury was diverted to keep thousands of laborers employed rather than run the risk of having those funds be seized by the Romans (*Ant.* 20.219–22).

[271] *M. Šeqal.* 4:3 contains a debate over whether surplus treasury funds were used to make more money for the temple by buying cultic supplies and then reselling them at a profit. R. Aqiba denies that any profit-making of the sort took place, but this does not mean it did not. Applebaum ("Economic Life in Palestine," 2:678) and Bauckham ("Jesus' Demonstration," 78) assume that it did.

[272] Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 378, 425; Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 120.

[273] The temple's most famous and valuable gate, the Nicanor Gate, was made of bronze from Corinth (*J.W.* 5.201; *t. Yoma* 2:4; *b. Yoma 38a*; cf. Acts 3:2); timber and cedar wood for building the temple, for adorning its roofs, and for the pillars upon which animals were slaughtered came from Lebanon at high expense (*J.W.* 5.36, 191; *m. Mid.* 3:5, 8; 4:5); the magnificent curtain in front of the holy of holies came from Babylon (*J.W.* 5.212–14); fine linen from Egypt and India was purchased for the high priest's garment (*m. Yoma* 3:7), and presumably linen from these places was also used for other purposes (cf. *j. Soṭah i.6, 17a.19*); and incense and spices, which were expensive and yet used in large amounts, came from the east,

Gabba argues that the temple's economic apparatus is responsible for giving rise to a middle, merchant class in Jerusalem that was missing elsewhere in Palestine, where agriculture was the order of the day.[274] Sanders lists the following trades and industry that the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple stimulated in Jerusalem: a special industry to produce stone vessels impervious to impurity; the incense industry which employed people to import, ground, and mix incense; the linen industry, for priests' robes; and the tourist trade, for pilgrims, which of course is closely tied with the sacrificial animal trade, which in turn stimulated an industry in animal hides.[275] Jeremias's description of the temple's commercial influence in Jerusalem is accurate: "The Temple was the most important factor in the commerce of Jerusalem. By means of the Temple treasury, to which every Jew had to pay his annual dues, the whole of the world-wide Jewry contributed to the commerce of Jerusalem."[276]

---

particularly Arabia (*J.W.* 5.218; 6.390; cf. *Let. Arist.* 114; *b. Ker. 6a*), since incense consisted of nard, frankincense from Hadramaut, cassia and cinnamon from Ethiopia, costum from India, and aloe wood and galbanum from Judea (Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:674; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 37; on spices and the spice trade during this period, see J. Innes Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire, 29 B.C. to A.D. 641* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1969]). From this information Jeremias draws a sensible conclusion: "Although we depend entirely on chance information, the conclusion is reached that foreign trade had considerable importance for the Holy City. The Temple drew the largest share" (*Jerusalem*, 38). This foreign trade undermines Josephus's well-known comment in *Ag. Ap.* 1.60 about the Jewish people's supposed predilection against commerce (see Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 632–33).

[274] "Social, Economic and Political History," 111.

[275] *Judaism*, 124.

[276] *Jerusalem*, 57.

The temple was therefore the cause of, venue for, and constituent element in a vibrant trade in Jerusalem, especially at festival time.[277] In Judea, temple commerce was as constitutive a component of a temple's identity as was cultic worship, and indeed it was a sign of a temple's efficacy at facilitating worship.[278] The sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple was a vital and consequential aspect of the temple's identity that left its mark on the city and beyond.

2.6 The Economic Impact of the Temple's Construction

---

[277] Sanders describes the temple's participation in trade as follows: "The temple had to trade with local merchants and craftsmen for some items. It consumed large quantities of incense (which was burned first thing in the morning and last thing in the evening: Ex. 30.7f.; *Spec. Laws* 1.171), and it also required a good deal of cloth. Its vessels and basins (for cooking, carrying blood to the altar, and so on) needed periodic attention. The Mishnah depicts the temple as a tough trading partner: in the case of price variation between conclusion of contract and completion of sale, 'the temple always has the upper hand' (*Sheqalim* 4.9). Small tradesmen may have been made to realize that they supplied the needs of a powerful corporation, but this particular mishnah comes at the end of a chapter that contains numerous second-century disputes about how the temple managed its goods, and it is not necessarily a description of how pre-70 trade was conducted. Rather than assume gross abuse, we should think that the usual kind of symbiotic relationship existed. The temple needed tradesmen and craftsmen, and it must have paid fair prices and wages, at least on average...Building projects also required the use of local markets and workmen...[and the temple] played some role in supplying worshippers with sacrificial victims" (*Judaism*, 85).

[278] "Seeing some priests as administrators and the temple as a commercial enterprise is essential for understanding ancient Judaism" (Sanders, *Judaism*, 91). According to Sanders, the temple's commercial expectations influenced its design, specifically that of the Royal Portico, where much of the business and trade related to the temple took place: "It is reasonable to think that Herod knew from the outset that this trade had to take place somewhere if the temple was to function efficiently. He was interested in efficiency and traffic control, as the great care that his builders took with the streets and shops to the south and west of the temple wall demonstrates" (ibid., 68). On the Royal Portico, see ibid., 64–68. On the layout of the temple shops (located on what Sanders labels "West Wall Street"), see ibid., 69.

In John 2:20, the Jews mention the ongoing construction of the Jerusalem temple. The economic background of the temple's construction merits investigation, as this verse suggests that economic matters are interwoven into the fabric of the entire pericope, not merely found in the first half of 2:13–22.

John 2:20 refers to the temple's expansion and renovation, not its initial construction. Originally built under Zerubbabel, the second temple underwent major expansion and renovation from either 20/19 B.C.E. (*Ant.* 15.380) or 23/22 B.C.E. (*J.W.* 1.401) to ca. 63 C.E. (*Ant.* 20.219).[279] In the eighteenth (*Ant.* 15.380) or fifteenth (*J.W.* 1.401) year of his reign, Herod the Great initiated this ambitious project as the pinnacle of his many public works.[280] Work on major parts of the temple was completed well before ca. 63 C.E. In one year and six months priests built the sanctuary, while the porticoes and outer walls, whose construction was overseen by Herod, took eight years (*Ant.* 15.420–21). By stating that the temple had been undergoing construction for forty-six years, the Jews in John 2:20 confirm what is

---

[279] On the construction of the second temple, see Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 41–59.

[280] Most scholars agree that the temple's reconstruction commenced in 20/19 B.C.E., during the eighteenth year of Herod's reign. Less clear is the reason for the discrepancy between *Ant.* 15.380 and *J.W.* 1.401. According to Jeremias, both of Josephus's dates for the commencement of the temple's reconstruction indicate 20/19 B.C.E. Herod became King of Judea in 40 B.C.E., but it was three years later, in 37 B.C.E., that he gained possession of his kingdom. Josephus derives seemingly different dates for the start of the temple's reconstruction by using two different methods of establishing chronology, one based on Herod's appointment as king, the other on his gaining control of Judea (*J.W.* 1.665; *Ant.* 17.191) (*Jerusalem*, 21 n. 39). Descriptions of Herod's temple based on both archaeological and literary sources can be found in Bahat, "Herodian Temple," 43–58; Netzer, *Architecture of Herod*, 137–78; Sanders, *Judaism*, 54–69.

known from Josephus, namely that construction, repair, and maintenance had continued on the temple up until ca. 63 C.E. (*Ant.* 15.391; 20.220).[281]

The temple's reconstruction had a remarkable impact on Jerusalem's economy and that of its neighbors.[282] Many and expensive materials had to be purchased and transported to Jerusalem, such as large stones and precious metals (*Spec. Laws* 1.71–73; *J.W.* 5.189; *Ant.* 15.390; *m. Šeqal.* 4:4). The impact of the temple's reconstruction on the economy was in addition to its regular economic impact, as the daily and seasonal temple rituals did not cease during its reconstruction.[283]

Perhaps more remarkable is the number of people who were employed as a direct result of the temple's reconstruction. According to Josephus, 10,000 lay

---

[281] Though Herod officially celebrated the end of construction nine and a half years after construction began in 20/19 B.C.E. (*Ant.* 15.380) or 23/22 B.C.E., *Ant.* 15.391 mentions repairs done during Nero's reign (54–68 C.E.), and laborers worked on the temple during the first half of Agrippa II's reign (50–93 C.E.) (*Ant.* 20.220). Recent excavations along the Western Wall reveal that Herod left the temple unfinished (Bahat, "Herodian Temple," in *CHJ* 3:39).

[282] "[T]he reconstruction of the Temple, which began in 20–19 BCE and lasted officially for nine and a half years...set in motion a series of activities which gave work for decades to thousands of labourers, thus representing the main source of sustenance for the capital city...it gave an impetus to the entire economic life of the kingdom and cannot but have created a general situation of reasonable well-being, even in comparison with many Roman provinces" (Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 3:123–24:)

[283] The buildings were designed in a manner that prevented temple laborers from observing temple rituals during construction and afterward (*m. 'Ed.* 8:6; *m. Mid.* 4:5), and the older sanctuary was not dismantled until the building materials for the new site had been assembled. These measures illustrate that Herod took great care in not offending the people's religious sensibilities during the temple's construction (cf. *Ant* 15.382–87) and that the project required a high degree of planning and coordination with the temple priests (Bahat, "Herodian Temple," 3:39; Netzer, *Architecture of Herod*, 12, 140, 146–47).

workers and 1,000 priests were trained for the project and worked on it at its beginnings (*Ant.* 15.390). Elsewhere Josephus writes of the aforementioned (§2.4.5) 18,000 workers who were saved from unemployment, remaining hired to pave Jerusalem's streets and then initiate a new set of building works in the temple (*Ant.* 20.219–22). Allowing for some exaggeration on Josephus's part, "it is clear that a whole army of labourers must have been involved."[284] These laborers were thought of highly,[285] and some of those involved in the building of the temple were wealthy people whose own resources contributed to the economy of Jerusalem.[286]

---

[284] Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 22. Pastor reports on the work of two engineers from the Technion Institute of Haifa who undertook an analysis of the building of the temple in terms of workforce and costs, and concluded the project involved 50,000 man-years of labor, a permanent crew of 7,000–8,000 but a total workforce of approximately 10,000 (*Land and Economy*, 114). This analysis is speculative, to be sure, but any way one looks at it, Herod's reconstruction of the temple gave work to thousands of people.

[285] In *Ant.* 20.219–22, this is indicated by the people's advocacy for their employment, even if the people had the ulterior motive of avoiding the volatile situation of having so many unemployed people in Jerusalem at a tense time in its history. Archaeological finds suggests that the 1,000 priests trained to assemble the sanctuary (*Ant.* 15.390) were esteemed. One ossuary contains the epitaph, "Simon, Builder of the Sanctuary" (Joseph Naveh, "The Ossuary Inscriptions from Giv'at ha-Mivtar," *IEJ* 20 (1970): 33–34: Rahmani 200 and Plate 27). Simon's title reveals that he was probably among the priests trained under Herod to be masons and carpenters for building the temple sanctuary (*Ant.* 15.390, 420–21). Normally, epitaphs like this only contain the name and patronymic of the deceased, so this additional information illustrates the prestige that resulted from close association with the temple (Williams, "Contribution of Jewish Inscriptions," 88). It also indicates that participating in its reconstruction was regarded as a noble endeavor.

[286] Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 114. See *OGIS* 599; SEG 8:200; N. Haas, "Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv'at ha-Mivtar," *IEJ* 20 (1970): 38–59; Naveh, "Ossuary Inscriptions," 33–37; James F. Strange, "Late Hellenistic and Herodian Ossuary Tombs at French Hill, Jerusalem," *BASOR* 219 (1975): 39–67.

While it is not universally acknowledged that the temple's construction had an entirely positive effect on the economy, recent scholarship has shown that Herod's economic policies, of which the temple's reconstruction was a major factor, had an overall beneficial effect for Palestine.[287] One scholarly perspective points out that the burden of financing large building projects like those of Herod comes in the form of taxes to fund the projects and low wages to carry them out.[288] However, according to Josephus, Herod built the temple at his own expense (*Ant.* 15.380; 17.162) with some assistance from private donations (*J.W.* 5.189), and maintenance and repairs on the temple that took place after Herod's time came from the ample funds of the temple treasury (*Ant.* 20.219–22).[289] Moreover, the temple's

---

[287] Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 118–125; Moses I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, 127; Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 114–15. Peter Richardson understands Herod's building program as, among other things, "a strategy of economic expansion...aimed to stimulate the economy of Judea, enhance its trade position, and secure full employment" (*Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* [Studies on the Personalities of the New Testament; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1996], 193–94; see 174–215). Richardson notes that the people valued the employment provided by Herod's reconstruction of the temple (ibid., 185–86). For opposing views, see Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:661; Grant, *Economic Background*, 69–70; Menahem Stern, "The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty," in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, 1:238–39.

[288] Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 2:661; Grant, *Economic Background*, 69–70; Menahem Stern, "The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty," in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, 1:238–39.

[289] Gabba finds it difficult to doubt Josephus's claim that Herod built the temple at his own expense ("Social, Economic and Political History," 123). Private donations for the building of temples were commonplace in antiquity, and all incarnations of the Jerusalem temple benefitted from them (Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 150–51). In the case of the Herodian temple, we have inscriptional evidence of

construction gave secure employment to thousands of people for decades (*Ant.* 15.390; 20.219–22), whose income in turn supported others in Judea, especially Jerusalem.[290] Pastor points out that not all of the laborers working on the temple needed to be craftsmen, and indeed could have included farmers who sought other work during the off-season.[291] The reconstruction effort also spurred an increase in donations and pilgrimages to the temple, which helped offset costs, provide employment, and stimulate economic activity in Jerusalem.[292] It was only after Herod's death that financing the continuing building works of the temple weighed heavily on the temple's resources, as can be seen in Agrippa's decision not to rebuild the eastern cloisters because it was not cost effective to do so (*Ant.* 20.220–22).[293]

---

one such donation (see Benjamin Isaac, "A Donation for Herod's Temple in Jerusalem," *IEJ* 33 [1983]: 86–92).

[290] Gabba, "Social, Economic and Political History," 123; Goodman, *Ruling Class of Judaea*, 64; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 21–27; Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 114.

[291] *Land and Economy*, 114.

[292] Pastor, *Land and Economy*, 115; Isaac, "A Donation for Herod's Temple," 86–93. According to *m. Šeqal.* 4:6, craftsmen's wages were in part taken from donations to the temple.

[293] Sanders's conclusion on the economic impact of Herod's building policies seems reasonable: "Moreover, a lot of Herod's expenditure was ploughed back into the local economy. Applebaum calls many of his building schemes 'unproductive monuments' [Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 666]. The temple, however, was not unproductive; Herod's expansion, which included additional space for shops, served pilgrims, who brought a lot of money, a good deal of which came from other countries. Moreover, Herod's projects provided employment for thousands. According to Josephus, when the temple was finally completed, long after Herod's death, 18,000 people were thrown out of work, and Agrippa II had to find a new project to employ some of them (*Antiq.* 20.219). During Herod's lifetime, the number of labourers must have been much larger, since he carried out numerous massive building projects, some of which ran concurrently (the temple, Caesarea, a

2.7 The Temple as an Economic Institution

This examination of temple commerce in first-century Jerusalem has shown the impact of the temple on the Judean and wider Palestinian economy.[294] The pilgrimage festivals, especially Passover, attracted crowds of people who spent their money in Jerusalem as part of the pilgrimage experience. These feasts provided an attractive opportunity for such businesspeople as animal merchants and moneychangers to ply their trade and make a profit. Over time, the temple accumulated a vast wealth that allowed it to perform its religious and economic duties; to carry out large-scale reconstruction, renovation, and maintenance; and to support the city and environs of Jerusalem in diverse ways. The Jerusalem temple thus "constituted an economic unit in its own right."[295] It "was not only a religious and national center, but also an economic 'empire' and center of surplus production."[296] Its impact as economic center was felt beyond the city in which it stood.

---

series of palaces at Jericho, fort-palaces at Matsada and the Herodium, Sebaste (Samaria), and others)" (*Judaism*, 164–65).

[294] "[I]t would appear that the majority of the residents of Jerusalem made their living in one form or another from the Temple or its environs" (Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 426). The prophet Haggai, who advocated for the initial rebuilding of the temple upon the return from exile (1:1–15, esp. 1:2–4), was correct in identifying a causal relation between the state of the temple and the economic prosperity of the people (see Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 51–52).

[295] Applebaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," 683.

[296] Z. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 425.

Attending to the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple in the first century is crucial to developing an exegesis of John 2:13–22 that situates it in its economic context. This chapter reconstructs the economic context of this pericope by examining in detail the economic realities that form the backdrop of this text. The information presented in this chapter has never all been gathered together for the sake of interpreting the Gospel of John. In the following chapter, I will conduct an exegesis of John 2:13–22 that demonstrates how viewing the temple as both a religious and economic institution deepens our understanding of this important pericope. In the course of this exegesis, access to the information collected in this chapter will show that John did have knowledge of temple practices and that he was attuned to economic realities in Judea. This data suggests that any interpretations of 2:13–22 that ignores this data do not read this passage as a first century Judean audience would have read it.

3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Temple Commerce in Judea

3.1 The Temple as Both the House of God and a Place of Economic Networks: Reevaluating the Consensus Interpretation

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how knowledge of the Jerusalem temple's sacred economy contributes to the interpretation of John 2:13–22. According to the dominant interpretation of 2:13–22, John uses the temple incident to propose Jesus as the replacement or fulfillment of the Jerusalem temple. Jesus' temple act abrogates the sacrificial cult and judges the temple institution and those who run it. John depicts Jesus declaring an end to the temple cult and presenting his body as the new temple, replacing the "old" ways of worship with his very person.[297]

---

[297] Examples of this line of interpretation are plentiful. See C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978); Brown, *John*, 1:114–25; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991); Jacob Chanikuzhy, *Jesus, the Eschatological Temple: An Exegetical Study of Jn 2,13–22 in the Light of the Pre-70 C.E. Eschatological Temple Hopes and the Synoptic Temple Action* (CBET; Leuven: Peeters, 2012); Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells*; Dubarle, "Le signe du temple," 21–44; Johannes Frühwald-König, *Tempel und Kult: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Biblische Untersuchungen 27; Regensburg: Pustet, 1998); Hoskins, *Fulfillment*; Hoskyns, "Adversaria Exegetica"; idem., *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. Francis Noel Davey; 2nd ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1947); Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup 220; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); Xavier Léon-Dufour, "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean," *RSR* 39 (1951–1952): 155–75; James McCaffrey, *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2–3* (AnBib 114; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1987), 185–92; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP 4; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998); Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*; Rahner, *„Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes"*; Ricardo López Rosas, *La Señal del Templo, Jn 2,13-22: Redefinición Cristológica de lo Sacro* (Biblioteca Mexicana 12; Mexico: Departamento de Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de México, A.C., 2001).

Cited in support of the consensus view is Jesus' driving out the cattle and the sheep, an action interpreted as a symbolic dismissal and removal of the temple's sacrificial cult.[298] His disruption of the moneychangers at work is read to support the same point, since as collectors of the temple tax moneychangers played a part in maintaining the sacrificial system.[299] The temple logion in 2:19 and the narrator's comment in 2:21—ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ—confirm John's claim that Jesus replaces the temple.[300] The immediately preceding sign at Cana (2:1–11), which shows Jesus turning into wine the water set aside for use in Jewish purification rituals, when read as contributing to the theme of replacement, reinforces or confirms this interpretation of 2:13–22.[301]

A basic knowledge of the Jerusalem sacred economy as laid out in chapter 2 provides grounds to reevaluate John 2:13–22 and question this consensus. The consensus interpretation highlights the symbolic and theological significance of the

---

[298] For example, C.H. Dodd writes, "The purging of the temple—that is, the expulsion of the sacrificial animals from its courts—signifies the destruction and replacement of the system of religious observance of which the temple was the centre: a new 'temple' for an old one" (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953], 301). Similarly, Schnackenburg: "The cleansing of the temple is meant to portray the abrogation of the Jewish cult by Jesus, and its replacement by himself and his community" (*John*, 1:356). The Johannine Jesus' actions in this passage are said to be "against the Temple sacrificial system itself" (Howard-Brook, *Becoming Children of God*, 84). See also Coloe, *God Dwells*, 72–73; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 18–19.

[299] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 72–73; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 18–19.

[300] Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 65–67, 87–89.

[301] Brown, *John*, 1:121 (cf. 1:104); Coloe, *God Dwells*, 69–70; Kerr, *Temple*, 69–71; C. Koester, "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John," *Bib* 70 (1989): 331; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 89–90.

temple's status as the locus of divine presence in order to make the case for the temple's symbolic replacement by Jesus' body, which appears as the new locus of divine presence.[302] The Jerusalem temple, however, was a multifaceted institution that served a host of religious, cultural, social, political, and economic functions. It was a real place, built around complex systems. Chapter 2 offered a glimpse of the temple's economic arm, and similar studies could showcase the temple's other roles.[303] No first-century reader of John's Gospel would have thought of the temple primarily or exclusively as a theological symbol that can be replaced, whose place in the community could easily transfer to some other entity. The identity and influence of the temple as an economic center was as important to its place in first-century Judea as its religious status as the locus of divine presence. Bringing the economic realities to bear on the interpretation of 2:13–22 produces a different reading of John's temple scene that respects the temple's identity as both a religious and economic center.

3.2 Johannine Studies and the Temple in the Gospel of John

---

[302] For example, Coloe writes of "the narrative skill and theological insight of the author who designs his scenes to convey his Christological perspective that Jesus, and later the community, displaces the Temple as the *locus* of the divine dwelling" (*God Dwells*, 14; italics hers).

[303] See, for example, Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 115–182. A survey of the numerous functions of the temple in Jewish life and thought leads Stevenson to remark, "It was the religious center for the Jewish people, a potent force in the economy, a social and cultural cohesive agent, and an institution bound up with the political and national life of the community" (*Power and Place*, 181).

The view that John presents Jesus as the temple's replacement or fulfillment is a longstanding feature of Johannine scholarship, though scholars are not always clear as to whether they see Jesus as the temple's replacement or fulfillment, or both.[304] Various older studies develop this view, and many of the standard commentaries adhere to the consensus that Jesus replaces and/or fulfills the Jerusalem temple.[305] Some patristic and medieval authors also write of Jesus being the true temple of God, sometimes with the attendant claim that as the true temple he brings to an end the sacrificial cult.[306]

---

[304] Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 10–18 (esp. 10 n. 41), 190 n. 36. Hoskins elaborates his own position on this question in ibid., 189–93.

[305] Older studies include: Dubarle, "Le signe du temple"; Hoskyns, "Adversaria Exegetica"; McCaffrey, *House*, 185–92; Léon-Dufour, "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean"; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*. For commentaries, see n. 1 above. Commenting on 2:21, C. K. Barrett states, "the human body of Jesus was the place where a unique manifestation of God took place and consequently became the only true Temple, the only centre of true worship" (*John*, 201)." Carson: "the human body of Jesus...[is] the living abode of God on earth, the fulfilment of all the temple meant, and the centre of all true worship (over against all other claims of 'holy space', 4.20–24)" (*John*, 182). Brown in particular structures his commentary to highlight the Johannine theme of Jesus as the replacement of Judaism, noting in his introduction "the importance given to the theme of Jesus' replacement of Jewish institutions like ritual purification, the Temple, and worship in Jerusalem (chs. ii–iv) and Jewish feasts like the Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles and Dedication (chs. v–x)" (*John*, 1:lxx).

[306] E.g., Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.138–39; Lactantius, *Inst.* 4.18, 25; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on John* 1.2.13–18, 19; Theodoret of Cyr, *Dialogue* 3.61; Bede, *Homilies on the Gospels* 2.1. Still, one finds in patristic and medieval writings a noteworthy degree of nuance and diversity of interpretation on this point, with some patristic interpreters emphasizing the church as the temple of God (e.g., Augustine, *Explanation of Psalm* 130.2–3; *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 10.9; Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.11; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.228–29.) or stating that it is the bodies of individual Christians who are temples for God's Spirit (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.6.2; Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 10.133, 221). Some modern scholars also understand John as

Johannine studies has witnessed a recent increase in interest in the temple in John, as seen in the publication of several monographs that develop the consensus interpretation of John 2:13–22.[307] Of note are Mary L. Coloe's *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (2001) and Alan R. Kerr's *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (2002). Coloe and Kerr trace

---

envisioning the church or the disciples as God's new temple. Among these, some argue for the church's replacement of the temple in lieu of its replacement by Jesus, while others maintain that Jesus' body as the replacement of the temple is the link between the destroyed Jerusalem temple and the church, since early Christianity saw the church as the body of Christ (1 Cor 3:16; 12:12–30; Rom 12:4–5; Eph 1:23; 2:21; 4:12; cf. 4:12–13, 15–16; Col 1:18, 24). See Mary L. Coloe, *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007); idem., *God Dwells*, 3; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 300–03; John F. McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1–4* (ed. Graham N. Stanton; ICC; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 201–16; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 75–84; Peter Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 171.

[307] Coloe, *God Dwells*; Frühwald-König, *Tempel und Kult*; Kerr, *Temple*; Hoskins, *Fulfillment*; Rahner, *"Er aber sprach"*. Not a monograph, Mark Kinzer's essay, "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John," addresses the same topic. Kinzer admits that John's Gospel never calls into question the fundamental legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple, though with Jesus' coming to the world, his death and resurrection, and his sending of the Spirit, "the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood are in their essential functions superseded" (462–63 [463]). According to Kinzer, John does not attribute this supersession to the failure of the Jerusalem priesthood but rather to "a further act of divine grace, bringing to fulfillment that which the Temple and priesthood represent" (463). Stephen T. Um's *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel* (Library of New Testament Studies 312; London: T&T Clark, 2006) does not treat 2:13–22, focusing instead on John 4 to develop John's presentation of Jesus as the new "True Temple of God" who replaces the Jerusalem temple and institutes "true worship" that is more inclusive and not temporally or geographically limited (190). Two older monographs maintaining the replacement/fulfillment consensus deserve mention: Nereparampil, *Destroy This Temple*; McCaffrey, *House*. Cf. the discussions of these books in Kerr, *Temple*, 4–5; Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 12–15.

the temple theme through the entire Gospel by a combined use of historical-critical and literary-critical exegesis.[308] Coloe seeks "to show that the Temple functions in the narrative as the major christological symbol that gradually shifts its symbolic meaning from the person of Jesus to the Johannine community in the post-resurrection era."[309] Kerr's thesis is that John offers Jesus as the replacement and fulfillment of the temple and its associated festivals as "a Christian (precisely 'christological') response to the Fall of the Temple in 70 CE."[310]

---

[308] Both present their studies as filling a surprising gap in Johannine studies, since no previous study had been devoted exclusively to examining the temple theme in the Fourth Gospel in its entirety (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 3; Kerr, *Temple*, ix). Some studies containing sections or chapters on the Gospel of John in their examination of the temple in the New Testament include: Margaret Barker, *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995); G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 17; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 2004); Yves Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple: The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse* (trans. R. Trevett; London: Burns & Oates, 1962); J. Daniélou, *The Presence of God* (trans. W. Roberts; London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1958); McKelvey, *The New Temple*; Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010); Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*. Other studies are devoted to particular passages of the Fourth Gospel, including Nereparampil, *Destroy This Temple*, and McCaffrey, *House*. Both detect a temple-replacement theme in the passages studied.

[309] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 3. Coloe conducts exegeses of all passages, in sequential order, where she finds a relationship between Jesus' words and the temple. The passages Coloe analyzes are 1:1–18; 2:13–25; 4:1–45; 7:1–8:59; 10:22–42; 14:1–31; 18:1–19:42. See her rationale for choosing these scenes in ibid., 13–14. That these scenes run through the entire Gospel shows that the temple "is not a peripheral image. It is used consistently throughout the text and moves beyond the life of Jesus into the life of the community, giving the community a clear sense of identity and a way of sustaining faith in the absence of Jesus" (ibid., 3). Coloe further develops the relationship between the temple and the Johannine community in her second monograph, *Dwelling in the Household of God*.

[310] Kerr, *Temple*, 34; cf. ibid., 31.

The studies of Coloe and Kerr exhibit certain recent scholarly trends with regard to the temple in John. First, they both emphasize the central role the temple plays in the Gospel, and they agree that John uses the temple to develop the Gospel's Christology.[311] Second, they both argue that according to John, the relationship between Jesus and the temple is one of replacement and fulfillment, and with varying degrees of emphasis they maintain that John sees the Christian community as replacing the temple as well.[312] Third, Jesus' replacement of the temple also signifies his replacement of its cultic practices and feasts.[313] Fourth, both Coloe and Kerr contend that it is by Jesus' death and resurrection that he replaces and fulfills the temple.[314] Finally, they identify 2:13–22 as the key passage establishing John's Christology with respect to the relationship between Jesus and the temple, arguing that it presents Jesus' body as the temple's replacement and that this replacement

---

[311] As Coloe puts it, "[T]he Temple is not just one symbol among many, used by the community to express who Jesus is for them; for the Johannine community the Temple is the *major* symbol" (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 3; italics hers).

[312] For Coloe, the temple has two main functions in John: (1) as the dwelling place of God, it points to the identity and role of Jesus; (2) since in the Gospel temple imagery becomes transferred from Jesus to the Christian community, it indicates the community's identity and role (*God Dwells*, 3). Kerr differs somewhat from Coloe on this, placing most of the emphasis on Jesus as the replacement and fulfillment of the temple: "Coloe argues that the Temple in John finds fulfilment in the Christian community, whereas my study argues that Jesus is the primary fulfilment and replacement of the Temple and only in a secondary and derivatory sense is the Christian community the new Temple" (*Temple*, 72–73).

[313] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 72–73; Kerr, *Temple*, 2, 31.

[314] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 179; Kerr, *Temple*, 32.

occurs through Jesus' death and resurrection.[315] In this reading, the temple functions primarily as a narrative and theological symbol that John uses to develop his Christology.[316]

Assessing the work of Coloe and Kerr in light of Paul M. Hoskins's *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (2006) is revealing. Hoskins

---

[315] Both Coloe and Kerr find that the temple scene is crucial, as Jesus' words and actions in 2:13–22 go beyond a cleansing of Jewish cultic practices and essentially declare the Jerusalem temple as void, and 2:21 "provides a major hermeneutical key to understanding the symbolism of the Temple in later passages," namely that "Jesus is the new Temple, the new dwelling place of God in human history" (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 12; see also Kerr, *Temple*, 31–32). For Coloe's exegesis of the temple scene, see Coloe, *God Dwells*, 65–84. Kerr studies many of the same passages as Coloe, though not in the order they appear in the Gospel. He chooses instead an order that most explicitly demonstrates Jesus is the temple's replacement and fulfillment, analyzing 2:13–22 first because it is "[t]he clearest passage for a Temple theme" (Kerr, *Temple*, 31). Kerr's discussion of the temple scene is in ibid., 67–101.

[316] Coloe articulates this position well: "The Temple cleansing and *logion* make explicit the hermeneutical key for understanding the Johannine use of the Temple as a narrative symbol. A possible reason why the Temple cleansing is so early in the Fourth Gospel is because this pericope provides the reader with both an explicit hermeneutical key for interpreting the Johannine Jesus as the new 'Temple,' and a paradigm for further scenes in the use of Johannine symbolism and misunderstandings. The foundational image is the Jerusalem Temple. As this scene develops there is a transfer of meaning from a building of stones to the person of Jesus...The Temple scene presents in a highly refined form, the christology of the Fourth Gospel—Jesus is the dwelling place of God, and, as the scene develops, it provides a paradigm for a narrative style that employs images and dialogue in a fusion of literary form and theological content...While there is much that is still unknown, the reader has been given one critical key to understanding the rest of this narrative—Jesus is the new dwelling-place of God. The reader has also seen in this action and dialogue the Johannine use of symbols and the ensuing misunderstanding that can happen when symbols are not recognized. Equipped with this key Johannine christological concept, and an example of Johannine misunderstanding, the reader is ready to enter further into the narrative" (*God Dwells*, 84; cf. Kerr, *Temple*, 67, 100–01).

accepts the consensus but seeks to clarify it by arguing explicitly that John uses typology to present Jesus as the fulfillment and replacement of the temple.[317] His views concur with those of Coloe and Kerr: the temple is an indispensable component of John's Christology; the relationship between Jesus and the temple is one of replacement and fulfillment; Jesus' replacement of the temple also signifies his replacement of the temple's cultic practices and feasts; Jesus' death, resurrection, and exaltation is the reason John sees him as the temple's replacement/fulfillment; and the temple incident is a key passage for the establishment and development of this motif and the Christology that drives it.[318]

Though Hoskins agrees with Coloe and Kerr on all these points, he pushes the conversation forward by pointing to the importance of a more explicit articulation of the replacement/fulfillment relationship between Jesus and the temple. Hoskins determines that typology provides the framework for understanding precisely how Jesus replaces and fulfills the temple.[319] Merely claiming that Jesus replaces and/or fulfills the temple "leaves too much room for ambiguity" and leaves it "not clear whether or why these notions belong together," whereas " '[t]ypology' or 'typological' carries more specific content than the terms 'replacement or fulfillment.'

---

[317] Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 2.

[318] For Hoskins's discussion of the temple scene, which he describes as "the most explicit passage where John correlates Jesus' body and the Temple," see ibid., 108–16 (108). For Hoskins this passage provides "a reliable starting point for examining Jesus' replacement of the Temple" and contributes to a proper understanding of other passages said to develop the temple-replacement theme in John (ibid., 108).

[319] See ibid., 182–193.

"[320] His analysis leads him to conclude that in John "Jesus fulfills and surpasses prophecies and patterns associated with the Temple. In doing so, Jesus appears to be the fulfillment of the Temple who has come to take its place."[321]

Hoskins perceives the problem that Johannine scholarship fails to explain how Jesus replaces and/or fulfills the temple in the Fourth Gospel.[322] The motifs of replacement and fulfillment are simply asserted. Hoskins's answer resides with John's literary and theological method. His description of the relationship between Jesus and the temple in John as typological may not be convincing.[323] Nevertheless, the fact that his study is one of the first to develop an explicit method and rationale for explaining how one can talk about Jesus in John as the replacement and fulfillment of the temple exposes a lack of critical reflection on this widely held consensus. To propose that an individual replaces and fulfills the temple institution

---

[320] Ibid., 191.

[321] Ibid., 108.

[322] Hoskins is not alone in seeing this problem. See Reimund Bieringer, Didier Pollefeyt, and Frederique Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, "Wrestling with Johannine Anti-Judaism: A Hermeneutical Framework for the Analysis of the Current Debate," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (ed. R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 26.

[323] See Coloe, review of Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, *RBL* (2008): n.p. [cited 29 August 2011]. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/6241_6693.pdf; Nicholas H. Taylor, review of Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, *RBL* (2008): n.p. [cited 29 August 2011]. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/6241_6701.pdf; N. Clayton Croy, review of Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, *CBQ* 71 (2009): 899–900.

is a remarkable claim. If indeed it is a claim the Fourth Gospel makes, critical exegesis bears the burden of proof for illustrating how this is so without simply stating that it is so. Hoskins shows that Johannine scholars like Coloe, Kerr, and their predecessors tend to assert or presume that—rather than demonstrate how—Jesus replaces or fulfills the temple in John. Hoskins points out that, despite the many adherents to replacement and/or fulfillment theories to explain the temple in John, no one has a clear method for illustrating the relationship between Jesus and the temple in John. Hoskins develops a method, questionable as it may be.

Two works that resist the tendency to interpret John 2:13–22 by reducing the temple to a theological symbol and that illustrate the importance of having a clear method for assessing the relationship between Jesus and the temple in John are Judith Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John" (1999) and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of the Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran* (2005).[324]

In her important article, Lieu challenges the scholarly commonplace that John's Jesus replaces the temple. Lieu addresses the function of the temple in John as a "narrative spatial-marker." She notes that in the biblical tradition "space" or location "are powerful markers of divine presence, blessing, or judgment," that the

---

[324] Judith Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue in John," *NTS* 45 (1999): 51–69; Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of the Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran* (NovTSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

Gospels use "significant narrative space" in this manner, and that the temple constitutes such a space.[325] John uses the temple as an important spatial construct to explore the identity of both Jesus and his believers.[326] The temple "is not a symbol for an idea, such as 'worship or 'access to God', nor for a system, such as 'Judaism', but has a 'symbolic role...in the narratological construction of the story.' "[327] This symbolic role is shaped by the way different books of the Jewish Scriptures conceive of the temple, and its main function is to point to the locus of divine presence.[328]

Lieu arrives at this conclusion from a careful comparison of how the temple functions as a narrative spatial construct in the Synoptic Gospels and John.[329] Mark most resolutely places the temple under judgment, and while Matthew is more ambivalent, it ultimately follows suit by presenting Jesus as departing from the temple and as "something greater than the temple" (Matt 12:6). Luke's presentation is ambiguous. On the one hand, the temple is viewed positively, not as "the place of sacrifice, now rejected and finished," but as a place taken over by Jesus and the faithful, even if only as a place of prayer for believers (cf. Luke 18:10).[330] On the

---

[325] Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 56–57.

[326] Ibid.

[327] Ibid., 67–68; quoting R. P. Carroll, "So What Do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets" in *Temple and Community in the Persian Period* (ed. T. C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards; vol. 2 of *Second Temple Studies*, ed. Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 40.

[328] Ibid., 68.

[329] Ibid., 59–64.

[330] Ibid., 60.

other hand, the disciples are told at the end of the Gospel to depart to all nations out from Jerusalem, a command fulfilled in the narrative of Acts.[331]

Lieu contends that John's picture of the temple is "surprisingly different,"[332] especially since at the start of Jesus' ministry near the beginning of the Gospel, Jesus identifies the temple as his Father's house (2:16) and the disciples immediately follow suit by quoting a Psalm verse that names the temple as God's house (2:17; Ps 69:9 [69:10 MT; 68:10 LXX]).[333] As a result, the consensus view that the miracle at Cana and the temple scene "together symbolize the replacement of the 'Jewish system' by the new life and the new locus of worship which Jesus offers…faces serious problems."[334]

Lieu identifies the influence of the Synoptic presentation of the temple as the reason interpreters distort John's own stance toward the temple:

> Were it not for the Synoptic parallels with the clear message of coming destruction, particularly in Mark, we would be unlikely to read the Johannine

---

[331] Lieu concludes, "Mark speaks for a community for whom the Temple, if not already destroyed, has had its doom assured…By contrast, as with the Law and perhaps the Sabbath, Matthew's community still values the Temple but struggles to articulate consistently its place for the present…Luke's picture is…more equivocal, particularly when the Gospel is viewed on its own; Luke struggles to affirm the continuity from the tradition of faithful Israel to Jesus and the earliest community" (ibid., 60–61).

[332] "Temple and Synagogue in John," 61.

[333] Ibid., 63.

[334] Ibid. Fuglseth agrees with the consensus that the temple incident and the wedding at Cana are formally and thematically connected but lists a series of problems for reading replacement motifs in the Cana pericope and has shown that such a view stands in conflict with the respect for the temple and its traditions displayed in John's Gospel (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 153–54).

> narrative in similar terms. There is no word of judgment, and the Scripture recalled comes not from Jeremiah's prophecy of destruction, as in the Synoptics, but from a Psalm (69.10) which in the Christian testimony tradition belongs to Jesus' passion. This is confirmed at the end of the narrative when there is no discussion of the Temple or its destruction and no splitting of the veil of the shrine at Jesus' death.[335]

In contrast, Jesus' appeal to his teaching in the temple in John 18:20 ascribes to the temple a more positive role as a textual and narrative symbol.[336] The temple, as God's house, is the locus of divine presence and of God's sovereignty, and in John's temple scene it is shown to be the object of Jesus' zeal (2:17), the object of his sole fidelity to God who alone is to be worshipped there, not the object of Jesus' judgment.[337] According to Lieu, "it is a mark of his zeal that the Temple is the primary location where Jesus claims the absolute authority to speak for and represent God who sent him."[338] In John, therefore, the temple is among the places that constitute the sphere in which Jesus makes himself "public" (ἐν παρρησίᾳ; cf. 7:4),[339] the place where Jesus both speaks for God and makes himself open and manifests his glory.[340]

---

[335] Ibid., 63–64.

[336] Ibid., 64.

[337] Ibid., 67–68.

[338] Ibid., 68.

[339] Jesus does not teach in secret in John's Gospel and the temple constitutes a space where he teaches openly, as is seen in how the narration describes Jesus' actions of leaving the temple after teaching in it in terms of Jesus hiding himself (κρύπτω) (8:59) (ibid., 54).

[340] Ibid., 68. "The Temple is where Jesus must teach, where he must be openly, where he must speak of the one who sent him. If, again as promised in the Prologue (1.11), 'he came to his own', this must be in the Temple. If God was to be

Lieu agrees with the aforementioned studies about the importance and pervasiveness of the temple in John, but she draws a different conclusion. Lieu has a more sophisticated understanding of the narrative role of the temple in biblical literature, noting its narrative function as the symbol of divine presence. As a result, she grasps that to understand Jesus' actions in the temple as a claim against the temple, including its cultic system of worship, misses the point. As a symbolic narrative space of divine presence, John 2:13–22 needs the temple, because the symbolic physical space of the temple is where Jesus' glory can be revealed.[341] Jesus does not judge the temple or symbolize its replacement. He goes to it and teaches in it because it is a space where he can reveal aspects of his identity. None of the recent studies on the temple in John sufficiently engages Lieu's article or addresses its implications.[342]

Lieu's article shows that the tendency to harmonize John and the Synoptics has led scholars to fail to read John's temple scene on its own terms. This problem of

---

made known, whom no-one has ever seen (1.18)...this too must be in the Temple." (ibid., 69).

[341] "That Jesus should thereafter [after the temple incident] continue to focus his presence on the Temple is no surprise – as it would be if we were to accept an interpretation that suggests that Jesus is rejecting the Temple. At no time in the Johannine ministry does Jesus speak words of judgment against or anticipate the destruction within the divine dispensation of the Temple – indeed he does not talk about the Temple at all" (ibid., 66).

[342] Coloe does not list it in her bibliography, perhaps because she was unaware of it or it had not been published at the time she conducted her research. Hoskins includes it in his bibliography (*Fulfillment*, 224), but does not discuss it. Kerr briefly discusses Lieu's essay, but he claims that Lieu's study supports his view that Jesus places judgment on the temple in 2:13–22, even though it argues the precise opposite (*Temple*, 5–6).

unconscious, and often uncritical, harmonizing, together with the tendency to give primacy to Mark's account, has led scholarship to overlook the differences between John's version of the temple incident and the Synoptic version. This can be seen most clearly with respect to the distinctive economic features present in John's account.

It is helpful to identify those differences here. In John Jesus' actions are directed at those offering mercantile services. John does not mention those who buy those services, as do Mark (11:15) and Matthew (21:12). In John, but not in the Synoptics, Jesus pours out the coins of the moneychangers, drawing attention to their trade. Not only does John use commercial vocabulary absent in the Synoptic version (κέρμα, κερματιστής, and ἐμπόριον), what Jesus says in John 2:16 differs in both content (overtly commercial) and style (presented as Jesus' own words, not a scriptural quotation) from the parallel verses in Mark 11:17, Matt 21:13, and Luke 19:46. Finally, John's version explicitly mentions the temple's ongoing construction, an important allusion to the temple's economic influence in Jerusalem.

These narrative details that are unique to John's account suggest ways in which John's version of the scene acknowledges the temple as a place of economic networks. The economic background of John 2:13–22 discussed in chapter 2 illustrates the complex and influential nature of the temple's economic identity. That the text of 2:13–22 includes references to the temple as an economic institution supports Lieu's insight that John does not reduce the temple into a symbol that can

be replaced but rather views it as a symbolic space wherein Jesus reveals his identity as the one with the absolute authority to speak for and represent God who sent him.

In his *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective*, Fuglseth uses sociological methods to study the Johannine community and the nature and extent of its supposed sectarianism.[343] A major portion of his sociological analysis focuses on the relationship of the community to the Jerusalem temple.[344]

Fuglseth attends to the temple's sociological, cultural, political, and economic importance, in addition to its religious importance.[345] He insists that the many functions of the Jerusalem temple be taken into account when studying the temple in John, including its economic aspects.[346] Whereas the tendency in Johannine scholarship is to posit that John's community saw Jesus as the replacement of the recently destroyed temple, Fuglseth recognizes that such a move would have been quite radical in its historical and social context.[347] The temple was not merely an idea or symbol whose meaning could quickly be substituted by some other entity, but a

---

[343] Fuglseth's project is quite sophisticated and cannot be adequately summarized here. His own description of the project, of the issues at hand and the history of scholarship on these issues, and of his method and its rationale, is clear and engaging. See *Johannine Sectarianism*, 1–116.

[344] Ibid., 117–85.

[345] Ibid., 117–19.

[346] Ibid., 118.

[347] Even after its destruction, the temple played a role in Palestine, as corroborated by certain movements to restore and rebuild it (ibid., 119–20).

social institution of some magnitude that was not easily replaced, even if a social group found itself in tension with the temple or its leadership.[348]

Like Hoskins, Fuglseth notes the lack of clarity in Johannine scholarship regarding what constitutes replacement, fulfillment, and the relationship between the two.[349] Seeking to avoid this problem, Fuglseth defines "transference of the temple" as "the phenomenon that takes place when the function and meaning of a geographically located and physical temple are applied to other domains, physical or not."[350] He notes that such "non-physical transference" commonly takes place through such literary devices as metaphors, allegories, typologies, and parables.[351]

Fuglseth rightly maintains that the historical complexity of the immediate post-70 context has important implications for assessing whether the Johannine community advocated transference of the physical temple to Jesus' body. The wide set of reactions to the temple's destruction, coupled with the fact that most Jews expected the temple to be rebuilt, means "we cannot take for granted, a priori, that the temple idea was immediately abandoned" and "cannot simply presuppose that the overthrow in 70 CE led to an immediate departure of the temple institution by

---

[348] "Tension must not be confused with neglect of or abrogation with the temple institution in such a way that if you find tension, you will also find neglect. The question of degree leads us to ask if *all* aspects of the temple institution were looked upon as in need of change or just *some*, and how important they were. We should not look for 'ideological destruction' alone" (ibid., 122; italics his).

[349] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 137.

[350] Ibid., 126.

[351] Ibid.

emerging Jewish-Christian groups."[352] With respect to the Johannine Christians, "we cannot exclude the possibility that the situation…shortly after (i.e. 70–100 CE) the destruction of the temple was similar to the situation *before* the destruction, regarding their relationship and attitudes to the temple institution as such."[353]

Fuglseth outlines his own view of the "logic of replacement:" " 'replace' [refers] to what happens when something (or somebody) takes the place of something (somebody) else."[354] He develops a method to identify replacement in an ancient text. According to Fuglseth, in order to advocate effectively for replacement or transference, a post-70 Jewish or early Christian text must explicitly contain: (1) a replaced object ("what is replaced"); (2) a replacing subject ("replacer"); (3) "a more or less explicit replacing statement saying that 'A has now taken the place of B' in one or another way," and (4) one or more agents that cause or accomplish the replacement process.[355]

Fuglseth analyzes 2:13–22 and other passages in John related to the temple (especially John 4), attitudes toward the Jerusalem temple in the New Testament corpus, and attitudes toward the temple in the writings of Philo and Qumran.[356] He posits three models for describing a community in tension with the temple:

---

[352] Ibid., 120.

[353] Ibid. 121 (italics his).

[354] Ibid., 142.

[355] Ibid., 142.

[356] Ibid., 117–249. His analysis of 2:13–22 can be found on pages 143–76; see also 184–85.

1. A *rejection model*, a strongly anti-temple group, indicating a protest and break with the temple institution in principle and in practice,
2. An *acceptance model*, indicating no break in principle nor in practice with the temple institution (only difference and disagreement), and
3. A *conjunction model*, a 'laissez-faire' attitude, indicating a break in some way theoretically (e.g. re-interpretation), a fact that in principle makes the temple institution redundant, but there is no break in practice, it is not neglected in a significant way.[357]

In light of his exegesis of John 2 and 4 and the evidence from Philo and Qumran, Fuglseth concludes that the "conjunction model" best describes the relationship of the Johannine community to the temple.[358] "The Johannine community was rooted in temple Judaism, an institution that was not easily disregarded with its multiple functions."[359]

Fuglseth's monograph is a significant contribution to the interpretation of the temple in John. Through his comparative sociological analysis of the temple in Philo, Qumran, and the New Testament, Fuglseth grounds John's view of the temple in its historical and sociological context. He illustrates that grounding John's text in its Second Temple Jewish context presents difficulties for concluding that John is as keen on portraying Jesus as the temple's replacement as is often asserted. Fuglseth shows that scholars too quickly ascribe to John a propensity for seeing the temple as a theological symbol, when for Jews in the first century it was too complex an

---

[357] Ibid., 175.

[358] Ibid., 249.

[359] Ibid. "In that case, it is fair to say that if the temple buildings had not been destroyed, the Jewish members of the Johannine community would probably not have been neglecting the temple worship and celebration. In light of the Philonic evidence, the statements in the Gospel of John concerning the temple are completely understandable as statements from a loyal temple group" (ibid.).

institution to be reduced to such a symbol. As we shall see in more detail below, his exegesis shows that the text of 2:13–22 does not grant explicit warrant for reading the passage as one which rejects the temple and puts forward Jesus as its replacement.[360]

The information pertaining to the sacred economy of the first-century Jerusalem temple identified in chapter 2 further corroborates Fuglseth's point that awareness of the temple's multiple functions challenges the consensus that the Johannine Jesus replaces the Jerusalem temple. Close attention to the literary dynamics of 2:13–22 in light of economic elements supports the work of Lieu and Fuglseth that the temple in 2:13–22 is a physical and symbolic space of revelation not equal to or replaced by the body of Jesus.

In chapter 1 I noted that 2:13–22's overall structure consists of two neatly divided halves (vv. 14–17 and vv. 18–22) introduced by v. 13.[361] Chapter 2 presented the economic context that informs the entire pericope. Here I undertake an exegetical analysis of 2:13–22 that incorporates the results of my investigation in chapter 2. The commercial elements of John 2:13–22 render an interpretation that integrates both halves of the passage that neither reduces the temple to a theological symbol nor downplays its wide-ranging significance in first-century Jerusalem. When read in light of the Jerusalem temple's commerce, John 2:13–22 emerges as an

[360] See §3.3.7.

[361] See §1.3.

important passage establishing Jesus' authority at the beginning of the Gospel of John without the implication that Jesus replaces the Jerusalem temple.

3.3 John 2:13–22 in Light of the Jerusalem Temple's Commerce

3.3.1 John 2:13

When we take into account the information about pilgrimage presented in the previous chapter, we see that behind the deceptively straightforward language of John 2:13—Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς—lies a rich social, religious, and economic background.[362]

The main action described in 2:13 is Jesus' travel to Jerusalem after having spent a few days in Capernaum with his mother, brothers, and disciples (2:12). Ἀναβαίνω became a technical term for pilgrimage to the holy city and temple, used for denoting travel to Jerusalem since it lies on a mountain at a higher elevation than its environs (cf. Luke 2:42, 51; 10:30, 18:10).[363] Use of this word here and throughout the Fourth Gospel (5:1; 7:8, 10, 14; 11:55; 12:20) points to John's depiction of Jesus as a pilgrim who travels regularly to Jerusalem during its festivals and provides a sense of the narration's knowledge of cultic life (cf. John 4:9). Its appearance in 2:13 communicates that Jesus' trip to Jerusalem is a deliberate pilgrimage to the center of the Jewish faith for its most important religious festival, τὸ πάσχα. In addition to the geographical destination of Jesus' travel (ἀνέβη εἰς

---

[362] See §2.2.

[363] Brown, *John*, 1:115; Coloe, *God Dwells*, 71; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1972), 138; McCaffrey, *House*, 36.

Ἰεροσόλυμα), the narration specifies the chronological (ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα) and religio-cultural (τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων) context of Passover. This technical vocabulary establishes the religio-cultural setting of the Passover pilgrimage experience, and John's narration creates a series of expectations about what is to come: a pilgrim going to Jerusalem to participate in Passover rites.

The combined use of pilgrimage language and chronological, religious, and geographical narrative markers hint that the temple, the goal of Jewish pilgrimage during Passover (Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16), is in view, even though it is not yet explicitly mentioned.[364] During festival periods, Jews by the thousands traveled to Jerusalem to visit the temple and there participate in worship and fulfill their cultic obligations, including the economic components of these obligations. By "going up" to Jerusalem for Passover, Jesus participates in a major religious, social, and economic phenomenon of Jewish cultic life, the Passover pilgrimage.[365] In 2:13 Jesus appears to be like Tobit, who travels "to Jerusalem (εἰς Ιεροσόλυμα) for the festivals, as it is prescribed for all Israel by an everlasting decree" (Tob 1:6a).

The syntax of v. 13 is often overlooked in interpretations of John 2:13–22. Jesus is the subject of the verb ἀναβαίνω in 2:13, syntax that identifies him as a

---

[364] The expression ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα recalls a conventional Hebrew construction for indicating the Passover period, further underscoring the Jewish context introduced the pericope's opening verse (Barrett, *John*, 197; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 155 n. 68).

[365] As Coloe notes, "The introduction (v. 13) stresses the Jewish context of this scene with the references to 'the Passover of the Jews' and Jesus 'going up' to Jerusalem for this pilgrimage feast" (70).

pilgrim. Jesus participates in Jewish customs—he goes up to Jerusalem for Passover. In a similar fashion, Tob 1:6a emphasizes Tobit's piety by stressing his sole agency in visiting the temple to fulfill his religious obligations.[366] Like Tobit, who makes festival pilgrimages to Jerusalem "often,"[367] Jesus in John goes to Jerusalem for at least two Passovers (2:13, 23; 12:12), one Feast of Tabernacles (7:10), one Feast of Dedication (10:22–23), one unnamed festival (5:1), and at least three Sabbaths (5:9–10, 16, 18; 9:14; 19:31).[368] Beginning in 2:13, John depicts Jesus as a Jewish pilgrim.

3.3.2 John 2:14–16

John 2:14–16 consists of one long sentence with complex syntax that describes what Jesus does when he gets to Jerusalem:

> [14] Καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστερὰς καὶ τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους, [15] καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν, [16] καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν· ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου.

3.3.2.1 John 2:14

---

[366] Tob 1:6a: "But I alone (κἀγὼ μόνος [variant: μονώτατος]) went often to Jerusalem for the festivals."

[367] Gk: πλεονάκις (variant: πολλάκις).

[368] See §2.2.2 n. 27. That Jesus would not have been required to attend all these festivals but did so anyway, all the more points to the depiction of Jesus in John as a devoted adherent of temple Judaism (see Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 117–85). The Synoptics, by contrast, give the impression that Jesus went up to Jerusalem once during his adult life.

John 2:14 contains the first explicit reference to the temple in the Gospel (καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ).[369] This reference continues to develop John's characterization of Jesus as a Passover pilgrim, since upon arriving in Jerusalem he does go to the temple, fulfilling the expectations established in 2:13.[370]

The narration casts the whole sequence of 2:14–16 from Jesus' perspective by opening with καὶ εὗρεν. Εὑρίσκω is a verb of perception, and the temple is introduced as the object in the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, indicating the place in which Jesus looks and finds. All that follows καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ in 2:14 constitutes what Jesus finds in the temple.

Τοὺς πωλοῦντας and τοὺς κερματιστάς are the direct objects of εὗρεν. Jesus sees animal merchants alongside moneychangers plying their trade ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, a detail that evokes the economic context of the pericope. As we have seen, during any of the pilgrimage feasts, especially Passover, the temple attracted sacrificial animal merchants and moneychangers who played an indispensable role in facilitating temple worship for pilgrims from abroad. Merchants sold sacrificial animals in

---

[369] Coloe and others see temple imagery in John's Prologue, particularly in the verb σκηνόω in 1:14. The temple imagery of John's Prologue is said to lay the groundwork of the theme of temple replacement and fulfillment they consider prominent in this Gospel (*God Dwells*, 15–63; see also Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 116–25; Kerr, *Temple*, 102–35). For an argument against replacement readings of John's Prologue, see Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 168–69. John 1:51 is also discussed as contributing to the Gospel's supposed temple-replacement motif (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 73, 215; Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 125–135; cf. Kerr, *Temple*, 136–66).

[370] "In 2:14, the scenery is further centred around the temple, (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ)—as Jesus is reported to pay a visit to the sanctuary. Thus, from the very beginning of this passage Jesus is described both as a 'Jew' and undoubtedly as a temple adherent" (Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 155).

Jerusalem. Given the diverse coinage in Judea, especially during pilgrimage feasts, moneychangers were needed to facilitate the sales of animals and other items. John's narration reflects this reality, mentioning the act of *selling* sacrifices in close proximity to the moneychangers when they are introduced in 2:14: Καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ **τοὺς πωλοῦντας** βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστερὰς καὶ **τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους**.[371]

The gathering of sacrificial animal vendors and moneychangers in the temple during festival periods conforms with the temple's standard economic practices. What Jesus finds in the temple upon his arrival—merchants and moneychangers—is what any pilgrim would find, since pilgrims need these traders and financiers in order to participate in the temple cult.

3.3.2.2 John 2:15

The main action of 2:15 is Jesus driving out πάντας, the referent of which is ambiguous. The accusative πάντας may modify the phrase τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, since τά πρόβατα and τοὺς βόας are in the accusative as well. However, because it is accusative masculine plural, πάντας could also refer to the merchants selling the sheep and cattle, the τοὺς πωλοῦντας of 2:14. In the latter reading, Jesus drives out

[371] Moneychangers also assisted in collecting the temple tax, but the text is silent on this aspect of their work.

the merchants along with the animals, herding them all out with an improvised whip.[372]

A recent article by N. Clayton Croy clarifies 2:15.[373] Croy surveys a series of sample passages containing the same τε…καί construction one finds in 2:15 and concludes these parallels demonstrate the likelihood that the τε…καί construction in 2:15 is a partitive appositive.[374] As such, the construction conveys the unity of a conceptual pair and modifies a more inclusive general term that precedes or follows it. In the case of 2:15, the τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας designates what is meant by πάντας: Jesus drove out all of the sheep and the cattle.[375]

---

[372] Many scholars accept this reading. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, 38; Brown, *John*, 1:115; Bruce Chilton, "[ὡς] φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων (John 2:15)" in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSupp 48; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 330–44; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 157; Moloney, *John*, 81; Harold K. Moulton, "*pantas* in John 2.15," *BT* 18 (1967): 126–27; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 18–19. Dodd reads the τε…καί clause as epexegetic of πάντας, a common usage (e.g., Matt 22:10) in which the masculine pronoun applies to nouns of different genders grouped as a collective term (Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 157n3). Bultmann considers τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας a secondary editorial addition (*John*, 123 n. 8).

[373] N. Clayton Croy, "The Messianic Whippersnapper: Did Jesus Use a Whip on People in the Temple (John 2:15)?" *JBL* 128 (2009): 555–68.

[374] Ibid., 559–62. The passages Croy examines are Luke 22:66; Acts 8:38; 1 Esd 6:26; 4 Macc 15:26; Matt 22:10; Acts 19:10; Rom 3:9; Rev 19:18; 3 Macc 1:1, a list he admits is selective due to "the abundance of close grammatical parallels" (561).

[375] "The whole would be πάντας, to which τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας would stand in apposition, giving the constituent parts, that is, 'he drove *all* out of the temple, namely, the 'all' consisting of *both the sheep and the cattle*.'…it is very difficult to construe the Greek as meaning anything but '*both* the sheep *and* the oxen,' 'the sheep *as well as* the oxen,' or perhaps '*not only* the sheep *but also* the oxen' " (ibid., 561; italics his). Further analysis of other grammatical parallels (most

That Jesus drives out the sheep and cattle shows him to have a concern for the sanctity of the temple space that exceeds that of the numerous other temple pilgrims, for whom the sale of sacrificial animals in the temple would have been a convenient and secure option for purchasing animals that were suitable for sacrifice. Keeping sheep and cattle in the temple would have affected the sanctity and serenity of temple grounds in a more pronounced manner than keeping birds.[376] Despite also seeing merchants, moneychangers, and doves in the temple in 2:14, Jesus refrains from casting them out in 2:15, reflecting the temple-economic reality that their mere presence in the temple's outer courts did not threaten the temple's sanctity and would have offended no one.[377] Such awareness of first-century temple-economic

---

of which feature authors referring to sheep and cattle) and of the passage's logic and narrative flow support this reading (ibid., 563–66).

[376] On the religious, practical, and economic problems that arise from selling sheep and cattle in the temple, see §2.3.5, n. 66. Selling doves ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ does not give rise to these concerns. Of the sacrificial animal trades listed in 2:14, the sacrificial bird trade likely had the closest connection to the temple. A temple priest was probably assigned the administrative responsibility of overseeing the procurement, sale, and inspection of doves (cf. *m. Šeqal.* 5:1); doves were by far the animal pilgrims bought most, on account of their permissibility as sacrifices, low cost, and small size; and if they were sold in the temple, doves would not have posed the same religious, practical, and economic problems as cattle and sheep.

[377] Even if readers conclude the merchants follow their animals out of the temple, it remains the case that the narration's primary concern is to point out that Jesus drove out the sheep and cattle (Croy suggests the logic and flow of the narrative implies the sheep and cattle merchants followed their animals away from the temple; "The Messianic Whippersnapper," 562–63). Grammatically, they are the objects of ἐκβάλλω in 2:15, and even before they appear as the objects of ἐκβάλλω, the prepositional phrase ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ immediately follows and modifies ἐκβάλλω. The redundant presence of ἐκ in the narration draws attention to Jesus' action of casting them *out*: πάντας **ἐξ**έβαλεν **ἐκ** τοῦ ἱεροῦ τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας. The narration of 2:15 thus indicates that the problem for Jesus is not the sheep and cattle in

practices is especially evident in John's account, which is the only version of the scene that specifies livestock were sold in Jerusalem and which along with Matt 21:12 mentions the sale of doves in the temple.[378] As we saw in chapter 2, buying animals in Jerusalem (especially doves in the temple) was the most sensible and convenient option for many. It increased the likelihood of the animals' purity and meant pilgrims did not have to transport their own animals when traveling from afar.[379]

---

themselves and not the fact that they are being sold, but that they are in the temple and must therefore be removed.

[378] Mark mentions those "who were selling and buying (τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας) in the temple" without specifying what was being bought and sold (11:15; cf. 11:16, which refers to certain objects or vessels [σκεῦος] being carried through the temple). Luke refers only to "those who were selling things there (τοὺς πωλοῦντας)" (19:45). Matthew mentions "all who were selling and buying (πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας) in the temple" and proceeds to mention "the seats of those who sold doves (τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς)" (21:12).

[379] See §2.3.5. Jesus makes a whip to drive out the sheep and cattle. Some witnesses, including such early ones as P^{66} and P^{75}, supply ὡς before φραγέλλιον, making the φραγέλλιον a less-defined object (a *kind of* or *sort of* whip, "something like a whip"). Like the possible ὡς of the text, the phrase ἐκ σχοινίων qualifies the φραγέλλιον. It is a whip made from "cords." The description of the φραγέλλιον, marked by these qualifications, appears obscure to us today. George R. Beasley-Murray notes, "Despite the age of these witnesses the addition [of ὡς] looks like an attempt to tone down the action of Jesus" (*John* [2nd ed.; WBC 36; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers 1999], 38). Its positive effect is to suggest the narration's knowledge of and respect for temple customs. Sticks or weapons were not allowed within the temple precincts (cf. *m. Ber.* 9:5), and so Jesus has to improvise an instrument to drive out the sheep and cattle. In Fuglseth's words, "The fact that he uses a whip and not a stick, may attest that the author knows the prohibition of using sticks in the temple area. If there were such a prohibition and if the author knew about it, the author would demonstrate his respect for this tradition" (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 157; cf. Barrett, *John*, 197; Brown, *John*, 115). Fuglseth reasonably cautions that this rabbinic prohibition may not have existed at the time John wrote his Gospel (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 157 n. 70).

Whereas Jesus commits one physical act against the sheep and cattle merchants (removing their animals), against the moneychangers he does two: he pours out their coins and overturns their tables (2:15). As noted, the overt mention of coins in 2:15 is unique to John's version of the temple scene. All sorts of coins would have been on the moneychangers' tables, given that foreign coinage was commonplace in Judea and became more prevalent during those times of the year when pilgrims came to Jerusalem for its major feasts. By pouring out the coins and turning over the tables, Jesus momentarily disrupts the moneychangers from collecting the temple tax and from assisting in the sale of sheep and cattle, as one of their main duties was to facilitate the sale of sacrificial animals in a context where many varieties of coinage were used.[380] Jesus does not remove the moneychangers from the temple, leaving them to pick up their coins and tables. This is consonant with customary temple-economic practices, as moneychangers were permitted to ply their trade within the temple precincts, where they could change pilgrims' coins into the acceptable Tyrian coinage for paying the temple tax.

The portrayal of Jesus as a conventional pilgrim ends dramatically in 2:15. Jesus' actions do not conform to the expectations of a pious temple pilgrim

---

[380] Some scholars see sacrificial imagery in Jesus' pouring out the coins, on the basis that the word ἐκχέω is used throughout the Septuagint for the pouring out of blood or libations in sacrificial acts (e.g., Exod 29:12; Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; Num 28:7; Jer 7:18; 19:13; 44:17, 25) and in the Synoptic Last Supper scene when Jesus speaks over the cup of wine (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20) (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 74, esp. n. 39). This readings risks overinterpreting John's use of ἐκχέω, since pouring is pouring, regardless of whether one is pouring out coins, blood, or libations.

established in 2:13–14. In 2:13–14 John presents Jesus as doing what any pilgrim would do at Passover: go to the temple and there find animal sellers and moneychangers. But his actions in 2:15 depart from the usual pattern of pious practices that mark the Passover pilgrimage, and certainly from the portrait of the ideal pilgrim depicted in Tob 1:6–8 and the atmosphere of friendliness, hospitality, and enthusiasm for spending second tithe money that arose during the Passover season.[381] During his regular visits to Jerusalem, Tobit pays the tithes of the first fruits in kind directly to the priests in Jerusalem (Tob 1:6b–7a), converts his second tithe into money for spending in Jerusalem as allowed and even encouraged by Deut 14:22–26 (1:7b), and offers a third tithe to the poor and proselytes (1:8). While Tobit fulfills his role in the sacred economy, Jesus, at least momentarily, disrupts the sacred economy. In 2:15, John sets Jesus apart from the myriads who ascended to Jerusalem for the Passover festival.

This trend recurs throughout the Gospel. In John Jesus regularly travels to Jerusalem for pilgrimage festivals and yet "does not behave like a pilgrim."[382] He distinguishes himself from all other pilgrims by participating in some but not all of the activities of the pilgrimage experience. Like many other pilgrims, Jesus and his disciples lodge in friends' homes nearby (12:1), remain within or near the city limits

---

[381] Customs and legal norms fostered an atmosphere that welcomed the pilgrims and their money, and promoted friendships and solidarity among them as one of the aims of the pilgrimage experience (S. Safrai, "The Temple," 903–904; Sanders, *Judaism*, 256–57.

[382] Haenchen, *John*, 1:182.

of Jerusalem during Passover (18:1), and perhaps give money to poor (12:4–6; 13:29). But John does not narrate anything that implies they paid the temple tax (cf. Matt 17:24–27), and Jesus is not said to share a Passover meal with his disciples.[383]

Pilgrims who went to the temple purchased animals for sacrifice in numbers large enough to engender and sustain a profitable sacrificial animal trade and sought the services of moneychangers for buying sacrifices and paying the temple tax. Jesus, by contrast, disrupts the sale of sacrificial animals and the work of the moneychangers. The narration sets Jesus apart as no mere pilgrim to the temple, as he does not comply with conventional expectations of what such a pilgrim would do and is far from the ideal represented by Tobit. Jesus' actions assert an independence from fulfilling the economic obligations of pilgrimage to Jerusalem and convey an authority to bring temple commerce to a temporary halt.

3.3.2.3 John 2:16

To the merchants selling doves Jesus commands: ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου (2:16). Jesus' words to the dove-sellers forms a unity with his driving out the sheep and cattle and disrupting the moneychangers, since it is all narrated in a single sentence and the saying is introduced with an aorist verb that has Jesus as its subject, εἶπεν. In John the saying

[383] Jesus' lack of participating in Passover rituals may be taken as evidence that John is against the sacrificial cult, as Haenchen does (*John*, 1:182). However, Fuglseth has shown that such a view stands in conflict with the respect for the temple and its traditions displayed in John's Gospel (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 117–85).

"is not a mere comment pointing the moral; it is part of the action."[384] If followed, Jesus' command would have the same effect as his actions in 2:15: it would stop the selling of sacrificial animals while he is in the temple. Jesus treats all tradespeople in the temple equally, disrupting all the sacrificial animal vendors from selling and their attendant moneychangers from plying their trade.

Jesus' statement consists of two parts. In the first part, Jesus orders the doves-sellers to remove the doves from inside the temple, a command that maintains the narration's locative depiction of the temple as its own physical space (ἄρατε ταῦτα **ἐν**τεῦθεν). The narration in 2:14–16 repeatedly calls attention to the temple as a physical place. The temple is a specific location to which Jesus travels, which he observes as a space populated by people, objects, and animals, where certain activities may occur. The temple is the location in which Jesus performs his actions, and it contains within it animal merchants, sheep, cattle, birds, moneychangers, coins, tables, and cords for making a whip. People, objects, and animals can be ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (2:14) or ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (2:15). In John 2:14–16, the temple is a physical place with boundaries delimiting whether something or someone is in it or outside it.

Up to this point, Jesus' actions intersect with the known economic practices of the Jerusalem temple. He drives out the sheep and cattle, neither of which were supposed to be sold on temple grounds. He stymies the ability of moneychangers to help sell sheep and cattle, but allows them to remain in the temple where they can

[384] Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 158.

proceed to collect the temple tax. Though he commands their expulsion, Jesus does not remove the doves. Selling doves locked in cages did not generate the same complications for the temple's sanctity as did the sale of sheep and cattle, and there appears to have been a close relationship between temple personnel and purveyors of sacrificial birds.

Nonetheless, Jesus' command to remove the doves stands out in light of the economic context of this scene. Dove suppliers and temple personnel worked together to ensure the majority of worshippers could offer sacrifice. Doves could be offered for a variety of reasons, and they were the sacrifice of the poor. Their small size allowed them to be kept in cages, so that they could be easily transported and sold on temple grounds without threatening the temple's sanctity. And since they were sold in such large numbers, it was economically viable to sell them in the temple, where the influx of pilgrims all but guaranteed the sellers a profit. Pilgrims could expect to find doves conveniently available for sale, rather than bring their own birds and risk them being deemed unsuitable for sacrifice. The selling of birds in the temple was done for the majority of pilgrims. Jesus disrupts this selling, an act that sets him apart from this majority. Against this backdrop, Jesus appears again as "no mere pilgrim" but rather as a "more than a pilgrim" who seeks for the sanctity of temple grounds to be respected in the extreme.

The second part of Jesus' saying continues to develop the narrative's characterization of Jesus as more than a pilgrim. Jesus commands the traders in the temple to stop making τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου an οἶκον ἐμπορίου. The present

imperative ποιεῖτε appears with μή, showing that Jesus seeks the cessation of an act already in progress.[385] Jesus demands from the dove merchants that they stop *continuing* to make the temple an emporium. Based on its appearance in classical Greek sources (e.g., Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.65, 2.78; Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.13, 1.100; Aristophanes, *Av.* 1523), inscriptions and papyri, the Septuagint (Deut 33:19, Isa 23:17, and Ezek 27:3), and Josephus (*Ant.* 9.17), BDAG defines ἐμπόριον as a "a place where business is carried on, *market*."[386]

Ἐμπόριον occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but its cognates ἐμπορεύομαι, ἐμπορία, and ἔμπορος do appear. Ἐμπορεύομαι appears in Jas 4:13, where it refers to conducting business and is associated with gain, and in 2 Pet 2:3, where it is used to describe the greedy, exploitative ways of false teachers. Ἐμπορία refers to business work that is set apart from agricultural work in Matt 22:5. The occurrences of ἔμπορος, in Matt 13:45 and Rev 18 (vv. 3, 11, 15, 23) designate a traveling merchant. The use of ἐμπορεύομαι, ἐμπορία, ἔμπορος in the New Testament confirms that ἐμπόριον designates a place where business or trade occurs, as does the sole

---

[385] Kerr, *Temple*, 69 n. 2; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1996), 724; BDF §336.

[386] BDAG s.v. ἐμπόριον (italics theirs). Similarly, LSJ s.v. ἐμπόριον defines ἐμπόριον as a "trading-station," "mart," or "factory," or as a "market-centre" for a district lacking a πόλις, also noting that in ancient Athens, the term designated *the Exchange*, where local and foreign merchants frequently gathered.

occurrence of ἐμπόριον in Josephus (*Ant.* 9.17) and its three appearances in the writings of Philo (*Moses* 1.194; *Spec. Laws* 4.154; *Legat.* 15).[387]

As with his command to remove the doves, Jesus' order to stop making the temple an emporium reveals an extreme passion on his part for the sanctity of the temple space. This protest against the temple's marketplace atmosphere would have set him apart from the majority of temple worshippers and the temple leadership. As the previous chapter demonstrated, commercial activity was part and parcel of a major temple's routine, accepted as commonplace, convenient, and even necessary, and the Jerusalem temple was no exception.

Jesus' identification of the temple as οἶκος ἐμπορίου follows his identification of it as the οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου. Οἶκος is the most frequent designation of the temple in the Septuagint, where it is often called the οἶκος (cf. 1 Kgs 6–8), οἶκος ἅγιος, οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ, or οἶκος τοῦ Κυρίου (cf. 1 Chr 9:23; 1 Kgs 5:14; Zech 6:12, 14; cf. Hag 1:9; Zech 1:15; Is 56:5, 7; 60:7), and where the phrase οἶκος (τοῦ) Θεοῦ appears as a fixed term for the sanctuary or temple (e.g., Gen 28:17, 19; Exod 23:19; Isa 65:5; Zech 14:21).[388] Later Jewish writings keep οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ as an appellation of the Jerusalem temple

---

[387] Based on occurrences in other primary sources, BDAG defines ἐμπορεύομαι as "to carry on an activity involving buying and selling, *be in business*" or "to engage w. someone in a business transaction, *buy and sell, trade in* (s.v. ἐμπορεύομαι; italics theirs); ἐμπορία as "the business or work in which one engages, *business, trade*" (s.v. ἐμπορία; italics theirs); and ἔμπορος as "one who travels by ship for business reasons, *merchant*," noting that in various sources the term "denotes *wholesale dealer* in contrast to κάπηλος 'retailer' " (s.v. ἔμπορος; italics theirs).

[388] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 73; McCaffrey, *House*, 30 n. 7; 49–50.

(e.g., *J.W.* 4.281; cf. Mark 2:26).[389] As James McCaffrey points out, "[A]gainst the OT and Jewish background…the Jerusalem temple is 'the house of God' par excellence."[390] Jesus' nomenclature for the temple in 2:16 thus reveals him to have a reverence for the temple as God's house that is on par with that of the Jewish Scriptures.[391]

For John the temple is also the house of Jesus' Father (τὸν οἶκον **τοῦ πατρός μου**) (cf. Luke 2:49). John 2:16 marks the first time in John that Jesus himself announces his filial relationship to God, reaffirming for the reader the filial nature of his relationship to God introduced in the Prologue (1:18) and confirming the earlier proclamations of John the Baptist (1:34) and Nathanael (1:49).[392] In 2:16, Jesus reveals to those in the temple this aspect of his identity. Its public introduction here underscores the importance of John's temple scene within John's christological framework. In 2:16, Jesus identifies himself as Son of the God whose οἶκος is the

---

[389] McCaffrey, *House*, 50. Similarly, the Hebrew בית appears in the writings of the Qumran community to refer to the temple (1QS 8:5, 8; 9:6; CD 3:18–4:10), though sometimes ambiguously (see ibid., 53–54).

[390] Ibid., 30.

[391] Judith Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 63–64.

[392] The Fourth Gospel's primary metaphor for describing the intimacy between Jesus and God is son-father, based especially on the cultural pattern of a son being an apprentice and continuing the work of the father (5:36; 9:4; 10:25, 37; 14:10) (Coloe, *God Dwells* 70 n. 26; see also C. H. Dodd, "A Hidden Parable in the Fourth Gospel," in *More New Testament Studies* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968]: 30–40). Coloe rightly agrees with Martin Scott, who notes the father-son relationship "takes its terms not from the gender of God, but from that of the earthly Jesus" (*Sophia and the Johannine Jesus* [JSNTSupp 71; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 173).

Jerusalem temple. Lieu draws from the Johannine Jesus' early identification of the temple as his Father's house an implication few interpreters make: "This means that in terms of narrative sequence the 'cleansing' does not signal Jesus' decisive and final judgment sign [against the temple], as in Mark and, to a lesser degree, Matthew."[393] Whereas the Synoptic Gospels articulate a move from synagogue and temple into the house, which for them becomes the locus of the new community, for John "[m]ore important than the 'domestic' house is the Temple as 'my Father's (= 'your', 2.17) house'."[394]

Jesus' command in 2:16 is framed in a manner that closely links the phrase οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου to the designation οἶκος ἐμπορίου. The narration emphasizes the link between the temple as God's dwelling and its status as an emporium by means of a play on words centered on οἶκος, the second instance of which is not strictly necessary in terms of syntax.[395] The same point can be made by using the noun ἐμπόριον alone; the phrase of οἶκον ἐμπορίου makes for awkward Greek. This particular phrasing further suggests the narrator's deliberate intention to link God's οἶκος and ἐμπόριον.[396]

---

[393] "Temple and Synagogue," 63.

[394] Ibid.

[395] Brown, *John*, 1:115.

[396] Daniel B. Wallace classifies the use of ἐμπορίου in John 2:16 as a descriptive genitive (see *Greek Grammar*, 79–81). According to Wallace, in a description genitive "[t]he genitive substantive describes the head noun in a loose manner" (ibid., 79). Noting that "[t]he nature of the collocation of the two nouns in this construction is usually quite ambiguous" (ibid., 79), he also calls genitives in this category "aporetic genitives," by which he means "the 'I am at a loss' gen.," from the

The close connection the narration makes here between temple and trade—between the temple as οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου and as οἶκος ἐμπορίου—reflects the status of the Jerusalem temple as a major source and center of commerce. The temple was simultaneously the locus of divine presence and the locus of market activities that influenced life and society in Jerusalem and Judea. John's rhetorical choice highlights that just as much as the temple "housed" Jesus' Father, it "housed" the commercial activities that sustained cultic worship and in large part benefitted Judea.

That the temple is ἐμπόριον is obvious and unremarkable. For the reader knowledgeable about temple commerce, what is remarkable about Jesus' saying is that by calling the temple the οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου, Jesus has publicly claimed that his relationship to the God who resides in the temple is close enough to be expressed in filial terms. The narration has added a layer to its characterization of Jesus, moving its depiction of him from a pilgrim, to an excessively devout pilgrim, to God's Son.

3.3.3 John 2:17

In 2:17, the disciples offer one reaction to Jesus' temple act: ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν· *ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεταί με.* John 2:13 does not mention that the disciples accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem, but in light of

---

Greek word, ἀπορέω (ibid., 79 n. 1). It is "the category one should appeal to when another slot cannot be found" (ibid.). According to Wallace, descriptive genitives are frequently close to the attributive genitive (ibid., 79), which "specifies an *attribute* or innate quality of the head substantive" (ibid., 86; italics his). In the case of οἶκον ἐμπορίου in John 2:16, Wallace suggests the translation "house of merchandise" and states, "The idea is 'a house in which merchandise is sold' " (ibid., 80). BDF categorizes ἐμπορίου as an epexegetical genitive: "a house that is a marketplace."

the comprehensive nature of pilgrimage to Jerusalem from Galilee for Passover, it is no surprise to discover that the disciples accompanied Jesus from Capernaum.[397] Not mentioning the disciples in 2:13 reflects the narrator's program of emphasizing Jesus' active role in 2:13–16.

The disciples are introduced by their act of remembering (ἐμνήσθησαν is the first word of 2:17), in particular remembering Ps 69:9a (BHS: 69:10; LXX: 68:10). The word that sparks the disciples' remembering is οἶκος, which Jesus uses twice in 2:16. Οἶκος is the only noun found both in Jesus' saying and the psalmist's words as remembered by the disciples. Again the rhetorical focus rests on οἶκος. The repeated use of οἶκος helps the reader to see that the central claim of 2:16 is Jesus' identification of the temple as his Father's οἶκος, not of it as ἐμπόριον. This makes sense in light of the Jerusalem temple's economic role. To call the Jerusalem temple ἐμπόριον would have been neither scandalous, disgraceful, nor otherwise remarkable. It simply was a fact. What matters more for the interpretation of 2:13–22 is that Jesus calls the temple his Father's οἶκος.

In 2:17 the term οἶκος appears in the context of the disciples' remembrance of Ps 69:9a. In citing this psalm, they attribute Jesus' actions in the temple to ζῆλος he holds for God's οἶκος.[398] Ζῆλος is a characteristic attributed to the most ardent defenders of God and God's law, to figures who commit dramatic, often violent, acts

---

[397] See §2.2.1 n. 25.

[398] On the concept of zeal in biblical literature and Second Temple Judaism, see David M. Rhoads, "Zealots," *ABD* 6:1044–45.

that "punished idolatrous violations of God's right to exclusive allegiance from Israel."[399] Taking it upon themselves to enforce God's commandments and restore allegiance to God, figures renowned for their ζῆλος act on behalf of God and God's covenantal interests on earth.[400] Like the other figures who possess ζῆλος, the psalmist sees himself as representing God's interests on earth: "It is *for your sake* that I have borne reproach, that shame has covered my face...It is zeal *for your house* that has consumed me" (69:7, 9a; LXX: 68:8, 10a; cf. 119:139). He experiences persecution for manifesting his zeal and views his devotion to God, expressed as ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου in 68:10a LXX, as the cause of his struggles.[401]

---

[399] Rhoads, "Zealots," 6:1044. Such figures include: Simeon and Levi, who avenged the rape of their sister Dinah by killing the men of Shechem (Gen 34:1–34); Phinehas who killed a fellow Israelite and a Midianite woman for carrying on an idolatrous sexual relationship that had led God to punish the Israelites with a plague (Num 25:1–15; 31:6; Ps 106:28–31); Elijah, who killed the prophets of Baal (1 Kgs 18:36–40; 19:10–18); King Jehu, who slaughtered all who worshipped Baal (2 Kgs 10:16–27); and King Josiah, who extirpated idolatry from the land (2 Kgs 22:1–23:30). Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period holds these figures in high esteem. See Sir 45:23–24; 48:1–2; 1 Macc 2:26, 54 [cf. 2:50; 2 Macc 4:2]; 4 Macc 18:12; Jdt 9:2–4 (cf. *T. Levi* 6:3; *T. Ash.* 4:2–5); *2 Bar.* 66:5). God is also said to possess ζῆλος, a trait that describes God's intolerance of violations of the covenant with Israel, especially idolatry (Exod 20:5; Deut 4:24; 5:9; Deut 29:20 [LXX: 29:19]; cf. Ps 79:5 [LXX: 78:5]). In the first century, bands of revolutionaries took on the name "zealot" as they sought to restore God's dominion over the land now ruled by Rome.

[400] In Num 25:11, God even says that by his actions Phinehas, who is the archetype of these zealous figures and whose stature as such crested during the Second Temple Period and extended into the rabbinic period (Rhoads, "Zealots," 6:1044), "has turned back my wrath from the Israelites by manifesting such zeal among them on my behalf."

[401] Acknowledging the ambiguity that arises in the context of the Psalm from the different possible meanings of "zeal" (which could mean "love" or "jealous passion"), "your house" (which could mean "the Temple of Jerusalem" or "the people of Israel"), and "consume" (which could mean "an engulfing passion" or "being

In John 2:17, the disciples liken Jesus to the psalmist, who presents himself in the psalm as holding a zeal for the temple willing to lead to persecution and suffering, even death.[402] John's narration alters the tense of Ps 69:9a. In the Psalm,

---

devoured in death—that is, a sacrificial death"), Kerr lists eight possible interpretations of John's appropriation of Ps 69:9a to argue that 2:17 is deliberately multivalent in meaning (*Temple*, 83–84). Despite this multivalency, Kerr emphasizes the importance for John that the psalmist suffered for his zeal: "What we *do* know is that the psalmist suffered for his zeal. He was ostracized and insulted (Ps. 69.10b). Drunkards made songs about him (v. 12). He was alienated from his own family (v. 8; cf. Jn 7.5 and the mention of Jesus' family just prior to the Temple episode in Jn 2.12). In whatever way the psalmist's zeal for the LORD's house manifested itself, it triggered a hostile reaction, a reaction that devoured...him" (ibid., 84).

[402] Many scholars see John 2:17's appropriation of this Psalm quotation as alluding to Jesus' death (Brown, *John*, 1:124; Bruce, *John*, 75; Coloe, *God Dwells*, 74–75; Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 204; Kerr, *Temple*, 85; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* [Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996], 41; Francis J. Moloney, "Reading John 2:13–22: The Purification of the Temple," *RB* 97 [1990]: 443–44; Andreas Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate* [WUNT 2/83; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 123; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:347; Udo Schnelle, "Die Tempelreinigung und die Christologie des Johannesevangeliums," *NTS* 42 [1996]: 362–63). One reason to agree with this camp of scholars is because this Psalm is quoted often in the New Testament to refer to Jesus' passion (cf. John 15:25 [quotes v. 5a], 19:28–29 [v. 22b]; Mark 15:36 par.; Matt 27:34 [v. 22a]; Luke 23:36; Acts 1:20; Rom 11:9–10; 15:3 [v. 10b]; 2 Cor 6:2) (Coloe, *God Dwells*, 74–75, n. 41; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 301; Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961], 105; idem., *John*, 140; Kerr, *Temple*, 83 n. 37; Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* [SBLDS 133; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992], 20 n. 17). Moreover, Coloe notes that virtually all of the instances in which the Fourth Gospel speaks of the act of remembering, it does so with reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus (2:22; 12:16; 15:20; 16:4, 21; cf. 14:26) (*God Dwells*, 75). Against this majority, Barrett (*John*, 199), J. H. Bernard (*The Gospel According to St. John* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928], 92), Fuglseth (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 158–59; but cf. ibid., 160), and B. F. Westcott

zeal for God's house has literally "eaten" (אֲכָלָתְנִי) the psalmist. The Septuagint's aorist *κατέφαγεν* in Ps 68 appears as the future *καταφάγεταί* in John 2:17.[403] By using the future tense, John's narration hints that the hardship Jesus endures because of his zeal for God's temple is in his future.[404] As Dodd puts it, "just as the Righteous Sufferer of the Psalm paid the price of his loyalty to the temple, so the action of Jesus...will bring him to grief."[405] The disciples have reason to suspect that this grief is imminent, as Jesus' actions in the temple are of the sort that could lead to immediate arrest, especially during the volatile Passover period (cf. Mark 11:18; Luke 19:47; *t. Sanh.* 13.5; *Roš Haš.* 17a; *y. Ber.* 9.13).

By applying Ps 69:9a to Jesus within the context of the 2:14–17, Jesus' is identified as displaying an intense devotion to the temple that further distinguishes him from the majority of pious temple pilgrims.[406] Countless pilgrims would

---

(*The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* [2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954], 1:92) see no allusion to Jesus' death.

[403] Most textual witnesses use the future *καταφάγεταί*. Witnesses that read *κατέφαγεν* in John 2:17 reflect the attempt to conform to the tense of Psalm 69:9a [LXX: 68:10a]. There are variants in the Septuagint tradition that use the future *καταφάγεταί*, possibly to conform to John's quotation. On the textual traditions at play here, see Barrett, *John*, 198–99; Bultmann, *John*, 124; Coloe, *God Dwells*, 74–75, n. 41; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:347.

[404] On the implications of the change in tense for understanding the narrative, see Francis J. Moloney, "Reading John 2:13–22: The Purification of the Temple," *RB* 97 (1990): 443; Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 40–41.

[405] *Interpretation*, 301.

[406] Francis J. Moloney writes that the disciples recognize Jesus as "a passionate figure committed to the honour of God unto death, like Phineas, Elijah or Mattathias (see Num. 25.11; 1 Kgs 19.10, 14; Sir. 48.2; 1 Macc. 2.24–26" ("Reading John 2:13–22," 443). Though in the context of the Psalm "house" could refer to the

participate in the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple, coming to Jerusalem to offer sacrifices, pay the temple tax, and spend second tithe money. By disrupting the well-established temple-economic system, Jesus shows that he is more than a pilgrim. He is someone who can claim the God who dwells in the temple is his Father. As God's Son, he can disrupt the temple's usual activities and in doing demonstrate zeal like the psalmist's. John's characterization of Jesus has developed throughout 2:13–17 from Jesus as pilgrim (2:13–14), to Jesus as hyper-pilgrim (2:15–16), to Jesus as God's zealous Son willing to endure any suffering or hardship on account of his zeal for the temple that is his Father's house (2:16–17).

3.3.4 John 2:18

John 2:18—Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς;—provides a second reaction to Jesus' temple act, that of the Jews. Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is a complex category in the Fourth Gospel, but here it refers to Jewish religious authorities who appear throughout the Gospel as Jesus' interlocutors, often debating with him on temple grounds (e.g., 7:14–52; 8:12–59).[407] Here the Jews emerge as active protagonists for the first time in the Fourth Gospel.[408]

---

people of Israel instead of the temple (Kerr, *Temple*, 83; see n. 108 above), John's appropriation of 69:9a has the temple in view, given the setting of the pericope.

[407] As Coloe notes, "In this Gospel the term 'the Jews' must be understood as a narrative device. The term indicates a specific group of characters in opposition to Jesus and as a narrative device these characters are to be distinguished from the historical people following Jewish religious beliefs" (*God Dwells*, 65 n. 1) On "the Jews" in the Fourth Gospel, see R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 125–31; Bieringer et al., eds., *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox,

The Jews ask Jesus for a σημεῖον. They question Jesus to determine whether or not he has the authority to demonstrate the zeal for God's temple that his actions in 2:14–16 claim he does. As Francis J. Moloney says, "here 'the Jews' are asking that a prophetic act of zeal be authenticated."[409] In Coloe's words, they "ask for a sign that will give divine legitimacy to his deeds."[410] Dodd paraphrases the Jews' question as follows: "In view of the drastic action you have taken, show us your credentials."[411] The nature of their question indicates the Jews accept that by his actions Jesus claims an authority to speak and act for God and ask him to validate this claim. "Their request lies in the expectation that those who act with God's authority can perform 'signs and wonders' that will testify to their authority," as did Moses and Aaron before the Israelites (Exod 4:29–31).[412]

The first of Jesus' σημεῖα, his turning the water into wine in the wedding at Cana (2:1–11), immediately precedes the temple scene.[413] The narrator explicitly states that by this σημεῖον Jesus revealed his glory, a manifestation that led the disciples to respond to his act at Cana with belief (2:11). In the Fourth Gospel, σημεῖον is a public work of Jesus that "displays God's glory in Jesus who is thus

---

2001); Adele Reinhartz, *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 2001).

[408] Moloney, *John*, 76.

[409] Moloney, *John*, 81.

[410] *God Dwells*, 76.

[411] *Historical Tradition*, 161.

[412] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 76.

[413] Other miracles are labeled as σημεῖα in 4:45; 6:14; 9:16; 11:47; 12:18.

shown to be God's true representative (cf. 20:30–31)."[414] Like the disciples, the Jews observe how Jesus' words and deeds present him—not as a pilgrim, but as someone who claims authority to speak for and represent God on earth—and question him accordingly using the language of σημεῖα.[415]

3.3.5 John 2:19

In 2:19, Jesus responds to the Jews' question: ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. His response shows that he understands the sort of sign they seek. He speaks to them as one who sees himself as

---

[414] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John's Christology," *BBR* 5 (1995): 95. On signs in the Fourth Gospel, see ibid., 87–95. John explicitly labels six of Jesus' works as "signs": (1) the changing of water into wine (2:1–11); (2) the healing of the nobleman's son (4:46–54); (3) the healing of the lame man (5:1–15); (4) the feeding of the multitude (6:1–15); (5) the healing of the blind man (ch. 9); and the raising of Lazarus (ch. 11). Köstenberger argues Jesus' temple act constitutes a seventh σημεῖον of the Gospel (ibid., 95–103).

[415] According to Coloe, the Jews focus only on Jesus' actions in the temple and ignore the words he speaks in 2:16, resulting in their failure to perceive that Jesus' authority stems from his identity as Son of the God who dwells in the temple (*God Dwells*, 76). It is notable that they do not bring up Jesus' identification of the temple as his Father's house. However, this does not mean that their request for a sign of Jesus' authority bypass his words in 2:16, which are as much a part of the temple act as his actions against the sellers and moneychangers. Their request for a sign of Jesus' authority indicates they consider what Jesus says and does in the temple as a claim of his close relationship to God, by which he is able to speak for and represent God. The term "son of God" in Jewish tradition often designated kings, prophets, and other figures thought to have an intimate relationship with God (e.g. 2 Sam 7:14). Over the course of the Gospel, as Jesus' claims to be God's Son more overtly reveals he means he has an ontological relationship with God, the Jews react in ways that show they view Jesus as committing blasphemy (e.g., John 5:17–18).

speaking for God by using a statement worded as an ironical imperative, a form of challenge found in prophetic literature (cf. Amos 4:4; Isa 8:9; Matt 23:32).[416]

Jesus challenges the Jews to destroy "this temple" (τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον). Ναός is the third term for "temple" that appears in the pericope (ἱερόν in 2:14–15 and οἶκος in 2:16–17). BDAG defines *ναός* as "a place or structure specifically associated with or set apart for a deity, who is frequently perceived to be using it as a dwelling, *temple*."[417] Jewish and early Christian literature often uses *ναός* to designate the Jerusalem temple's sanctuary, the innermost temple building that contained the Holy of Holies. However, it is also used of the entire temple complex (*J.W.* 6.293; *Ag. Ap.* 2.119). In fact, both ἱερόν and *ναός* can refer to the entire temple area or its inner sanctuary, so that a clear distinction between the two terms is not possible.[418] A degree of ambiguity therefore arises when Jesus says λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον—is he referring to the temple sanctuary exclusively or to the entire temple complex?[419]

---

[416] Brown, *John*, 1:115; Bultmann, *Gospel*, 125; Kerr, *Temple*, 87–88. According to Brown, the sense of Jesus' challenge is, "Go ahead and do this and see what happens!" (*John*, 1:115). Dodd reads this statement as a conditional sentence with λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον as its protasis, according to the rules of Hebrew syntax: "If you destroy this temple, I will raise it up" or "If this temple be destroyed I will raise it up" (Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 90; *Interpretation*, 302 n. 1).

[417] BDAG s.v. "ναός, οῦ, ὁ" (italics theirs).

[418] U. Borse, "ἱερόν," *EDNT* 2:175; O. Michel, "ναός," *TDNT* 4:882.

[419] Coloe (*God Dwells*, 76) and Schnackenburg (*John*, 1:349) classify Jesus' reply as a *mashal*, a purposely enigmatic riddle which the Jews do not comprehend. Brown reads Jesus' saying in 2:19 as referring to the Jerusalem temple as whole, with Jesus' words being an eschatological proclamation foretelling what will happen to the temple in the eschatological age (*John*, 1:23). For a survey of different scholarly interpretations of this temple logion, see Neremparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 31–35.

Jesus' claim to raise the ναός in three days does not provide a clear answer to this question. Ἐγείρω can refer to the erection of a building,[420] but to whatever temple structure Jesus' statement may apply, construction in antiquity on the scale of a major temple like the one in Jerusalem was an arduous and prolonged process impossible to complete in three days' time. The sanctuary took about one-and-a-half years to build and was a delicate project that involved sophisticated coordination among the priests who built it, so that temple services could continue as construction ensued and the Holy of Holies remain restricted from view.[421] The outer temple took eight years to complete, and further construction, maintenance, repair, and renovation continued on the temple complex long afterward. For Jesus to claim to build a temple on the scale of the Jerusalem temple in three days appears ludicrous, but from John's perspective, it boldly asserts that he has the authority to do so.

3.3.6 John 2:20

In their response to Jesus in 2:20—εἶπαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν;—the Jews point out that the temple has been undergoing construction for forty-six years. They use

---

[420] BDAG s.v. "ἐγείρω." For its use on the raising of buildings, cf. Lucian, *Alex.* 10; 1 Esdras 5:43 (44); Sir 49:13. Josephus occasionally uses it for the temple (*Ant.* 15.391; 20.228).

[421] See §2.6.

the aorist passive indicative οἰκοδομήθη in a complexive sense that sums up "the whole process of building which is not yet completed."[422]

This complexive use of οἰκοδομέω suits the reality of the temple's lengthy reconstruction and renovation. Though the sanctuary took about one-and-a-half years to build and the outer temple took eight years officially, further construction, maintenance, repair, and renovation continued on the temple complex up until 64 C.E., and recent excavations along the Western Wall reveal that Herod left the temple unfinished.[423] The reality of the temple's ongoing construction indicates that when the Jews use ναός in 2:20, they do not refer exclusively to the sanctuary, which took much less than forty-six years to construct, but rather to the whole temple structure, which was built over a longer period and was never really completed.

The Jews hear Jesus claim to have the authority to build the Jerusalem temple, including its sanctuary. The authority to build previous incarnations of the Jerusalem

---

[422] Brown, *John*, 1:116; see also Beasley-Murray, *John*, 38; Kerr, *Temple*, 91–92. As an aorist passive indicative, οἰκοδομήθη in 2:20 seems to indicate that the temple's construction had been completed by the time of the temple scene. But, as in the parallel use of οἰκοδομέω in Ezra 5:16 LXX (ἀπὸ τότε ἕως τοῦ νῦν ᾠκοδομήθη καὶ οὐκ ἐτελέσθη), the verb here functions in the complexive sense described by Brown (cf. John 4:3, 20). Ezra 5:16 LXX also pertains to the Jerusalem temple: "Then that Sabanazar came, and laid the foundations of the house of God in Jerusalem: and from that time even until now it has been building, and has not been finished" (translation is from Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* [London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986], 623). Beasley-Murray's (*John*, 38): "From that time until now building has gone on and it is not yet finished."

[423] See §2.6.

temple was granted to kings directly by God or by one of God's prophets.[424] When Herod took it upon himself to renovate the Jerusalem temple, he made sure God's priestly representatives played an active role in the project, especially in building the sanctuary. Read against this background, the emphatic σύ in the Jews' response shows they question whether Jesus has the authority he claims to have to build the temple. "This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will *you* raise it up in three days?" In both 2:18 and 2:20 the Jews question Jesus about whether he has the authority claimed by his words and deeds in the temple, to speak for and represent God as a prophet or a priest would.

3.3.7 John 2:21

In 2:21 the narrator supplies a statement intended to clarify matters for the reader: ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. It is a characteristic feature of Johannine style for the narrator or Jesus to explain the correct meaning of a term or statement that has multiple possible interpretations (e.g., 3:3–5; 4:10–15, 31–34; 6:32–35, 41–42, 51–53; 7:33–36; 8:21–22, 31–33, 51–53, 56–58).[425] Asides by the narrator in 7:39, 12:33, 21:19, and 21:23 directly inform the reader of the proper interpretation of Jesus' words.[426] In 2:21 the narrator addresses the ambiguity of Jesus' saying in 2:19. Which ναός does Jesus challenge the Jews to destroy so he can

---

[424] See Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 36–59.

[425] Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 165, 303; Herbert Leroy, *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannes-evangeliums* (BBB 30; Bonn: Peter Hansteins Verlag, 1968).

[426] Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 113.

raise it in three days? The inner sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple or the whole temple complex? The narrator informs the reader Jesus was not referring to the Jerusalem temple at all. He was speaking about his body.[427]

Fuglseth states 2:21 presents two main alternatives for understanding Jesus' saying in 2:19: (1) either it indicates that the object of Jesus' saying in 2:19 is his "body temple" only, or (2) Jesus' saying is a double entendre that says "if you tear down this geographical temple, I shall raise up a new one…a body temple [that] takes the place of the [geographical temple]."[428] The genitive τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος can be read as either explicative ("the temple that is his body"), which supports the first alternative, or appositional ("the temple, that is, his body"), which supports the second.[429]

Given the narrator's consistent presentation of the Jerusalem temple as its own physical space in 2:13–16, reading τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος as referring to the "body temple" of Jesus proves to be more in line with the narrator's perspective.[430] According to the narrator of John 2:13–22, when Jesus speaks of a temple's

---

[427] The narrator is especially specific at pointing out that Jesus—literally, *that one* (ἐκεῖνος)—was speaking of his body, the use of ἐκεῖνος rather explicitly distinguishing Jesus' understanding of his words in 2:19 from that of the Jews (Moloney, *John*, 82).

[428] *Johannine Sectarianism*, 164. The first alternative involves "very little replacement" while the latter interpretation indicates complete replacement (ibid.).

[429] Bultmann, *Gospel*, 127 n. 5; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 162; Moloney, *John*, 82.

[430] As Fuglseth puts it, Jesus' statement in 2:19 "is now seen as a reference to the 'body temple' and not primarily to the geographical temple."

destruction and raising in 2:19, he is speaking of "the temple that is his body" (explicative), not the temple that is God's οἶκος and the οἶκον ἐμπορίου of Jerusalem.[431] The Jerusalem temple is the site of the cultic worship of God, to which pilgrims can travel (v. 13), in which commerce flourishes and animals, merchants, and moneychangers can be found (v. 14), in which Jesus can grasp materials to make a whip (v. 15), out of which Jesus can remove animals or order their removal (vv. 15, 16), and which is the house of Jesus' Father as well as the most influential and powerful religio-commercial sector of Judea (v. 16).

On the surface, Jesus' statement in 2:19—λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν—appears to be about the Jerusalem temple. The term ναός appears to refer to the Jerusalem temple and ἐγείρω to its reconstruction. But the massive scale of the Jerusalem temple's construction makes clear that Jesus' statement cannot apply to it, and the narration provides clues that Jesus' words point beyond their literal meaning and pertain not to the Jerusalem temple but to the "body temple" of Jesus, validating Fuglseth's interpretation. Ἐγείρω has a double-meaning that allows the narrator to interpret Jesus' words in 2:19 as a reference to

---

[431] The use of the concept of "temple" as a metaphor for a body (individual, communal, or institutional) is common in Jewish and early Christian literature, including as a metaphor for Jesus' body (1 Cor 3:10–17; 1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; 1 Pet 2:4–10; cf. Eph 2:19–22; Rev 21:22) (BDAG s.v. "ναός, οῦ, ὁ"; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 162). In the New Testament, ναός is used to describe the individual body as a sanctuary for the soul or Holy Spirit (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 5:1; 6:16) and to designate the Christian church (Eph 2:19–21; 4:12; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17). In *Opif.* 137 Philo uses temple language with reference to the first man, and 4QFlor 1, 1:6 applies the temple metaphor to the Qumran community (ibid., 162 nn. 80, 81). In 2:21, the narrator states that in 2:19 Jesus speaks of his body as a temple metaphorically.

Jesus' resurrection. It can refer to the raising of a building, but it can also refer to the resurrection of a dead body and is routinely used for Jesus' resurrection in early Christian literature.[432] In 2:19 it is modified by the prepositional phrase ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, which allows the narrator in 2:21 to tell the reader that Jesus' claim to rebuild the temple in three days alludes to the resurrection of his body.[433]

By framing Jesus' response to the Jews in resurrection language, John's narration lays the groundwork for its claim that Jesus' resurrection is the sign of his authority to stop commerce in the temple, a claim that becomes more explicit in the final verse of the pericope. In Matt 12:38–40 the scribes and Pharisees seek a sign from Jesus and, as he does here, he answers in terms of the resurrection after three days (cf. Luke 12:29–30). The size and scale of the temple's reconstruction confirms that Jesus' logion in 2:19 has to do with the resurrection of his body and not the Jerusalem temple. By focusing on Jesus' body in 2:21, the narrator recalls the resurrection undertones hinted at by Jesus' use of ἐγείρω and ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις in 2:19

---

[432] BDAG s.v. "ἐγείρω." E.g., Rom 6:4.

[433] Though the phrase in early Christian literature that usually refers to Jesus' resurrection with "third day" language is τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (cf. 1 Cor 15:4; Matt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Luke 9:22; 18:33; 24:7, 46) (Brown, *John*, 1:116), "the 'three days' interval of the temple-saying belongs essentially to the tradition of the resurrection in all its forms (= τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ)" (Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 161; cf. Nereparampil, *Destroy This Temple*, 50–54). Other phrases used include μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (Matt 27:63; Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:34) and διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν (Matt 26:61; Mark 14:58), and ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις is also found (Matt 27:40; Mark 15:29). "It seems best to allow for diverse phraseology rather than to insist that only one or two of these phrases contains a reference the resurrection" (Hoskins, *Fulfillment*, 114 n. 29). See also Bernard, *John*, 1:94; Coloe, *God Dwells*, 77, n. 49. Johannes Baptist Bauer ("Drei Tage," *Bib* 39 [1958]: 355) and Lindars (*John*, 143) argue John's ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις is a Hebraic idiom that merely refers to a short period of time (cf. Hos 6:2; Luke 13:32).

in preparation for the pericope's closing verse, which makes clear for the reader that the sign of Jesus' authority to disrupt commerce in the temple is his resurrection.

3.3.8 John 2:22

The narrator's commentary on Jesus' saying in 2:19 resumes in 2:22: ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Verse 22 begins with a proleptic reference to Jesus' resurrection from death (ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν). Ἐγείρω appears here for the third time in the pericope, but with three important distinctions from its prior appearances. First, rather than the veiled reference vis-à-vis the double-meaning of ἐγείρω in 2:19, where it can refer to the raising of a building or the resurrection of a corpse, in 2:22 ἐγείρω clearly refers only to a raising from the dead. Here the narrator brings to the surface the death and resurrection undertones of 2:19–21, fully revealing that Jesus is referring to his death and resurrection in 2:19 while the Jews are under the impression he is speaking about the temple.

Second, whereas in 2:19–20 ἐγείρω appears as an active verb with Jesus as its subject (2:19: ἐγερῶ; 2:20: σὺ...ἐγερεῖς), in 2:22 it appears in the passive (ἠγέρθη), so that Jesus has the raising done to him. The doer of the action is left unspecified, making ἠγέρθη in 2:22 a "divine passive" which attributes Jesus' resurrection from the dead to God, a common way of indicating God as the cause of Jesus' resurrection in early Christian literature (e.g., Rom 6:4). This is the first time in the pericope the narration uses a true passive for an action pertaining to Jesus, breaking the pattern

of ascribing agency to Jesus begun with ἀνέβη in v. 13.[434] Verb use throughout this pericope has served the purpose of underscoring the control and authority with which Jesus acts in this scene. We see this especially in the first half of the pericope. With the exception of the verbs in Jesus' speech in v. 16, Jesus is the subject of every verb in 2:13–16, each narrated identically with an aorist third person singular active verb, from ἀνέβη in 2:13 to εἶπεν in 2:16. In this way, John communicates Jesus' disruption of the commerce he finds taking place in the temple in a vivid manner that emphasizes Jesus' agency in carrying out these actions. From a narrative point of view, Jesus controls what happens in 2:13–16. Use of the divine passive in 2:22 connects Jesus' authority to God's action of resurrecting him. Jesus' authority to speak and act for God in the temple stems directly from his relationship to God, which God's own self corroborated by resurrecting Jesus. Jesus is God's Son and as such is filled with zeal for his Father's house and has the authority to act as he does in 2:14–16.

A final distinction between ἐγείρω in 2:19–20 and 2:22 is its change in tense, from the future in 2:19–20 to the past in 2:22. The exchange between Jesus and the Jews about a future raising is confirmed in 2:22 as a past reality due to God's

[434] Ἀποκρίνομαι, used for Jesus' reply in 2:19, is passive in form but active in meaning. In 2:21 the narrator uses λέγω in the imperfect tense (ἔλεγεν) to explain that Jesus "was speaking" of the temple of his body. While use of the imperfect departs from the consistent use of the aorist tense to depict Jesus' actions in the temple, the narration maintains its presentation of Jesus' actions in the active voice.

intervention. God's act of resurrecting Jesus fulfills Jesus' statement in 2:19 that in the future the temple that is his body will be raised.

The use of resurrection language in this pericope conflates responsibility for the resurrection between Jesus and the God who resides in the Jerusalem temple.[435] By using the divine passive ἠγέρθη in 2:22, the narration attributes the resurrection to God. The same word occurs in the active with Jesus as its subject in 2:19, by which the narration implies Jesus' agency in his own resurrection, attributing to him an agency equal to that of his Father (see also 10:17–18). Just as God does, Jesus has the power to raise from the dead (see also 5:19–21). He can manifest God's activity on earth.

At a time after Jesus' resurrection, the disciples "remembered" and "believed" (cf. 12:16). The narration introduces the disciples' act of remembering exactly as it does in 2:17 (ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι). In 2:17 they remember Ps 69:9a at the moment of Jesus' disruption of temple commerce. In 2:22 they remember Jesus' words in 2:19 after Jesus had been raised from the dead.[436]

---

[435] Kerr, *Temple*, 90; cf. Nereparampil, *Destroy This Temple*, 56–57.

[436] Since it alludes to Jesus' death and resurrection, the λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς mentioned in 2:22 is Jesus' saying in 2:19 (Beasley-Murray, *John*, 41; Kerr, *Temple*, 95; and Lindars, *John*, 144). In light of 2:22, the question becomes whether the disciples' act of remembering the Scripture passage in 2:17 occurs during the temple incident or after Jesus' death and resurrection. This question does not emerge from reading the narrative up through 2:17, and the passage is perfectly intelligible with the disciples remembering Scripture to interpret Jesus' act as it happens, as a number of scholars hold (Barrett, *John*, 198; Bernard, *John*, 1:91–92; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 158; Haenchen, *John*, 1:184; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:347; Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 18 n. 5). Bultmann (*John*, 124), Brown (*John* 1:123), Hoskins

The verbatim introduction links 2:17 and 2:22 and instructs the reader to interpret the second instance of remembering in light of the first. By formulating the disciples' belief in Jesus' word the same way as their belief in Scripture, John's narration shows the disciples granting to Jesus' word an authority akin to God's own word in the biblical writings. Moreover, by formally connecting 2:17 and 2:22, John's narration points out the γραφή the disciples believe in 2:22 is the Ps 69:9a quotation in 2:17, further indicating Jesus' authority stems from the zeal he has for his Father's house.[437]

This final verse of the pericope reveals that Jesus' words and actions in John's temple scene find their ultimate justification in Jesus' resurrection. In 2:21 the narrator explains to the reader that Jesus was talking about the destruction and raising of his body when answering the Jews' request for a sign of his authority. The

---

(*Fulfillment*, 110 n. 7), and Lindars (*John* 140) take 2:22 as suggesting the disciples' remembering of the Psalm in 2:17 took place after the resurrection, but the narrative makes no indication of this. Several scholars are indecisive on this matter (Bruce, *John*, 75; Carson, *John*, 180), and Kerr argues that the time of the disciples' remembering in 2:17 is deliberately vague (81–86).

[437] Coloe, *God Dwells*, 78, esp. n. 55. Barrett notes that ἡ γραφή in the singular usually refers to a specific passage (*John*, 201), but disagrees that it refers to Ps 69 (*John*, 201). Like Coloe, Beasley-Murray (*John*, 41), Fuglseth (*Johannine Sectarianism*, 164), Kerr (*Temple*, 95), Lindars (*John*, 144), and Schnackenburg (*John*, 1:353) maintain the scripture referred to in 2:22 is Ps 69:9. A number of scholars hold that in 2:22 the disciples are said to believe that scripture in general foreshadows the resurrection of Jesus (Bernard, *John*, 97–98; Haenchen, *John*, 1:185; Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, 196; Robert Kysar, *John* [ACNT; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986], 50). Hoskins holds the reference is to passages in the Jewish Scriptures relevant to Jesus' death and resurrection (*Fulfillment*, 192 n. 49). Some scholars think the scripture referred to is Ps 16, particularly 16:8–11 (Carson, *John*, 183) or specifically 16:10 (Westcott, *John*, 95). Brown finds the reference unclear, and posits Ps 16:10, 69:9, or scripture in general as possibilities (*John*, 1:116).

narrator begins 2:22 by introducing the post-Easter period as the context which grounds the disciples' belief in Jesus' word. The disciples witness Jesus' temple act in 2:14–16 and his dialogue with the Jews in 2:18–20, but only after his resurrection do they fully affirm belief in Jesus as God's authoritative representative in the temple and in the world. The resurrection is the sign the Jews had asked for, the sign of Jesus' authority to speak and act for God in the temple.[438]

3.4 John 2:13–22: Jesus' Authority as God's Son

Several features of John's narrative support the view that Jesus' disruption of temple commerce reveals his authority in public as God's Son. First, the narration of 2:13–17 underscores that by his actions and words Jesus exercises a veritable control in the temple. Jesus takes the initiative to go up to the temple, and there creates a dramatic scene that draws attention to himself as the subject of a series of actions that presume the authority to dictate what goes on in the temple: temple commerce must stop upon his arrival in the temple.[439] Second, the topic of conversation in

---

[438] Many scholars agree that Jesus' death and resurrection is the sign provided to address the question of the Jews in 2:18 (Bultmann, *John*, 125; Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism*, 165, 166; Kerr, *Temple*, 96–97; Nereparampil, *Destroy this Temple*, 92–98). Others argue that Jesus' temple act is itself the sign (Dodd, *Interpretation*, 300–01; Kostenberger, "The Seventh Johannine Sign," esp. 95–103).

[439] This consequence of his presence in the temple is reminiscent of the eschatological vision of Zech 14:21a, where commerce comes to a halt on the day the Lord comes to the temple. On the possible connection between John 2:16 and Zech 14:21, see Kerr, *Temple*, 73–77. Kerr favors an allusion to Zech 14:21 in John 2:16 (ibid., 81). If this allusion is intended, it would work to support the pericope's claim that Jesus' actions in the temple display zeal and divine presence (Lieu, "Temple and Synagogue," 68). But it is difficult to determine conclusively whether or not the text intentionally alludes to Zech 14:21. In its original context, Zech 14:21 might be

2:18–22 centers on the question of Jesus' authority. In 2:18 the Jews ask for a sign that qualifies Jesus for doing what he has done in the temple, and Jesus' response points to his death and resurrection as that sign.

John 2:13–22 marks the first moment in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus displays his authority to speak and act for God openly in the temple. His authority is grounded in Jesus' zeal as God's Son; his resurrection is its verification. By setting Jesus' actions in the temple within a Jewish pilgrimage context, John develops a complex depiction of Jesus by which Jesus simultaneously acts like a pilgrim and as something other than a pilgrim. Like any devout Jew, Jesus goes to Jerusalem for Passover (2:13–14). But at the same time that Jesus participates in the religio-economic phenomenon of Passover pilgrimage, he exceeds its religious and economic expectations and challenges them by acting in the temple as if he has the authority to direct and disrupt its commerce (2:14–16), an authority based on his zeal as God's Son (2:16–17). Read against the backdrop of the Jerusalem temple's construction, Jesus' words and the narrator's comments in the second half of the passage (2:18–22), especially the post-resurrection perspective of v. 22, point to Jesus' resurrection as the ultimate sign of his authority to speak and act for God.

---

referring literally to Canaanites and not traders (see Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 25C; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 489–92, 506–07). If it does refer to traders being absent from the temple upon the Lord's arrival, it does not smoothly cohere with John's temple scene, in which Jesus expels the sheep and cattle while leaving the doves, animal merchants, and moneychangers in the temple.

3.5 The Hermeneutical Significance of Attending to the Economic Realities of the Jerusalem Temple for the Interpretation of John 2:13–22

Attention to John 2:13–22 from the perspective of the economic realities of the Jerusalem temple shows that John presents the temple in much broader terms than scholars generally recognize. As God's οἶκος, the temple for John is the locus of divine presence. But it is also the place to which pilgrims go by the thousands each year to buy animals and other items for worship, and to pay the temple tax and make other contributions. It is the place where animal vendors and moneychangers congregate to ply their trade and make a living. It is a place of business, ἐμπόριον, where temple commerce thrives in the service of the temple cult that enacts proper worship of God. It is the place thousands of construction and maintenance workers in Jerusalem depend on for their livelihood.

The consensus reading of 2:13–22 holds it as a key passage in presenting John's view of Jesus' body as the replacement of the Jerusalem temple, but when the passage's economic background is taken into account, one sees how difficult it would have been for John and his readers to view the temple merely as a theological symbol open to replacement. It was a real place, whose social, religious, economic, and political impact was felt by real people. The temple-replacement consensus interpretation bypasses the fact that the physical space identified as the dwelling place of the Jewish God was also a place of economic networks that influenced the religion, culture, and society of first-century Judea. This interpretation also generates unnecessary tensions, if not outright contradictions, between the two halves of the

passage by interpreting Jesus' claim to rebuild the temple in three days to mean that Jesus' body replaces the Jerusalem temple. The narration does not draw this conclusion, stating rather explicitly that Jesus' claim in 2:19 is about his body, not the Jerusalem temple (2:21). Drawing the conclusion that 2:18–22 indicates that Jesus' body replaces the temple creates a tension with the narration in the passage's first half, where Jesus identifies the temple as his Father's house (2:16) and displays his zeal for the temple (2:17).

Reading John 2:13–22 in light of its economic context shows the passage to be a cohesive unit wherein the temple's economic aspects reinforce the passage's claim for Jesus' authority as God's Son and spokesperson. Jesus halts temple commerce as a demonstration of his authority, and then points to his death and resurrection as the ultimate sign of it.

The economic background of 2:13–22 helps more clearly show the passage is about Jesus' authority as God's Son to speak and act for God. Whatever temple commerce Jesus disrupts in 2:14–16 continues once Jesus leaves and the moneychangers pick up their coins. The temple was a marketplace before Jesus entered it and remains one after he leaves. What changes for the reader of John's Gospel is the perception of Jesus as someone who is no mere pilgrim to the temple, but rather someone whose connection to the temple is so deep, he has the authority to both participate in temple practice and also to disrupt it as a means of proclaiming his authority as Son to speak and act for the God who dwells in the temple.

4 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Temple Commerce in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria

4.1 The Question of John 2:13–22's Communicability Beyond Judea

For the early Christian movement, the Jerusalem temple remained an essential component of its religious identity.[440] Yet few of the earliest readers of John 2:13–22 had any connection to first-century Judea and its temple. This was especially true of Gentile converts to Christianity, who lacked the deep connection to the Jerusalem temple the Jewish converts had prior to their conversion.[441] After 70 there was no physical temple to go and see. The temple and the sacred economy the temple had sustained for centuries were decimated.

The preceding chapter showed how the realities of the Jerusalem temple's sacred economy inform the way John 2:13–22 presents its claim of Jesus' authority as God's Son. Jesus disrupts the temple's commerce, an act intended to show he has the authority to challenge the economic engine of Judea. Given the importance of temple commerce in telling this story, would the passage have been intelligible to readers in antiquity whose knowledge of the Jerusalem temple's commerce was minimal or nonexistent, to readers more familiar with the sacred economy of non-Jewish temples?

---

[440] Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (WUNT 2/291; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), esp. 166–226.

[441] On the special significance the temple had for Jews worldwide during the Second Temple period, see Sanders, *Judaism*, 47–189; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 115–82; Wardle, *Jerusalem Temple*, 13–30.

This chapter proposes that the narrative demonstration of Jesus' authority in 2:13–22 was communicable beyond the Judean context of the pericope, to John's first readers in the wider Roman world. Economic identity and importance was not unique to the Jerusalem temple. The Jerusalem temple was hardly the only temple to function as an economic institution, and the reality of temples as economic institutions persisted well after the Jerusalem temple's destruction in 70. Readers encountering John after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple could still understand temples as physical places and economic centers. This chapter will show that major temples in places where John's Gospel was read share many of the same features of temple commerce with the temple in Jerusalem. As a result, even after 70, readers in these places would see 2:13–22 as a passage that emphasizes the economic impact of the temple to make the claim for Jesus' authority.

4.2 The Ancient Reading Contexts of John's Gospel

John's Gospel was read in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria by the middle of the second century C.E., so they are a good starting point for investigating the intelligibility of John 2:13–22 in the Roman world beyond Judea.[442]

Asia Minor, especially the city of Ephesus, is traditionally associated with Johannine Christianity. The early patristic witness to John, Irenaeus, claims that the

---

[442] See R. Alan Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Studies on Personalities of the New Testament; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994; repr., Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 107–38; Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Gospel of John was written in Ephesus (*Haer.* 3.1.1; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.8.4).[443] At least three groups in Asia Minor read and revered John's Gospel, since they based their own religious beliefs and practices on it. The Quartodecimans followed its chronology for their Easter observances, a practice they were following prior to 155, as attested by the writings of Apollinaris of Hierapolis (d. after 177, probably no later than 180) and Melito of Sardis (act. 169–177; d. ca. 180), who alludes to the Gospel of John extensively in his Paschal homily.[444] Montanist Christianity attests to the presence of John's Gospel in northern Asia Minor.[445] Around 170 in Phrygia, Montanus, influenced by the significant Johannine images of Paraclete and λόγος, began to proclaim that he was a prophet, the fulfillment of the promise of the Johannine Paraclete, and taught that "God brought forth the Word" (cf. John 1:1–18). If we take Irenaeus's testimony to mean that at least the Gospel of John was present in Ephesus (if not composed there), then proto-orthodox Christians in Ephesus also read and revered the Fourth Gospel.[446]

---

[443] Culpepper, *John, Son of Zebedee*, 123–28.

[444] Ibid., 120. Melito of Sardis was cited as a Quartodeciman by Polycrates of Ephesus (ibid.).

[445] Ibid., 120–22.

[446] Irenaeus's testimony is a crucial factor in assigning Ephesus as the provenance of John's Gospel, but it is debatable whether Irenaeus, who was born in Asia Minor, can be trusted on this matter. At any rate, John's Gospel circulated throughout Asia Minor by the mid-second century, whether or not it was written in Ephesus. For a clear and evenhanded presentation of the data pertaining to Irenaeus and the critical issues surrounding this testimony, see Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee*, 123–28; cf. Barrett, *John*, 100–25, 132–33; Martin Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM Press, 1989), 2–4.

P^{52}, our earliest evidence of John's Gospel, comes from Egypt, indicating the Fourth Gospel made it to Egypt by ca. 150, with many scholars holding that P^{52} proves the Gospel presence in Egypt by ca. 125.[447] Valentinian Christian writers in Egypt cite and comment upon John's Gospel: *The Gospel of Truth* (ca. 150), possibly composed by Valentinus himself, shares affinities in language and thought with the Fourth Gospel, but does not mention or quote it; Heracleon wrote the earliest known commentary on John's Gospel in approximately 170; Ptolemy (d. 152 or after 180) wrote a commentary on John's Prologue (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.5) and quotes John 1:3 in his *Letter to Flora* (cited in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 33.3.5); and the excerpts of Theodotus (ca. 160–70) contain interpretations of John's Prologue and other verses from the Gospel.[448] That prominent members of the Valentinian school comment on it indicates that John's Gospel was read and revered by at least one segment of Christians in Egypt by 150. Not long afterward, proto-orthodox leaders, educators,

---

[447] Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee*, 108. The generally accepted date of P^{52} is 125, with a leeway of about 25 years on either side (Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* [trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987], 85). Most standard commentaries and textbooks accept and reproduce this early date; see the discussion in Brent Nongbri, "The Use and Abuse of P^{52}: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel," *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–24, 30–32. But in recent important challenges to this early dating, Andreas Schmidt proposes a date of ca. 170 (+/- 25 years) ("Zwei Anmerkungen zu P. Ryl. III 457," *APF* 35 [1989]: 11–12), and Nongbri ("The Use and Abuse of P^{52}," *HTR* 98 [2005] 23–48) argues that "the window of possible dates for P^{52} must include dates in the later second and early third centuries" (46).

[448] Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee*, 114–17.

and commentators in Alexandria (e.g., Origen; Clement) interpreted John extensively, cementing John's importance in Egyptian Christianity.

It is possible that John was read in Syria before the end of the first century, as some letters of Ignatius of Antioch (b. ca. 35 or 50; d. 98–117) contain resonances to the Fourth Gospel (*Romans* 7.2; *Magnesians* 8.2; *Philadelphians* 7.1, 9.1).[449] More conclusively, in the mid-second century Tatian (d. ca. 185) appears to regard John's Gospel as Scripture.[450] His *Diatessaron* (ca. 150–60), probably written in Syria, uses John as its framework for the life of Jesus, and he cites John 1:5 using an introductory formula in his *Oration Against the Greeks* (13.1; ca. 160–170), also probably written in Syria. Finally, Theophilus the bishop of Antioch (act. 168–181 or 188), the first orthodox writer to identify the author of the Gospel as "John," quotes John 1:1 (*Autol.* 2.22).[451] By the middle of the second century the Gospel of John had made its way to Syria.

Three cities in each of these provinces where John's Gospel was read emerge as suitable test cases for this project: Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch.[452] Each was

---

[449] Ibid., 108–09.

[450] Ibid., 122.

[451] Ibid., 122–23.

[452] The religious, cultural, and geographic contexts of late first- and early second-century Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria are too vast, complex, and replete with temples to be comprehensively assessed in this study. On temples in western Asia Minor in the late Hellenistic and early Roman Imperial periods, see Charles Picard, *Éphèse et Claros: Recherches sur les sanctuaires et les cultes de l'Ionie du nord* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 123; Paris: de Boccard, 1922), 326–29); John E. Stambaugh, "The Functions of Roman Temples," in *ANRW* 16.1:554–608; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 37–114. Stevenson discusses role of

a city of international stature during the Roman period. All three were important commercial centers and at times served as provincial capitals. They each housed nascent Christian communities and became centers of the emerging Christian religion.[453]

---

temples in the economy of western Asia Minor on pages 72–75. On temples in Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, see Ragnhild Bjerre Finnestad, "Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts," in *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (ed. Byron E. Shafer; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997), 185–237. On temples in Roman Syria, see Daniel M. Krencker, and Willy Zschietzschmann, *Römische Tempel in Syrien, nach Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen von Mitgliedern der Deutschen Baalbekexpedition 1901–1904, Otto Puchstein, Bruno Schulz, Daniel Krencker* (Denkmäler antiker Architectur 5; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938); Ted Kaizer, *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period* (Oriens et Occidens 4; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002), esp. 67–162; Ann Irvine Steinsapir, *Rural Sanctuaries in Roman Syria: The Creation of a Sacred Landscape* (BAR International Series 1431; Oxford: John and Erica Hedges Ltd., 2005).

[453] On the history, economy, and social, cultural, and religious makeup of Ephesus, see Joseph Keil, *Ephesos: ein Führer durch die Ruinenstätte und ihre Geschichte* (5th ed.; Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut; Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1964); Richard E. Oster, Jr., "Ephesus," *ABD* 2:542–49; Peter Scherrer, *Ephesus: The New Guide* (trans. Lionel Bier and George M. Luxon; authorized by Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut and Efes Müzesi Selçuk; rev. ed.; Instanbul: Ege Yayinian, 2000); Helmut Koester, ed., *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture* (HTS 41; Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995); Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus: Texts and Archaeology* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2008). In addition to the bibliography in his entry to his *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, Richard E. Oster, Jr., provides a good source on the extensive literature on Ephesus in his *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus* (ATLA Bibliography Series 19; Philadelphia: American Theological Library Association; Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1987). See also the relevant sections of T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," in vol. 4 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (ed. T. Frank et al; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938), 499–918.

On Alexandria, see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972); Birger A. Pearson, "Alexandria," *ABD* 1:152–57; Christopher Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Ancient Society

Like Jerusalem, the cities of Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch were each identified with a major temple famous throughout the Roman world: the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, the Serapeum at Alexandria, and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Antioch. Like the Jerusalem temple, these temples were centers of worship identified with a particular deity (even if multiple deities were worshipped inside them, as at the Serapeum), were famous for their size and beauty, were visited

---

and History; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Theodore Vrettos, *Alexandria: City of the Western Mind* (New York: Free Press, 2001); W. V. Harris and Giovanni Ruffini, eds., *Ancient Alexandria Between Egypt and Greece* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 26; Leiden: Brill, 2004); George Hinge and Jens A. Krasilnikoff, eds., *Alexandria: A Cultural and Religious Melting Pot* (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 9; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2009); Yousrya Abdel-Aziz Hosni, *Alexandria: Historical and Archaeological Guide* (Cairo: The Supreme Council of Antiquities, 2009). See also the relevant sections of Allan Chester Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian* (vol. 2 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*; ed. T. Frank et al.; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936).

On Antioch, see Carl Hermann Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *JBL* 51 (1932): 130–60; G. W. Elderkin, Richard Stillwell, Frederick O. Waagé, Dorothy B. Waagé, and Jean Lassus, *Antioch-on-the-Orontes* (Publications of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity; 5 vols.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934–1972); Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961); J. H. W. G. Liebeschutz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972); Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBLSBS 13; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1978); D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1983); Robert R. Hann, "Antioch: Charisma and Conflict in the First Century," *JRH* 14 (1987): 341–60; Frederick W. Norris, "Antioch of Syria," *ABD* 1:265–69; Christine Kondoleon, ed., *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). See also the relevant sections of F. M. Heichelheim, "Roman Syria," in vol. 4 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (ed. Tenney Frank et al.; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press), 121–257.

by people from throughout the Roman world, and played a significant role in the economies of the cities which housed them.[454] This chapter seeks to show that the interpretation of John 2:13–22 developed in the previous chapter holds when, using Tilborg's language, the temple commerce of these major non-Jewish temples "interferes" with this passage.[455]

As with the examination of the Jerusalem temple's commerce in chapter 2, I will survey literary and archaeological materials that illuminate the sacred economy of these temples with respect to the five aspects of temple commerce pertinent for interpreting 2:13–22: (1) commerce related to religious pilgrimage (2:13); (2) the sacrificial animal trade (2:14, 16); (3) moneychangers (2:14, 15); (4) temples as sources and centers of trade and commerce (2:16); and (5) temple construction (2:20). Temporally, my focus is the early Christian period, between the late first- and mid-second centuries in particular. Because I intend to localize the interpretation of John 2:13–22 as much as possible on the Artemision in Ephesus, the Serapeum in Alexandria, and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch during the early Christian period, I make limited use of comparative evidence (e.g., evidence from Serapia elsewhere in the Roman world, or from temples elsewhere in Roman Egypt).

---

[454] Of course, these three cities had a higher degree of religious diversity (especially from polytheistic traditions) than Jerusalem and they contained many more religious shrines and centers of various sorts and sizes. As religious centers, the temples studied here are more comparable to the Jerusalem temple than, say, the Asclepion in Ephesus (also famous and visited by many), which was more of a healing center that provided lodging and that focused as much on the healing of the individual visitor as on the worship of Asclepius.

[455] See §1.5.4.

Relevant evidence for the Alexandrian Serapeum and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch is scanty.[456] Since a more complete reconstruction is possible for the temple of Artemis in Ephesus, much of this chapter will present information pertaining to this temple, and data pertaining to the Serapeum will supplement this information as available. Data pertaining to the temple of Jupitor Capitolinus is especially scarce and problematic, and so the Antioch context will be addressed briefly in a separate section at the end of this chapter (§4.9). My investigation into the temple commerce of these three major non-Jewish temples aims to be illustrative, not comprehensive. The point is to show that the sacred economy of these temples was similar enough to that of the Jerusalem temple to make it possible for readers in these non-Jewish contexts to grasp the claims about Jesus' authority over temple cult and commerce as depicted in John 2:13–22.

4.3 The Economics of Cult in Ancient Greek and Roman Contexts

The study of the sacred economy of temples in antiquity is an important field within the study of ancient Greek and Roman religion.[457] Evidence for assessing the temple commerce of ancient Greek and Roman temples is drawn from literary, epigraphic, archaeological, and comparative sources, with epigraphic material

---

[456] Among other reasons, this is especially due to natural disasters that have struck Alexandria and Antioch as well as uneven excavation of these ancient sites. The late date of the literary sources of Antioch also poses methodological difficulties.

[457] See Tullia Linders and Brita Alroth, eds., *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990* (Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992).

providing the most concrete, if ever insufficient, evidence.[458] Given that in and of themselves any one of these types of evidence is insufficient for assessing the sacred economy of Greek and Roman temples, scholars regularly employ a combined use of these sources to understand the sacred economy of a given temple or temples within the broader framework of ancient societies, using this evidence to provide either a qualitative or quantitative assessment of a cult's sacred economy or one particular aspect thereof.[459] This chapter seeks to offer a qualitative overview of the temple commerce of the Artemision in Ephesus, the Serapeum in Alexandria, and the temple of Jupitor Capitolinus in Antioch. More important than determining the precise numbers of pilgrims to these places or animals sacrificed or temple funds and expenses, for example, is illustrating in a more general fashion the reality that these temples were economic institutions in their respective cities.

That temples played a vital role in the economy of cities of ancient Greece during the classical and Hellenistic periods, and later in the periods of the Roman Republic and Empire is clear.[460] Major temples drew income from a host of sources,

---

[458] Tullia Linders notes that the sources pertaining to sacred finances "are almost wholly epigraphical" ("Sacred Finances: Some Observations," in *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990* [ed. Tullia Linders and Brita Alroth; Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21; Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992]), 21.

[459] For example, the nature of the evidence leads Beate Dignas to discuss "the general character and ideology of sacred finances rather than quantities and balances" (*Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* [Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002], 13).

[460] See Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 72–75, for a survey of the economic role of temples in western Asia Minor and Greece. Dignas identifies "sacred finances"

including: territories owned by temples for economic gain; rent accrued from leasing out such territories; goods produced and sold in sacred territories; the sale of priesthoods; festivals, competitions, processions; and funds provided by kings, cities, and donors, as well as funds accumulated as the spoils of war. The expenses of the temple cult—supplying commodities and animals for sacrifice, paying temple staff and workers, construction and upkeep of sacred buildings—ensured that temple funds would continually contribute to the local and regional economies of the cities in which they stood.[461]

All five aspects of temple commerce that appear in John 2:13–22 constituted significant components of the sacred economies of temples in the non-Jewish world. Pilgrimage to sacred sites for festivals gave rise to markets that not only provided for the pilgrims' basic needs of food, shelter, and water, but also took advantage of the increased number of potential buyers of other types of goods.[462] There is debate as to whether the benefit to cities that held major pilgrimage festivals were primarily economic or whether the main benefit had to do with civic pride in the context of intercity rivalries, with T. R. S. Broughton and Ramsay MacMullen emphasizing the financial benefits of pilgrimage festivals and L. de Ligt and P. W. de Neeve

---

(which she defines as "a system of more or less regular revenues and expenses") and "sacred land" as two economic dimensions of the cults crucial for the assessment of temple finances (*Economy of the Sacred*, 13).

[461] Linders writes of certain temples taking on the role of "a large-scale employer" ("Sacred Finances," 10–11 [11]).

[462] Matthew Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London: Routledge, 1997), 214–217.

contending that cities were more concerned with attracting as high a number of attendees as possible in the interests of civic pride.[463] As Matthew Dillon points out, these positions are not mutually exclusive.[464]

Pilgrims to Greek and Roman temples faced many expenses tied directly to their pilgrimage piety, including fees to enter a given sanctuary, fees to lodge overnight in a healing sanctuary, fees to consult an oracle, fees to participate in an initiation ceremony, and charges that provided funds for temple upkeep.[465] Of course, sacrifices had to be purchased. Signe Isager argues a number of gods owned their own sacred animals, mainly to be a source of income for the god, but perhaps also as a way to ensure more costly sacrificial animals would be available if necessary.[466] Drawing on inscriptions and archaeological evidence that includes the

---

[463] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 870, 899; de Ligt, L., *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire: Economic and Social Aspects of Periodic Trade in a Pre-Industrial Society* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 11; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1993), 225–29; idem., and P. W. de Neeve, "Ancient Periodic Markets: Festivals and Fairs," *Athenaeum* 66: 411–13; Ramsay MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1981), 25.

[464] Certainly festivals brought benefits, but not always on a scale which would have been of great economic assistance to the city hosting the festival...though individual traders could have made a lot of money. Moreover, that city authorities organised festivals in order to benefit the business class of the relevant city is not in accord with ancient economic practice: as a rule, the state did not generally encourage business...On the other hand, it cannot be denied that a community could benefit from visiting pilgrims" (*Pilgrims and Pilgrimage*, 217).

[465] On the expenses tied to pilgrimage piety, see Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage*, 166–68.

[466] "Sacred Animals in Classical and Hellenistic Greece," in *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990* (ed. Tullia

remains of animal bones in sanctuaries, Michael H. Jameson has shown that among cattle, pigs, and sheep and goats, the predominant sacrificial victims were sheep and goats, with Athens during the classical period being exceptional in its ability to afford sacrificing cattle regularly in large numbers.[467] Jameson's analysis reveals that as ancient societies accrued wealth from sources less directly related to local agricultural or pastoral resources, the sacrificial requirements of ancient sanctuaries placed greater emphasis on social and ritual values than on whether these requirements were economically compatible or practical in relation to local animal husbandry practices.[468]

Moneychangers assisted in the trade that took place between festival pilgrims and merchants. Dillon cites the late second century B.C.E. Amphictyonic decree regulating the exchange rate of the Athenian tetradrachm to show that, despite the little evidence for money-changing facilities in the markets that arose at sacred sites, moneychangers provided a necessary service during festivals and measures were in place to protect pilgrims against moneychangers not complying with the established

---

Linders and Brita Alroth; Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21; Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992), 15–19.

[467] "Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece," in *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity* (ed. C. R. Whittaker; Supplementary Volume 14; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1988), 87–119.

[468] Ibid., 106–07.

exchange rate.[469] De Ligt cites this same decree as evidence of festival-connected commercial activity.[470]

These features alone show that temples were major economic institutions long before the first and second centuries C.E., the period addressed in this study. They attracted paying worshippers on an annual basis, could set sacrificial demands on their own terms, and drew to their cities merchants and moneychangers who sought to profit from the pilgrimage traffic. In her analysis of the temple financing of major cults in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, Beate Dignas argues against the prevailing view that temples were highly dependent on municipal governments for their religious and financial administration.[471] Emphasizing inscriptional evidence and centering on the cult of Zeus at Labraunda and the city of Mylasa, Dignas argues for a more complex relationship between temple and *polis* in antiquity by which city, cult, and ruler maintained a triangular relationship between them.[472] Her study reveals how powerful the sacred economies of major temples made them, since they were not beholden to their host cities and at times even had Hellenistic and Roman rulers and governors side with them when a conflict of interest arose between the temple and the city.

---

[469] *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage*, 216.

[470] De Ligt, *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire*, 65.

[471] *Economy of the Sacred*.

[472] Ibid., 1–12.

Temple construction and maintenance was a major component of the sacred economies of ancient Greek and Roman temples. In her study of the economics of Greek temple building, A. M. Buford points out that the chief economic concern for building temples was not so much the expense (building temples was less expensive than other major projects conducted regularly, like conducting warfare) or the finding of suitable materials (the patrons of a temple's construction did not hesitate to import precious stones from afar, and in the cases in which cost was a concern, they imported stone from closer by, even if it was of inferior quality), but in finding and contracting the necessary skilled labor with the training necessary to execute such a complex building scheme.[473] Regardless, the building of a major temple constituted a long, expensive project, and using literary, epigraphic, and comparative evidence (from the ancient Near East) Walter Burkert explains that funding for temple construction was derived from a variety of sources, including monarchs, the host city, and war booty.[474]

Clearly, the study of temple commerce in ancient Greek and Roman contexts is a complex field that raises various important questions and addresses them in various ways. My own study seeks to illustrate the simple point that three major temples in places where John's Gospel was read—Ephesus, Alexandria, and

---

[473] "The Economics of Greek Temple Building," in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 191 (1965): 21–34.

[474] "Greek Temple-builders: Who, Where and Why?" Pages 21–29 in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992* (ed. Robin Hägg; Stockholm: Paul Åströms, 1996).

Antioch—were economic institutions in the first and second centuries C.E., as the Jerusalem temple was up to its destruction in 70. The aim is to determine the communicability of John's temple scene to readers who had accepted the Gospel of John as a source for the life and significance of Jesus. As a result, this particular study will emphasize the points of continuity between the Jerusalem temple and the temples of Artemis in Ephesus, of Sarapis in Alexandria, and of Jupitor Capitolinus in Antioch to show that the point being made about Jesus' authority in John 2:13–22 was communicable across these cultural contexts. Naturally, the reading supplied here is not the only reading that the social and economic contexts of Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch could produce. Tilborg has shown, for example, the myriad "interferences" between the Gospel and the Ephesus context.[475] Nevertheless, John's Gospel spread quickly and must have been able to communicate its message effectively across the Roman world, and this chapter seeks to show that this was indeed possible, even likely, in the case of John 2:13–22.

4.4 The Economic Impact of Pilgrimage Piety

4.4.1 The Temple of Artemis

Pilgrims and locals came in droves to the numerous festivals held at Ephesus, where they witnessed and participated in a host of activities that included

[475] See §1.5.4.

processions, sacrifices, athletic contests, music, dance, and other activities.[476] As the temple of the city's patron deity, the Artemision played a part in Ephesian festivals, even those not associated with the cult of Artemis. For example, the Ephesia, which was the national festival of Ionians in Greece and Asia (Thucydides, *Hist.* 3.104.3; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 15.49.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 4.25.4), featured a choral dance performed by maidens in the temple of Artemis (cf. Aelian, *Hist. An.* 12.9).[477]

The events associated with the Artemisia were an especially significant festival for Ephesus. This month-long series of rituals and festivities centered on the cult of Artemis were celebrated throughout the Greco-Roman world, but "were observed with special magnificence by the Ephesians."[478] One mid-second century inscription states that during the month of Artemision "festivals and sacrifices are performed, particularly in our city" (B.20–21) and that the Ephesian populace "regard it as appropriate that the entire month...be sacred and dedicated to the goddess, and through this decree approved that the religious ritual for her be stipulated" (B.23–27).[479] The inscription decrees:

> that the entire month Artemision be sacred for all its days, and that on the same (days) of the month, and throughout the year, feasts and the festival

---

[476] See Irene Ringwood Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," *AJA* 76 (1972): 17–22; Richard E. Oster, "Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I: Paganism before Constantine," *ANRW* 18.3:1706–11; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 62–63.

[477] Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18.

[478] Ibid.

[479] *I. Eph.* Ia.24.

> and the sacrifices of the Artemisia are to be conducted, inasmuch as the entire month is dedicated to the goddess. For in this way, with the improvement of the honouring of the goddess, our city will remain more illustrious and more blessed for all time. (B.28–34)[480]

This decree may have been issued to counteract a decline in the fidelity and scrupulousness with which the Artemisia were kept. Nonetheless it "is clear from this document and from literary sources that the celebrations of Artemis in the month Artemision included games, festivals, banquets, sacred possessions, and sacrifices."[481] The Artemisia drew crowds and perhaps even imperial support. Young women and men came to select their fiancés (Xenophon of Ephesus, *Ephesian Tale* 1.2), spectators came to watch athletes compete in the various contests,[482] legal business in the city was suspended,[483] and by the end of the second century the city probably received some imperial assistance for the festival.[484]

One popular ritual of the Artemisia, depicted in a highly regarded painting by Apelles (Pliny, *Nat.* 35.93, 96), was the procession of the statue of Artemis from the

---

[480] On the inscription, including its Greek text and the translation reprinted above, see Richard Oster, "Holy Days in Honour of Artemis," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979* (ed. G. H. R. Horsley; *NewDocs* 4; Macquarie University, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1987), 4:74–82; see also idem., "Acts 19:23–41 and An Ephesian Inscription," *HTR* 77 (1984): 233–37.

[481] Oster, "Holy Days," 77–78 (77); cf. Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18.

[482] Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18.

[483] Oster, "Holy Days," 77.

[484] Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18.

temple to the city and back, accompanied by a band of maidens offering sacrifice.[485] Xenophon of Ephesus's description depicts the grandeur and splendor of the procession:

> The local festival of Artemis was in progress, with its procession from the city to the temple nearly a mile away. All the local girls had to march in procession, richly dressed, as well as all the young men...There was a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival...So the procession filed past—first the sacred objects, the torches, the baskets, and the incense; then horses, dogs, hunting equipment...some for war, most for peace. And each of the girls was dressed as if to receive a lover...And so when the procession was over, the whole crowd went into the temple for the sacrifice, and the files broke up. Men and women, and girls and boys came together. (*Ephesian Tale* 1.2–3)[486]

Given the length of the procession,[487] the presence of a crowd consisting of both locals and visitors, the number and types of items featured in the procession (sacred

---

[485] Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18. Though Apelles of Cos flourished in the fourth century B.C.E., in the first century C.E. Pliny can state that, "[c]onnoisseurs put at the head of all his works...his Artemis in the midst of band of Maidens offering a Sacrifice, a work by which he may be thought to have surpassed Homer's verses describing the same subject" (*Nat.* 35.93, 96 [Rackham, LCL]).

[486] Translation by Graham Anderson in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (ed. B. P. Reardon; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 125–69. The realistic description of this procession served Xenophon's literary purposes of providing a credible backdrop for the opening moments of his second century C.E. Greek romance *The Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes* (Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 178).

[487] Xenophon states the procession from the city to the temple was seven stadia. The distance is accurate. The Artemision was just under seven stadia from the Coressian Gate, and research has shown there to have been a processional way between them (Dieter Knibbe, "Via Sacra Ephesiaca: New Aspects of the Cult of Artemis Ephesia," in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture* [ed. Helmut Koester; HTS 41; Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995], 149–50). For literary reasons Xenophon's seven stadia refer only to the last part of the returning procession. The procession was circular, so that the goddess may leave her sanctuary to visit her city and then

objects,[488] torches, baskets, incense, horses, dogs, hunting equipment), the ornate dress of the girls in the procession,[489] and the fact that at the procession's end the whole crowd enters the temple for the sacrifice, this portion of the festival alone presumes that an array of goods and services were supplied, purchased, and consumed in large quantities. The Artemisia as a whole were very popular. During them, Ephesus "was thronged with strangers as well as local citizens" who came and spent their time and money in the city to venerate its patron goddess and participate in her namesake festival.[490]

Of course, one need not wait for a festival to visit the Ephesian temple of Artemis, one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. Its fame, grandeur, and status as a depository of famous paintings and statues attracted visitors from abroad

---

return (Picard, *Éphèse et Claros*, 326–29). Another longer processional way ran from Artemis's temple to the Magnesian Gate (Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 2.23). See Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 174, 178, and §4.8.1 below.

[488] There is debate as to whether Xenophon's τὰ ἱερά refers to "sacred objects" or "sacrificial victims." Disagreeing with Anderson's translation (reprinted above), Christine Thomas favors the latter ("At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period," in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture* [ed. Helmut Koester; HTS 41; Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995], 85 n. 10), a view that finds support in the sacrificial offering that takes place at the end of the procession. However, statues of Artemis were carried in the procession, so τὰ ἱερά could well refer to them (Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 178–79).

[489] Xenophon (*Ephesian Tale* 1.2–3) describes the attire of his heroine Anthia, who "wore a purple tunic down to the knee, fastened with a girdle and falling loose over her arms, with a fawnskin over it, a quiver attached, and arrows for weapons." Additionally, Anthia "carried javelins and was followed by dogs." According to Xenophon, "it was the custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men," which justifies the demand for expensive, high-quality dress.

[490] Arnold, "Festivals of Ephesus," 18.

year-round.[491] One could visit to see on display in the temple a statue by Rhoecus or paintings by Calliphon of Samos and the renown Apelles of Cos (Pausanias, *Descr.* 10.26.6, 10.38.6–7; Pliny, *Nat.* 35.92–93).[492] With the "museum atmosphere" that made them a "tourist magnet," magnificent temples like that of Artemis in Ephesus "generated economic growth and civic pride."[493]

Whether for a festival or otherwise, visitors to the Artemision served as consumers for a thriving trade in sacred objects pertaining to Artemis and her temple. This trade is memorably depicted in the story of the silversmiths of Ephesus in Acts 19:23–41. Demetrius, "a silversmith who made silver shrines of Artemis (ἀργυροκόπος, ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος)" who "brought no little business to the artisans (παρείχετο τοῖς τεχνίταις οὐκ ὀλίγην ἐργασίαν)" (19:24), gathers a crowd of artisans and fellow silversmiths to warn them that Paul's missionary success has endangered their trade (19:25–27).[494] The opening words of his speech presume

---

[491] On temples in Asia Minor, including the Ephesian temple of Artemis, as tourist destinations, see Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 68–69.

[492] Pliny the Elder lauds Apelles as the artist "who surpassed all the painters that preceded him and all who were to come after him" (*Nat.* 35.80 [Rackham, LCL]).

[493] Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 69.

[494] Archeological evidence supports the existence of a guild of silversmiths at Ephesus. See G. H. R. Horsley, "The Silversmiths at Ephesos," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979* (ed. G. H. R. Horsley; *NewDocs* 4; Macquarie University, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1987), 4:7–10. Acts describes Demetrius as an ἀργυροκόπος, ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος (19:24), indicating that the business of the silversmiths involved making small silver temples (ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς) that were modeled on the Artemision and kept as souvenirs or used as votive offerings (W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire Before*

trade in the sacred objects of Artemis was quite profitable: "Men, you know that we get our wealth from this business (ἄνδρες, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῖν ἐστιν)" (19:25).[495]

The closing words of his speech reveal that Demetrius interprets a threat to the Artemision's sacred economy as a direct threat to the deity and her temple: "And there is danger not only that this trade of ours may come into disrepute but also that the temple (ἱερόν) of the great goddess Artemis will be scorned, and she will be deprived of her majesty that brought all Asia and the world (ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία καὶ ἡ

A.D. 170 [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893], 123–26, 134; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 60–61 n. 160). The absence of silver temples like the ones mentioned in Acts 19:24 have led some to argue that ναοὺς ποιῶν was a mistake for νεωποιός (E. L. Hicks, *Expositor*, 4 [1890], 401–22; G. M. Rogers, "Demetrios of Ephesos: Silversmith and Neopoios?" *Belleten* [1987]: 877–82). However, this lack may simply result from the low likelihood of silver shrines or models being preserved as opposed to those made from baser materials, and indeed numerous terra cotta ones have been found (T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* [ed. T. Frank et al; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938], 4:828). If Demetrius is to be considered one of the νεωποιοί, it would suit his role as defender of Artemis and her temple, including its sacred economy; the νεωποιοί were temple administrators whose duties included, among other things, managing aspects of temple finances (Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 57–58).

[495] As part of his momentous philanthropic gift to the city of Ephesus and its people, C. Vibius Salutaris donated a group of statuettes made of precious metals that were to be used in public processions at the festivals of Artemis. Even though these, as objects used in public processions, were likely more magnificent than the sacred objects goldsmiths and silversmiths usually made, Broughton includes them in his list of known Artemis statuettes and includes their subject, material, and ancient weight as is available, because they "give some conception of the demand upon the industry for sacred objects both in Ephesus and in many other cities, according to the means of the temples or their benefactors" ("Roman Asia Minor," 828–29).

οἰκουμένη) to worship her" (19:27).[496] Allowing for exaggeration for rhetorical effect, this statement reflects the high volume of pilgrim traffic engendered by the Artemision—ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη come to Ephesus to worship Artemis. Demetrius's focus on the temple shows the central role the Artemision played in drawing these pilgrims. The text emphasizes that Paul's religion threatens the ἱερόν of Artemis, which means that to the degree that Paul is successful, the cult of Artemis will suffer a decline, and so will the temple commerce dependent on it ("this trade of ours," τοῦτο...τὸ μέρος [= ἡ ἐργασία, 19:25]). According to Demetrius, this temple commerce contributes to the majesty (μεγαλειότης) of the goddess as well as to the livelihood of those trading in temple wares. Demetrius recognizes the incompatibility of worship of Jesus and worship of Artemis and sees this incompatibility playing itself out in the arena of temple commerce. Cult and commerce were as intertwined in the Ephesian temple of Artemis as in the Jerusalem temple.

4.4.2 The Serapeum

The Serapeum was renowned for its magnificence in the Roman period. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, "nothing in the world is considered more sumptuous than it except the Capitol, which is the eternal pride of the august city of

---

[496] Acts 19:27: οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι, μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς ἣν ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη σέβεται. The τοῦτο...τὸ μέρος refers to the ἐργασία of Demetrius and his fellow silversmiths and artisans mentioned in 19:25.

Rome" (*Reg. Gest.* 22.16, 12).[497] Though the much earlier work of Strabo refers to the temple as "almost abandoned" (*Geogr.* 17.1.10 [Jones, LCL]), papyrological evidence calls into question the older scholarly view that the temple's reconstruction in the Roman period was intended to revive the site as a place of worship.[498] This is a place people wanted to see and at which people wanted to worship.

Documented along the Nile valley as late as 315 C.E.,[499] the national festival of Sarapis, the Serapia, drew devotees to the Serapeum in Alexandria.[500] Evidence of pilgrimage to the Serapeum for the Serapia is lacking, but ancient population estimates for Alexandria give a sense of how many people may have participated in the Serapia at Alexandria. Diodorus estimates the free population during his visit in 60 B.C.E. to have been 300,000, an estimate he claims is based on information

---

[497] Translation in Alan Rowe, *Discovery of the Famous Temple and Enclosure of Serapis at Alexandria* [with an Explanation of the Enigmatical Inscriptions on the Serapeum Plaques of Ptolemy IV by Étienne Drioton; supplément aux *Annales du Service des Antiquités de L'Égypte* 2; Le Caire: Imprimerie de L'Institut Français D'Archéologie Orientale, 1946], 2.

[498] Robert A. Wild, "The Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries from the Roman Period," *ANRW* 17.4:1755–57.

[499] David Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 56. This documentation includes: P.Stras. IV.559 (315); third-century papyri: P.Stras. IV.635; P.Giss. I.40, ii, 20; BGU II.362, xii, 16; P.Oxy. XXXI.2586; SB V.7336.

[500] The Serapeum at Alexandria was the temple of the god Sarapis, who was not an indigenous Egyptian deity but rather a god "created" by Ptolemy Soter, who "in creating the cult," as P. M. Fraser argues, "aimed at giving the Greek population of Egypt, and especially that of Alexandria, an overriding patron deity, which it otherwise did not have" (*Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:252). On the history and development of the Sarapis cult, see Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:246–59; John E. Stambaugh, *Sarapis Under the Early Ptolemies* (EPRO 25; Leiden: Brill, 1972).

attained from bureaucrats in charge of keeping census returns (*Library of History* 17.52.6). The estimate is as vague and unreliable as any population statistic from the ancient world, but Diodorus remarks that Alexandria is the largest city in world, which if correct suggests the total population in his day would have been at or just under one million.[501] Information from Josephus, who puts the total population of Roman Egypt excluding Alexandria at 7.5 million (*J.W.* 2.385), leads scholars to deduce Roman Alexandria's population at somewhere between .75–1.5 million.[502]

Whatever the precise number of inhabitants, Roman Alexandria was the second largest city of the Roman Empire.[503] The sizable Jewish population of the city notwithstanding, one may reasonably assume its famed Serapeum attracted many local worshippers to it during the Serapia and other religious festivals. Papyrological evidence attests that the fame and splendor of the Alexandrian Serapeum attracted large festival crowds from abroad as well.[504] Without specifying the Serapeum, the

---

[501] Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:90–91.

[502] Ibid., 2:171–72 (= 1:91 n. 358); Dominic W. Rathbone, "Roman Egypt," in *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris, and Richard Saller; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 699.

[503] Rathbone, "Roman Egypt," 706.

[504] In *Geogr.* 17.1.10, Strabo appears to identify the Serapeum as included among ancient sacred sites that "are now almost abandoned" as a result of the construction of new sanctuaries in the Nicopolis (Jones, LCL). But as Robert A. Wild notes, the syntax of Strabo's statement does not necessarily designate the Serapeum among the τεμένη ἀρχαῖα ἐκλελειμμένη ("Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries," *ANRW* 17.4:1757 n. 25). Moreover, "frequent mention in the papyri of pious visits to the shrine suggest quite the opposite," which leads Wild to contest the commonly-held view (e.g., Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:272–75) that devotion to Sarapis at this shrine slackened during the Roman period prior to the second century C.E. (ibid., 1755–57 [1757]).

edict of Caracalla (215 C.E.) mentions people who "gather here to see the sights of the most glorious city of Alexandria."[505] Votive offerings from the Roman period found at the Serapeum indicate people came and offered them to the deities represented there.[506] As in Ephesus, the pilgrim and tourist traffic stimulated trade in the city and was an important source of income for the Serapeum at Alexandria.[507]

4.4.3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of the Economic Impact of Pilgrimage Piety in the Contexts of John's Readers

---

[505] P. Giss. 40 ii.16–29. See Allan Chester Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 255 (no. 151); L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (2 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912), 1:38–39 (no. 22). Translation is from Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 255 (no. 151).

[506] These include fragments of white marble statuettes of Hermanoubis, Serapis and Venus; a pottery lamp showing the bust of Isis; a slab of white marble with the letter "H" (for Hermanoubis) painted in red on it; gold jewelry; a tiny plaquette of gold with a Latin inscription; and a white marble votive stela bearing an inscription dedicating it to Hermanoubis (Rowe, *Discovery*, 34–35).

[507] See Richard Alston, "Trade and the city in Roman Egypt," in *Trade, Traders, and the Ancient City* (ed. Helen Parkins and Christopher Smith; London: Routledge, 1998): 168–202; A. Jördens, "Sozialstrukturen im Arbeitstierhandel des kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten," *Tyche* 10 (1995): 49–52; Naphtali Lewis, *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 71–72. Michael Joseph Brown summarizes how the Serapeum's status as a destiny for pilgrims and tourists stimulated trade in the city and provided income for the temple: "The avenue leading to the temple was lined with shops and booths serving food, selling souvenirs, and other goods and services to the visitors and pilgrims...Of course, these locations were rented to vendors by the temple authorities. It was one source of temple income. The other major source of temple income was the fees suppliants paid: an entrance fee, ritual purification fee, and a fee to spend the night in the presence of Asclepius-Imhotep. And if the deity responded to the suppliant's concern, there was a fee to interpret the dream the god gave the pilgrim" (*The Lord's Prayer Through North African Eyes: A Window into Early Christianity* [New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 104.

Readers in Ephesus and Alexandria would have understood what it meant for Jesus to make a pilgrimage to a temple to celebrate a festival. Pilgrimage was part of the social fabric of their cities, which during festival periods became more populous and experienced a spike in economic activity.[508] John's Gentile audiences could easily recognize John's characterization of Jesus as a pilgrim traveling to a large, famous temple to participate in the religio-economic rites associated with the pilgrimage experience.

But the Passover festival was different than festivals associated with Artemis and Sarapis. There were no elaborate processions or athletic contests, no statues of the God of Israel to parade around the city, no sacred objects depicting the temple or the deity on sale for pilgrims to buy and use as votive offerings or keep as souvenirs. Its fundamental monotheism separated Judaism from the polytheistic religions that dominated Ephesus and Alexandria. This makes John's emphasis on temple commerce all the more important for making 2:13–22 intelligible to a wider audience. The economic impact of major pilgrimage festivals to the cities in which

---

[508] See Dietrich O. A. Klose, "Festivals and Games in the Cities of the East during the Roman Empire," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, Andrew Burnett; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 125–33. Throughout Roman Egypt, for example, periodic specialized markets arose to service the demands of festivals (Rathbone, "Roman Egypt," 708). Dio Chrysostom succinctly explains the importance of events that draw crowds for the economy of a city: "[N]ot only can those who have goods to sell obtain the highest prices, but also nothing in the city is out of work...And this contributes not a little to prosperity; for wherever the greatest throng of people comes together, there necessarily we find money in greatest abundance, and it stands to reason that the place should thrive" (*Cel. Phryg.* 36.15–16 [Crosby, LCL]).

they occurred provides one broad point of interference that makes the characterization of Jesus simultaneously as pilgrim and as more than a pilgrim communicable in polytheistic contexts. A challenge to the economic apparatus of temple festivals would have communicated the same point across religio-cultural borders: Jesus is assuming an authority to throw temple pilgrimage customs into temporary disarray.[509]

4.5 The Sacrificial Animal Trade

4.5.1 The Temple of Artemis

Sacrifices were offered regularly in the temple of Artemis.[510] In two mid-first century C.E. inscriptions, a priestess of Artemis (a different one in each inscription) records that "the mysteria and the *sacrifices* have been fulfilled in a dignified manner."[511] Another inscription, an early first-century foundation text of a freed slave of Augustus, mentions a sacrifice offered to Artemis, though it is not clear whether it was offered in the temple.[512] Two other inscriptions describe the rules the prytanis of the city must keep when offering sacrifice.[513] They state 365 sacrifices must be offered for the year and list the gifts that are to be given to the various

---

[509] Luke appeals to this same reality in Acts 19, noted above (§4.4.1), where according to Demetrius a threat to temple commerce associated with Artemis is in effect a threat to the deity herself.

[510] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 71–73.

[511] *I. Eph.* 3.987, 988. Translation is from Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 72 (italics his).

[512] *I. Eph.* 3.859A.

[513] *I. Eph.* 1a.10; 4.1210A.

celebrants of the sacrifice, who among others include a hierophant, a herald, a flute-player, a trumpeter, and an overseer of the sacrifice.[514] The inscription states the hierophant should receive the heart, tongue, and skin of every animal sacrificed, but it does not specify what animals were sacrificed.[515] To this inscriptional evidence we may add Xenophon of Ephesus's description of the Artemisia procession concluding with the crowd entering the temple to sacrifice (*Ephesian Tale* 1.3), and what Philostratus writes about the temple of Artemis: "Your temple is thrown open to all who would sacrifice, or offer prayers, or sing hymns, to suppliants, to Hellenes, barbarians, free men, to slaves" (*Ep.* 67 [Conybeare, LCL]).

The scattered inscriptional and literary evidence might provide information on the sacrificial cult of Artemis "only in a general way,"[516] yet even this relatively small amount of data offers a glimpse of the sacrificial animal trade sustained by the Artemision. Many individual and communal sacrifices are offered throughout the year, whether an individual sacrifice to mark the freedom of a slave or fulfill the obligations of a prytanis, or a communal sacrifice during a festival. Animal sacrifices

---

[514] The remuneration given to priests led to abuses. A decree of Paullus Fabius Persicus (*I. Eph.* 1a.17–19; 44 C.E.) sought to curb or eliminate the public selling and auctioning of priestly positions, and priests of Artemis would lend out sacred money. See Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred*, 141–56, 188–204, 238–39; Oster, "Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I," 1716–17; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 75 n. 259.

[515] According a much earlier literary text, the cult of Artemis featured pigs, goats, antelopes, and deer as sacrificial animals (Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.3). Whether or not this applies to the first and second centuries C.E. is difficult to verify with certainty.

[516] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 72.

took place with enough ceremony and regularity to require regulations as well as documentation by temple personnel that the sacrifices were properly fulfilled. Sacrifices were performed by specific personnel according to set rituals, whether carried out under the supervision of priestesses dedicated to Artemis or according to the rules required of the prytanis offering sacrifice. Various cult ministers appear (priestesses, hierophants, musicians, overseers) who "next to their probable function with other gods...play a role in the Artemis cult."[517]

Sacrificial animal traders thus could expect a continual demand for sacrificial animals to be offered to Artemis, a demand that surely increased during festival periods. The money at stake in this trade is seen in the text of the foundation of C. Vibius Salutaris, a wealthy Roman equestrian who in 104 C.E. made a bequest to the boule and demos of Ephesus that has been preserved as "one of the longest, most complex, and important foundation deeds to have survived from the Roman world."[518]

Salutaris's instructions were to inscribe the text of the foundation in two places in the city, on the marble wall of the theatre and in the Artemision (precisely where is unknown). The foundation consists of a long, complex scheme of lotteries

---

[517] Ibid., 73.

[518] Guy MacLean Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London: Routledge, 1991), 2. Rogers's *Sacred Identity* is a monograph-length study of the Salutaris foundation that seeks to examine its "content, purpose, and significance...against the background of the city life of Ephesos at the beginning of the second century AD" (2). In an appendix, Rogers provides a translation of the entire foundation, which is the source of all translations of the Salutaris inscription reprinted here.

and distributions that include funds for certain people to pay for sacrifices and rituals celebrating the mysteries of Artemis.[519] Six registered asiarchs, who probably used the money to buy materials for sacrifice, received 11 denarii each for a total of 66 denarii.[520] With the exception of the 30 denarii allotted to the person who cleaned the statues of Artemis, the 11 denarii given to each asiarch represents the largest individual allotments of the main endowment.[521] In the addendum to the main endowment, Salutaris allots 55 denarii for five members of the boule (selected by lottery), 27½ of which were earmarked for the purchase of materials to perform a sacrifice to Artemis on the goddess's birthday.[522] Also in the addendum, Salutaris instructs the 63 paides who win their share of the lottery (a total of 15.75 denarii to

---

[519] Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 48–50.

[520] *I. Eph.* 1a.27, lines 240–46; cf. Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 164, 166. A lacuna at line 242 makes it uncertain whether Salutaris explicitly intended this money for the purchase of sacrifices for Artemis or was simply honoring the asiarchs (Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 49). Rogers's reconstruction of the text presumes that each of the asiarchs will use his portion to "buy the things for sacrifice" (ibid., 166–67). Rogers argues the fact that Salutaris grouped the asiarchs with the neokoroi charged with the statues of Trajan and Plotina supports this reconstruction (ibid., 49).

[521] Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 49.

[522] *I. Eph.* 1a.27, lines 488–97; cf. Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 182. What the other 27½ denarii were used for is unknown, since the text is incomplete: "Those who win the lottery will make a sacrifice to Artemis on the sixth of the month, on the birthday of the goddess, buying [] 27½ denarii, and the remaining 27 denarii and 9 asses they will spend in the sanctuary of Artemis for the [21 lines missing]." Rogers maintains "that the provision in the addendum which ordered members of the boule to buy materials for sacrifice supplies the clearest indication that Salutaris wished to associate his endowment ritually with the celebration of the mysteries of Artemis" (ibid., 49).

be split among them) to pray and sacrifice in the temple.[523] The addendum prescribes a penalty of 5 denarii "for the further adornment of Artemis" to "any of the winning men or paides" who "either do not make sacrifices, or do not pray in the sanctuary, as has been ordered."[524]

The amounts designated for sacrifices in the Salutaris inscription are relatively small, but they account for sacrifices on only one day of the year (the commemoration of Artemis's birth on 6 Thargelion) and by only those persons mentioned in the inscription. The common funds of the gerousia paid for feasts and sacrifices throughout the year, and the expenses were substantial enough to be periodically interrupted due to a lack of funds.[525] Sacrifice was a regular component of worship in the temple of Artemis, which meant that sacrificial animals had to be purchased. Given this demand stemming from the sacrificial cult, the temple of

---

[523] *I. Eph.* 1.27, lines 519–31; cf. Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 182.

[524] *I. Eph.* 1.27, lines 528–31. Charles Picard sees the requirement to personally go to the temple to pray and sacrifice as illustrating the city's worsening financial problems during this period (*Éphèse et Claros*, 86), but recent archaeological research has proven this to be untrue, at least as a generalization (Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 72 n. 19).

[525] An inscription from the reign of Commodus (177–18 March, 18 180 C.E.) reveals that in the third century B.C.E. (during the reign of Lysimachos, 306–281) members of the gerousia received unspecified amounts from the common funds for feasts and sacrifices to Artemis (*I. Eph.* 1a.26, lines 5–6). Dwindling funds caused an interruption of these feasts and sacrifices at some point in the imperial period, halting the ceremonies associated with the annual reenactment of Artemis's birth, until the wealthy Tiberius Claudius Nikomedes effected their renewal by providing funds for offering worship and sacrifice to Artemis and the emperor Commodus (*I. Eph.* 1a.26, lines 2–12). See Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 64.

Artemis at Ephesus was a significant contributor to the economy of Ephesus and its environs.

4.5.2 The Serapeum

The raising and export of cattle, sheep, and doves were profitable industries in the economy of Roman Egypt.[526] Papyrological evidence for these trades mainly documents the use of these animals for reasons other than sacrifice (e.g., leasing or selling oxen for farming; pasturing sheep for their wool; rearing pigeons for food or to use their dung as fertilizer). This omission does not rule out the practice of exporting cattle, sheep, and doves for sacrificial worship, literary evidence indicates cattle were exported for sacrificial purposes (Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.10; Achilles Tatius, *Leuc. Clit.* 2.15).[527]

Documentation of the sacrificial animal trade specific to the Serapeum in Alexandria is sparse. A 215 C.E. edict of Caracalla that banishes peasants from Alexandria states, "I learn that at the festival of Sarapis and on certain other feast days, or even on other days, the Egyptians are accustomed to bring down bulls or other beasts for sacrifice. In this matter they are not to be restrained."[528] A broken Roman altar of sacrifice surrounded by "a considerable quantity of ashes" was found

---

[526] See Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 228–230.

[527] Allan Chester Johnson notes that "[t]rade in cattle is seldom recorded, although they were used extensively in sacrifices and even exported to other countries for this purpose" (*Roman Egypt*, 229).

[528] P. Giss. 40 ii.16–29; translation is from Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 255 (no. 151).

in the Serapeum, immediately west of the fireplaces.[529] Sacrifices for festivals and other customary worship took place at the Serapeum. Animals for sacrifice had to be purchased, and the surrounding regions had the supply from which to purchase these animals. Like the temples in Jerusalem and Ephesus, the Serapeum helped sustain this regional commerce in sacrificial animals.

4.5.3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of the Sacrificial Animal Trade in the Contexts of John's Readers

The animals necessary for sacrifice in the major temples of Ephesus and Alexandria had to be supplied and purchased. The buying and selling of sacrificial animals was constant throughout the year, and surged during feast days, making festival periods all the more important for the profitability of the sacrificial animal trade in these places.

Birds were a common sacrifice of the poor in Greek and Roman temples, sheep and goats constituted an acceptable sacrifice for a number of deities throughout the Roman Empire, and bovines were a customary sacrifice to a number of deities of both Greek and Egyptian origin.[530] Yet regardless of whether John's

---

[529] Rowe, *Discovery*, 27.

[530] See Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Sarah Iles Johnston, ed., *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide* (Harvard University Press Reference Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004); Jeremy McInerney, *The Cattle of the Sun: Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Siegfried Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (trans. Ann E. Keep; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973); Maria-Zoe Petropoulou, *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Greek Religion, Judaism, and*

readers in polytheistic contexts knew the particulars of how cattle, sheep, and doves functioned in Jewish worship, the emphasis of John 2:14–15 on Jesus' authority to disrupt the sacrificial animal trade remains readily comprehensible because the narration places its emphasis on the economic activity and its disruption. The reader's attention is focused on the *selling*, not the particulars of the animals.[531] Selling and buying animals for sacrifice, whatever types or breed of animal they were, was as recognizable a practice for worshippers and temple personnel in Ephesus and Alexandria as it was for priests and worshippers in Jerusalem. Readers in all these contexts could understand that by disrupting the selling of these animals, Jesus was exercising an authority to disrupt the commerce in the temple. The communicability of John's temple scene to readers in non-Jewish contexts becomes more apparent the more one recognizes the importance of the passage's economic elements for constructing its meaning.

4.6 Money Changing

4.6.1 The Temple of Artemis

Christianity, 100 BC–AD 200 (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, eds., *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Serge Sauneron, *The Priests of Ancient Egypt* (trans. David Lorton; new ed.; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000); Byron E. Shafer, ed., *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997). P. Giss. 40 ii.16–29, discussed above, shows that cattle were offered to Sarapis. Citing the cult of Asclepius as an example, Sanders notes that, as was the case with the Jerusalem temple, accepting birds as a sacrifice most could afford "was very much in line with the practice of most temples" (*Judaism*, 90). For example, see Plato, *Phaed.* 118a; Pausanius, *Descr.* 2.11.5–8; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 5.17.

[531] See §3.3.2.1.

Even though neither of the terms John uses for moneychangers (κερματιστής, κολλυβιστής) appear in inscriptions from Ephesus, the inscription do show that moneychangers plied their trade throughout the city.[532] One inscription reveals that an association of moneychangers (τραπεζεῖται) rented three places in the public lavatories.[533] We know the name of one moneychanger (*nummelarius*), Calyx, and of his patron, Autronius, from a 4 B.C.E. inscription.[534]

Moneychangers helped facilitate the transactions between merchants and their customers from abroad who came to Ephesus to visit the Artemision, bringing their foreign coins.[535] Those who came from abroad had to exchange their money for the local currency. This coinage usually bore an image of the temple, sometimes with the cult statue of Artemis that was stationed in the temple visible on the coin.[536] By featuring the temple of Artemis (usually on the reverse), Ephesian coinage advertised

---

[532] Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 91.

[533] *I. Eph.* 2.454; SEG 4.541 (cf. *FiE* 3:65).

[534] *I. Eph.* 562.

[535] The relation between moneychangers and local trade in Roman Asia Minor is best exhibited in a letter of Hadrian to Pergamum, which shows that they exchanged money (apparently at illegal rates) to facilitate trade among merchants, small dealers, and fish-sellers (Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 891–95).

[536] Andrew Burnett, Michel Amandry and Pere Pau Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage* (2 vols.; London: British Museum Press, 1992), pt. 1, no. 2222; pt. 2, pl. 99; Barclay V. Head, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia* (ed. Reginald Stuart Poole; Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum; Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964), 77–78 (nos. 224–26, 229, 233–34; pl. 13, no. 7); William E. Metcalf, *The Cistophori of Hadrian* (Numismatic Studies 15; New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1980), 14–15 (nos. 40–67; pls. 3–4).

the Artemision and its goddess as a defining symbol of the city, reinforcing and promoting the city's bond with the cult of Artemis.[537]

That coins functioned to promote the glory and grandeur of the Artemision is fitting, given the temple's fame for storing money. Dio Chrysostom (ca. 40–120 C.E.) discusses the Artemision's reputation as a deposit bank in the first century:

> You know about the Ephesians, of course, and that large sums of money are in their hands, some of it belonging to private citizens and deposited in the temple of Artemis, not alone money of the Ephesians but also of aliens and of persons from all parts of the world, and in some cases of commonwealths and kings, money which all deposit there in order that it may be safe, since no one has ever yet dared to violate that place, although countless wars have occurred in the past and the city has often been captured. Well, that the money is deposited on state property is indeed evident, but it also is evident, as the lists show, that it is the custom of the Ephesians to have these deposits officially recorded. Well then, do they go on and take any of these monies when any need arises, or do they 'borrow' them at any rate—an act which, perhaps, will not seem at all shocking? No; on the contrary, they would sooner, I imagine, strip off the adornment of the goddess than touch this money. Yet you would not say that the Ephesians are wealthier than yourselves. The very opposite is the case, for not only were you the richest of the Greeks in former times, but now you are still richer; whereas the

---

[537] "The provincial coinage of cities in western Asia Minor was a tool for broadcasting a city's identity and claims. Cities issuing their own provincial coinage had a unique, yet limited, opportunity to advertise their city. The amount of available space was very small, so the choice of what image to put on the coin was highly significant. From the standpoint of the archaeologist and historian, therefore, a recognition of what was chosen for these coins provides a window into how a city defined itself and the desired civic image it wanted to proclaim...[O]ne of the most common reverse types on provincial coinage was that of a temple. The symbiotic relationship between temple and city was so strong that their identities were mutually intertwined. Thus, the symbol often used to identify a city was that of its temple and patron deity. In the first and second centuries C.E., the Temple of Artemis functioned as a symbol for Ephesus" (Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 89).

> Ephesians, one can see, are less prosperous than many. (*Rhod.* 31.54–55 [Cohoon, LCL])[538]

Dio Chrysostom attributes the temple's repute as a bank to the stringency with which deposits would be protected. He claims the bank was run by officials who kept records of deposits stored in the temple, and these deposits were never lent out at interest nor used to supply Ephesus with funds when needed, though other sources indicated the Artemision did lend out money.[539]

Whether or not Dio Chrysostom's report of its banking practices is entirely accurate, the temple's status and fame as a deposit bank is amply attested, even well before the first century (Xenophon, *Anab.* 5.3.4–13; Plautus, *Bacch.*, 306; Caesar, *Bell. civ.* 3.33, 105; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 30.1; Diog. Laert. 2.6.7). Ephesians and others from all over the world stored their money there on account of its strength and security. Inscriptions show that people deposited inheritance money in the temple to be withdrawn some time later by their heirs, indicating their trust that the goddess's protection and the temple's impenetrable walls would keep it safe for their

---

[538] Translation in Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 31–36* (trans. J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940).

[539] According to Dio Chrysostom's statement above, the deposits made at the Artemision were officially recorded, and other ancient sources corroborate the existence of a deposit bank under official control (CIG 2:2953b; Plautus, *Bacch.* 312; Caesar, *Bell. civ.* 3.33). In contrast to Dio Chrysostom's insistence that the bank at the Artemision did not use or lend money stored there, Nicolaus of Damascus mentions notes that the Artemision did lend money (*frg.* 65), and Aristides states the Artemision's treasury functioned as a "refuge for necessity" (*Oration* 42.522). See Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 31–36*, 60–61 n. 1.

posterity.[540] Such activity was common enough for it to merit regulation. One inscription, for example, honors Hadrian for establishing regulatory legislation "about the inheritances and deposits to the goddess."[541] In ca. 44 C.E. the proconsul of Asia praised the Artemision for its revenues,[542] and Aristides calls Ephesus "the common treasury and the refuge for necessity" (*Oration* 42.522), suggesting the temple's reserves could sustain the city in difficult times. Whether moneychangers facilitated the depositing of money in the temple at Ephesus, as they did in Jerusalem, is not attested, but like the Jerusalem temple, the Artemision functioned as an important treasury and deposit bank for the city.

4.6.2 The Serapeum

Moneychangers were essential in Roman Alexandria. Foreign coinage was not allowed to circulate in Egypt, so foreign merchants and travelers to Alexandria were required to exchange their money if they wanted to partake in any commerce, including the temple commerce of the Serapeum.[543] Regulations designed to ensure moneychangers charged fair rates were in place, as seen in an ordinance of the idiologus forbidding the exchange of money for more than its worth.[544] Just as the

---

[540] *I. Eph.* 3.678, 692, 725, 731.

[541] *I. Eph.* 2.274; translation is from Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 74.

[542] *I. Eph.* 1a.18b, lines 2–3.

[543] Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 432, 439–40.

[544] Ibid. (no. 444). Of course, the mere existence of such laws does not guarantee they were followed. As Kenneth W. Harl writes, "Imperial laws never abolished the daily forces affecting exchange rates in markets—either in the East where so many different coins stayed in circulation, or in the northern frontiers

coinage minted at Ephesus contained images of the Artemision and its patron deity, coins minted and used in Alexandria showed the Serapeum and the figure of Sarapis, or of the Adrianon or Hadrianum within the Serapeum.[545] This temple too was a defining symbol of the city.

Though the Serapeum's status as a deposit bank is not as well-attested as the Artemision's, the Serapeum at Alexandria was built in a manner that could securely store a number of treasures.[546] A certain Marsisuchus instructed in his will that if its terms were not executed properly his estate should go to the temple of Serapis at Alexandria.[547] Temples throughout Egypt functioned as banks and treasuries that stored and lent money, including the Serapeum at Oxyrhynchus.[548] The same was probably also true of the Serapeum at Alexandria, even if documentation is lacking.

4.6.3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Money Changing in the Contexts of John's Readers

Readers in Ephesus and Alexandria knew moneychangers facilitated sales transactions for visitors from abroad, who had to change their coins into the local

---

where old coins stayed in circulation so long that they were often countermarked or halved for fractions" (*Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C. to A.D. 700* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996], 260).

[545] Reginald Stuart Poole, *Catalogue of the Coins of Alexandria and the Nomes* (Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum; Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964), xc–xciv.

[546] See Rowe, *Discovery*, 27–28, 33–36, 38, 62.

[547] Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 440.

[548] P.Oxy. 91, 513 (184 C.E.). On temples as banks in Egypt, see Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 440.

currency in order to participate in the local trade. To these readers, the moneychangers who facilitate the sales of sacrificial animals in John 2:14 appear to be doing what is routinely expected of them during a busy religious festival. The depiction of Jesus as a religious pilgrim who finds "business as usual" in the temple in 2:13–14 thus remains intelligible in non-Jewish contexts where John's Gospel was read. Pilgrims to Ephesus and Alexandra would also have encountered moneychangers who helped facilitate commerce resulting from the festivals of Artemis and Sarapis.

As shown in the previous chapter, John 2:15 marks the point in the pericope where Jesus stops being a normal pilgrim and starts demonstrating his authority over temple commerce. As a display of his authority, Jesus spills the coins of the moneychangers on the floor. For readers in Ephesus and Alexandra, Jesus' act of pouring coins out on the floor pointedly captures the authority Jesus assumes in 2:15. Coins used by readers living in these cities bore images of their famous temples, often including an image of the statue of the deity housed inside the temple, making them emblems that displayed the interconnectedness of cult and commerce in the ancient world. The act of spilling coins, symbols of temple cult and temple commerce, on the temple floor vividly depicts Jesus' authority over temple cult and commerce in these non-Jewish contexts. To readers in Ephesus and Alexandria familiar with coinage promoting the temples of these cities, Jesus in 2:15 distinguishes himself from the many who were awed by the these places for their economic stability.

The detail of Jesus' spilling of the coins thus communicates Jesus' authority, regardless of whether readers in Ephesus and Alexandria were familiar with the Jerusalem temple tax and the moneychangers' role in providing the appropriate Tyrian coinage. Jesus' act of spilling the coins on the floor, not explicitly narrated in the Synoptic account of the scene, is yet another detail unique to John's version that allows the pericope to communicate its claims about Jesus' authority beyond the Jerusalem context of the scene.

4.7 The Temple as a Source and Center of Trade

4.7.1 The Temple of Artemis

The temple of Artemis was itself a center of commerce where trade could take place and which stimulated trade in its immediate vicinity and surrounding areas. The Salutaris inscription (discussed above, §4.5.1) appears to instruct winners of the lottery to spend a portion of their winnings in the temple.[549] As was common in antiquity, the Artemision was built near a public marketplace because it would, and did, attract citizens of Ephesus as well as tourists and pilgrims from abroad to visit the temple site and spend money in the markets nearby.[550]

---

[549] *I. Eph.* 1a.27, lines 492–528 (as reconstructed in Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 182). Many Greek and Roman temples, usually in their surrounding colonnades or porticoes, contained shops (Stambaugh, "The Functions of Roman Temples," *ANRW* 16:1:573; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 71). In Ephesus, the Ephesian temple of the Sebastoi contained shops in the terrace on which it sat (V. Mitsopoulou-Leon, "Ephesos," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* [ed. Richard Stillwell; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976], 308).

[550] Margaret Lyttelton, "The Design and Planning of Temples and Sanctuaries in Asia Minor in the Roman Imperial Period," in *Roman Architecture in the Greek*

Artemis's temple in Ephesus owned land that generated revenue. The temple had long possessed quarries, pastures, salt-pans, and fisheries in addition to extensive estates in the Cayster valley that it had acquired through mortgages and pledges or business investments.[551] These sacred territories were economic entities in their own right, so much so that the city successfully sought to incorporate them into city territories in the Augustan period.[552] So in addition to spurring trade on the site of its sanctuary, the Artemision's off-site properties prompted various trades and commercial ventures that generated revenue for the temple. The temple of Artemis drew income from other sources as well, including from payments associated with liturgies and foundations like that of Salutaris.[553] Income that the temple of Artemis attained from various sources made it an economic institution that generated an "abundance of revenues."[554]

World (ed. Sarah Macready and F. H. Thompson; London: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1987), 46; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 68–69. On the close association between temples and marketplaces in Hellenistic cities, see Walter Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," in *Temple in Society* (ed. Michael V. Fox; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1988), 42; Pausanias *Descr.* 2.2.6.

[551] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 645; see Vitruvius, *De architectura* 10.2.15; Xenophon, *Anab.*, 5.3.4–6,; Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.1.26; *FiE* 1:40.

[552] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor, 645.

[553] On payments associated with liturgies, see *I. Eph.* 1a.17–19; Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 73. On the Salutaris inscription, see Rogers, *Sacred Identity*.

[554] *FiE* 2:118 (no. 22); translation is from Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 679. This same inscription claims "the deified Augustus" had something to do with this "abundance of revenues," showing that one way to explain the large income

Whether accrued by land-ownership, donations and foundations or from liturgies by wealthy benefactors, the temple's money financed its cult. Instructions specified in such gifts and foundations as that of Salutaris give an idea of how much money was necessary to conduct public worship of Artemis, especially on festival occasions. While festivals were in large part an expense of the municipality in which they were held, private funds donated to temples and income drawn from temple lands defrayed a large portion of these expenses.[555] Managing the income and expenditures of the Artemision was an important and complex task handled by a group of twelve neopoioi whose duties included managing temple finances.[556]

The temple of Artemis, given its size, fame, and fiscal resources, was a consistent stimulus to the city of Ephesus, especially during festivals. While festivals like the Artemisia were expensive, the fact that they attracted so many people to the city made them a worthwhile expense, since they "often gave a temporary increase to the profits of the merchants and artisans of the cities, as well as to others who came

---

produced by Artemis's temple was to attribute its financial success in part to supernatural assistance by a deified emperor.

[555] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 804–05.

[556] *I. Eph.* 2.419A; 3.951, 966; Rogers, "Demetrios of Ephesos," 879; C.T. Newton, Edward Lee Hicks, and Gustav Hirschfeld, *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* (4 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1874–1916), 3:27–28 (no. 413); Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 57. The inscriptions refer to the neopoioi of Ephesus as a "synagogue" (τῆς συνα[γωγῆς]) or "synhedrion" (τοῦ συνεδρίου). Later inscriptions reveal that by the latter half of the second or first half of the third century, an organization known as "the most sacred council of the society of hirers" (ἱερωτάτον συνέδριον τοῦ μισθωτηρίου) regulated the hiring of temple personnel and received praise for its work (*I. Eph.* 5.1577, 1993; 6.2227; 7.1.3050, 3071; 7.2.4124; translation is from Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*, 73).

in for the occasion."[557] The temple was fundamental to making Ephesus "the largest emporium [ἐμπόριον] in Asia this side of the Taurus" (Strabo, *Geog.* 14.1.24 [Jones, LCL]). It was a source and center of trade and commerce for Ephesus and its environs.

4.7.2 The Serapeum

Temples throughout Egypt were centers and sources of trade and commerce in ways that resembled the Artemision.[558] The Serapeum owned land and could receive gifts that would have increased its land holdings. In a letter containing his will, a former high priest of the temple of Hadrian named Marsisuchus writes to his daughter, "[I]f you do not observe these my wishes...the contracts and title-deeds [of his estate]...shall be the property of the great god Serapis at Alexandria." To his wife he writes, "[I]f you disobey me all that I have placed in your name is the property of the great god Serapis at Alexandria."[559] Purchasing the materials and hiring the labor needed for the Serapeum's construction and expansion, involved the temple in a

---

[557] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 805–06.

[558] Evidence of the sort raised in the preceding section is lacking for the Serapeum at Alexandria, though abundant for temples elsewhere in Egypt. See the sections on hieratic lands and temple accounts in Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 122–24 and 639–70, respectively. Also worth consulting are the sections on taxes, assessments, and fees (ibid., 537–90), which list many taxes and assessments known from the papyri that were levied on sales and revenues associated with trades taking place in connection with temples. In the Roman period, temple lands in Egypt were confiscated by Roman authorities and restricted from earning profits. Johnson attributes this to the wealth that temples would accrue as a result of their properties; the Romans feared the power and influence wielded by temples and so took measures to curtail it (ibid., 122; cf. 162–63, 639–40).

[559] P. Tebt. 407 (199 C.E.); translation from Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 284–85.

number of trades and made it a major contributor to the economy of the region.[560] Like other Egyptian temples, the Serapeum would have generated revenue from various sources, would have had temple personnel to administrate its fiscal responsibilities, would have employed temple staff for various duties, would have had taxes levied upon its revenues, and would have had markets within or adjacent to it.[561]

By the middle of the third century B.C.E., Sarapis had been identified as a patron of material advancement.[562] Sarapis eventually became the patron deity of Alexandria, and the Serapeum would have contributed to making Alexandria a city Strabo calls "the greatest emporium in the inhabited world" (*Geogr.* 17.1.13 [Jones, LCL]; cf. Diodorus, *Library of History* 17.52.5; Dio Chrysostom, *Alex.* 35–36).[563]

4.7.3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Temples as Sources and Centers of Trade in the Contexts of John's Readers

In John 2:16 Jesus refers to the Jerusalem temple as οἶκος ἐμπορίου and οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου. John's audiences in Ephesus and Alexandria would have easily

---

[560] See §4.8.2 below.

[561] See the description of the sacred economy of Egyptian temples in Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 639–47.

[562] Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:258–59. According to Fraser, "This aspect of the god's power is clearly secondary and artificial...the notion of Sarapis as holding the key to advancement clearly reflects the royal patronage bestowed on the cult; it was this which in turn gave the god's patronage its especial value" (ibid., 1:259).

[563] According to Fraser, "Alexandria in the late Ptolemaic period was the unrivalled centre of world trade" (*Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:133).

understood that a temple could house both the patron deity of a city and the economic apparatus that effectively made it an emporium. The major temples of these cities were economic institutions that generated revenue, spent funds, participated in local and regional trade, drew commerce to their surrounding vicinities, and even housed markets on or adjacent to their properties. These temples played a significant role in developing the economies of their respective cities.

The ways the temples of Artemis in Ephesus and Sarapis in Alexandria generated revenue and engaged in commerce were hardly identical to the manner in which the Jerusalem temple did. Land ownership, for example, constituted a significant revenue stream for the major temples of Ephesus and Alexandria while it appears the Jerusalem temple did not own land or other properties. While the Artemision and the Serapeum accepted gifts and donations from private citizens, they did not mandate that their adherents pay an annual tax as a consistent and crucial source of income, as did the Jerusalem temple. Yet even if readers in these polytheistic contexts remained unaware of the differences between the particulars of the sacred economies of the major temples of their cities and that of the Jerusalem temple, they could have understood that Jesus' disruption of temple commerce in John 2:13–16 amounts to a demonstration of his authority, precisely because these readers knew the economically influential positions the major temples in their cities held. Temples in these places were economic institutions, capable of being labeled as οἶκοι ἐμπορίων. For readers in Ephesus and Alexandria, Jesus' disruption of temple commerce represents a challenge to a temple's ability to run its cult and execute the

financial tasks that benefit the deities in these temples and the cities in which they stood.

To be sure, taking on the sacred economy of a temple could also be seen as a challenge to the authority of the deity or deities dwelling within it. Given the interrelated nature of cult and commerce in ancient temples, challenging the commerce of a deity's temple could amount to challenging its cult. As shown in the previous chapter, John's version of the temple scene provides a number of textual indicators to guide readers to avoid seeing Jesus' disruption of the Jerusalem temple's commerce as an attack on the temple cult or a call for the permanent end of its commerce. Because the text, especially Jesus' words in 2:16 and the disciples' application of Ps 69:9a in 2:17, focuses on Jesus' zeal and devotion to his Father's οἶκος, readers in Ephesus and Alexandria are given clues that Jesus' actions in the temple are not intended as an attack on the temple itself or the God who dwells in it. That the text narrates Jesus' disruption as focused specifically on the commerce of the Jerusalem temple means John's readers across religio-cultural contexts can know that Jesus' temple act constitutes a demonstration of his authority to disrupt the valued function of any great temple to give economic support to its cult and city. Jesus is a temple visitor with enough authority to interrupt the temple's function as οἶκος ἐμπορίου.[564]

---

[564] That being a center of commerce is such a valued function is seen how Strabo uses ἐμπόριον as a term of high praise for both Ephesus and Alexandria (*Geog.* 14.1.24; 17.1.13). Jesus' command to stop making his Father's house an οἶκος ἐμπορίου stands as a sharp criticism of the temple's status as such, a command that

4.8 The Economic Impact of Temple Construction

4.8.1 The Temple of Artemis

The temple of Artemis had been rebuilt twice before the first century. The first sanctuary to stand on the site dates to the Bronze Age and was destroyed in the 7th century B.C.E. by a flood. It took ten years, beginning in 550 B.C.E., to rebuild the temple, which was then destroyed by Herostratus, who on 21 July 356 B.C.E. set fire to temple with the expectation that his act of arson would bring him worldwide fame (Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.1.22; Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Deeds and Sayings* 8.14, ext. 5; Plutarch, *Alex.* 3.6; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 2.6.18). Construction on the temple that stood in the first century began in 323 B.C.E., and according to the elder Pliny the building of this temple "occupied all Asia Minor for 120 years" (*Nat.* 36.21.95 [Eichholz, LCL]). However precise Pliny's figure of 120 years may be, building grand temples took a long time in antiquity, and in the Hellenistic period the temple of Artemis at Ephesus was hailed as one of grandest.[565] In his list of the Seven Wonders

---

emphasizes his authority while he is the temple. Through his speech, he determines whether the temple's status as ἐμπόριον is valuable enough to proceed uninterrupted.

[565] "Details of the construction and decoration show that it was built over a considerable period, which goes some way to confirming Pliny's '120 years,' " (Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 117). See Frederick E. Winter, "Towards a Chronology of the Later Artemision at Ephesos," *AJA* 84 (1980): 241. For a description of the temple that incorporates ancient literary descriptions with what can be known about the temple through archaeology, see Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 20–24, 116–19.

of the World, Antipater of Sidon famously declared its grandeur and brilliancy second only to Olympus (*Greek Anthology* 9.58).[566]

Construction work on the Artemision required the purchase and transport of expensive materials as well as hiring the labor to procure and transport whatever was needed. For example, marble used to construct the temple (Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 10.2.11–12, 15) had to be quarried and transported, and this in a region notable for its dependency on salaried labor (as opposed to slave labor) for all types of industrial production.[567] Building the temple was such an expensive endeavor, that at one point Alexander the Great offered to pay for its construction. Alexander promoted his offer to fund the temple's construction as an act of generosity and stipulated that it be commemorated by an inscription on the temple. It was a source of pride for the Ephesians to decline this offer and pay for the temple's building themselves through their own donations and through the sale of the pillars of the temple that had been burned down by Herostratus (Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.1.22).[568]

---

[566] "I have set eyes on the wall of lofty Babylon, on which is a road for chariots, and the statue of Zeus by the Alpheus, and the hanging gardens, and the Colossus of the Sun, and the huge labor of the high pyramids, and the vast tomb of Mausolus, but when I saw the house of Artemis that mounted to the clouds, those other marvels lost their brilliancy, and I said, 'Lo, apart from Olympus, the Sun never looked on aught so grand!' " (Antipater of Sidon, *Greek Anthology* 9.58 [Paton, LCL]). The temple remained grand until 263 C.E., when it was damaged or entirely destroyed by invading Goths (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *The Two Gallieni* 6.2; cf. Zozimus, *Historia nova* 1.28.1). By the end of the fifth century C.E. it had fallen victim once and for all to the Christian policy of destroying pagan temples (see Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 119).

[567] Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 841.

[568] Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 79.

Ephesian citizens "willing to pay a fixed sum" were offered the right of having their names inscribed on a designated pillar commemorating their donation (Aristotle, *Oec.* 2.2.19).

Construction on this temple was completed well before the first century C.E., but maintenance, expansion, and renovation continued into and after the first century. One inscription suggests an Augusteum had been built within the sanctuary of Artemis by 6 or 5 B.C.E.,[569] and a ca. 100 C.E. inscription refers to a new gymnasium in the temple.[570] Philostratus writes of a certain Damianus of Ephesus who in the first half of the second century C.E. used his wealth to fund two projects connected with the temple of Artemis (*Vit. soph.* 2.23).[571] The first was a portico made entirely of marble that connected the temple with the city. It "was completed at great expense," so that "worshippers need not stay away from the temple in case of rain" (Wright, LCL). Philostratus says the portico was a stadion in length, about 200 meters, but the archaeological record shows that when finished, the portico was over 2.5 kilometers long and 3.70 meters wide, making it over ninety percent longer

---

[569] *I. Eph* 5.1522; Newton, Hicks, and Hirschfeld, *Greek Inscriptions*, 3:177–78 (no. 522); David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ* (2 vols.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), 1:470; Oster, "Holy Days," 76; S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 254; Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 85. C. P. Jones disagrees ("A Deed of Foundation From the Territory of Ephesos," *JRS* 73 [1983]: 121).

[570] *I. Eph* 3.938.

[571] Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 174.

than a stadion.[572] Brick and limestone were acquired for the portico's foundation. Because of the marshy terrain, laying this foundation necessitated the hire of skilled engineers and laborers.[573] In addition to the boost this project gave to the local construction industry, it would have had a lasting effect on the commerce of the city, since a covered walkway made it easier for consumers and merchants to travel between the temple and the city in inclement weather, and made pilgrimage to the temple generally more pleasant by keeping pilgrims' feet dry from the marshy terrain and shielding pilgrims from the sun.[574]

The second project was a banquet hall inside the temple, built large enough "to surpass all that exist elsewhere put together" and "decorated...with an elegance beyond words, for it is adorned with Phrygian marble such as had never before been quarried" (Wright, LCL). The building of this banquet hall, given its large size and expensive décor, provides another example of the Artemision's ongoing contribution to the economy, to the construction and pilgrimage trades in particular. In this case, its economic influence extended as far as Phrygia, where the marble was quarried and from which it was transported. In conjunction with the portico, this banquet hall was designed to improve the pilgrimage experience. The portico provided a

---

[572] Ibid.

[573] Scherrer, *Ephesus*, 70. "The extraordinary depth (five meters) and strength of the foundations betray the difficulty of constructing a processional road across very marshy land" (Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 174).

[574] Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 174.

comfortable walkway for festival processions and the banquet hall a space large enough to accommodate pilgrims for a communal meal.[575]

The second century C.E. was a period of considerable expansion for the temple: the construction of magnificent structures associated with the Artemision, including the precinct wall of an Augusteum; an addition to the stage building; the entrance from the stoa to the Hellenistic market; mosaic decoration in the stoa; the exedra and the statue by Ischyrion and Isidor of Alexandria; doors for the Artemision; repairs to buildings; and the aforementioned banquet hall and marble portico from the Magnesian gate to the precinct of Artemis funded by Damanius.[576] In some instances, funds of the Artemision paid for building projects in the city, as was the case for the precinct wall of an Augusteum.[577] Given the constant construction work on temples in Ephesus, including but not limited to the Artemision, it is no surprise that a guild of temple-builders and carpenters (οἱ

---

[575] Dieter Knibbe, "Via Sacra Ephesiaca," 149–50; Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 174–75. "Its size reflected the hope of Damanius that the comfort of the new processional route would attract more participants" (Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 175).

[576] Precinct wall: *BCH* 10 (1886): 95, by Titus; stage building: *FiE* 2:35, by Domitian; the entrance from the stoa to the Hellenistic market, mosaic decoration in the stoa, the exedra and the statue by Ischyrion and Isidor of Alexandria: *FiE* 3:5, by Domitian; doors for the Artemision: by Trajan, *FiE* 1:246 (no. 105); repairs to buildings, marble portico from the Magnesian gate to the precinct of Artemis, and a banquet-hall, decorated with Phrygian marble, in the Artemision: Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 2.23, all by Flavius Damianus, the sophist. See Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 752–53.

[577] *BCH* 10 (1886): 95; Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 752.

ναουργοὶ τέκτονες) had formed by 200 C.E.[578] Stone-cutters and sculptors must have had plenty of work from the temple as well.[579] Construction work in general was a significant component of the economy of major cities in Asia Minor like Ephesus, and the Artemision was a reliable and consistent contributor to the construction industry in and near Ephesus.[580]

4.8.2 The Serapeum

While there may have been a pre-Ptolemaic era sanctuary at the site of the Serapeum, the temple standing there in the first century was built by Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 B.C.E.).[581] Foundation-plaques inscribed in Greek and hieroglyphics that were excavated at the site contain a dedication that attributes the temple's construction to Ptolemy III: "King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the Theoi Adelphoi, <dedicated> the temple [*naos*] and the sanctuary [*temenos*] to Sarapis."[582]

---

[578] *FiE* 3, no. 75; Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 842.

[579] "Many temples and other public buildings demanded the exercise of the sculptor's art" (Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 833). See ibid., 832–35.

[580] "The mass of public building, basilicas, aqueducts, fountains, to say nothing of innumerable temples both large and small, makes construction easily the most important, as it became the most enduring, object of expenditures" for any large city in Asia Minor (Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," 804). On the building industry in general, see ibid. 837–39, and on architects in particular, see ibid. 850–51.

[581] Rowe, *Discovery*, 1–2.

[582] Translation is from Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:28.

The Serapeum underwent a massive reconstruction effort during the Roman period, sometime between 181 and 217 C.E.[583] The Ptolemaic Serapeum was large, spacious, and accommodated many visitors. Any large-scale construction on it would have been a costly project that necessitated the purchase of expensive materials and labor. The Roman Serapeum, whose enclosure was 105.55 meters in width, was built over the Ptolemaic Serapeum, itself with an enclosure 77 meters wide.[584] The total overall length of the Roman enclosure was about 237.70 meters.[585] The temple was tall, evidenced dramatically by the Column of Diocletian (also known as "Pompey's Pillar"), the only column of the Serapeum still standing today, at a height of 26.85 meters. The Roman Serapeum featured three staircases, including a monumental staircase of about 100 steps that led to a propylon closed by a bronze grille with four

---

[583] On the dating of this reconstruction, see J. S. McKenzie, S. Gibson, and A. T. Reyes, "Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archeological Evidence," *JRS* 94 (2004): 98–99; Wild, "Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries," 1757–58. Earlier scholarship held this reconstruction took place during the reign of Trajan (98–117 C.E.) or Hadrian (117–138 C.E.). Alan Rowe argues for a reconstruction during the reign of Hadrian (*Discovery*, 62; cf. idem., and B. R. Rees ("A Contribution to the Archaeology of the Western Desert: IV: The Great Serapeum of Alexandra," *BJRL* 39 [1956–1957]: 496), and Fraser (*Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1:803–04) maintain the Roman Serapeum was built by Trajan or Hadrian. More recent scholarship argues for a later reconstruction. Wild dates it to shortly after 181 C.E. ("Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries," 1758), and Susan Handler to the reign of Caracalla (211–17 C.E.) ("Architecture on the Roman Coins of Alexandria," *AJA* 75 [1971]: 64–68). A fire dated to 181 C.E. (Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 4.51; cf. Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* 6.23) probably instigated the Roman reconstruction of this Serapeum not long afterward (Wild, "Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries," 1758). The Serapeum was destroyed either by a Christian mob or Roman soldiers in 391 C.E.

[584] Rowe, *Discovery*, 60.

[585] Ibid., 33.

columns behind it; a œcus roofed with a cupola; a large entrance door; a library; a great piscina; an atrium at its long underground complex that might be from the Ptolemaic temple; and a white marble bust of Sarapis.[586] The stones that comprised the temple's structure included limestone, granite, and marble, and bronze was present as well.[587] Despite the problematic nature of the site's excavation, at the least its excavation shows that construction work undertaken on the Serapeum during the Roman period made a large, grand temple even grander.[588]

---

[586] Ibid., 34, 38.

[587] Ibid., 34, 38.

[588] See McKenzie, Gibson, and Reyes, "Reconstructing the Serapeum," 82–84, 89; Barbara Tkaczow and Iwona Zych, *Topography of Ancient Alexandria: An Archaeological Map* (Travaux du Centre d'archéologie méditerranéenne de l'Académie polonaise de sciences 32; Warsaw: Zakład Archeologii Śródziemnomorskiej, Polskiej Akadmii Nauk, 1993). The later testimony of Rufinus, who visited the Serapeum in the late fourth century, speaks to the magnificence of this reconstruction: "The whole edifice is built with enormous vaults, above which are immense windows. The hidden inner chambers are separate from one another and provide for the enactment of various ritual acts and secret observances. Sitting courts and small chapels with images of gods occupy the edge of the highest level. Lofty houses spread across this height in which the priests, or those which they call *agneuontas*, this is, those who purify themselves, had been accustomed to live. Beyond these buildings, a portico raised on columns and facing inward runs around the periphery. In the middle of all of this stands the temple, rising on precious columns and constructed on a magnificent scale out of marble. Inside there was a statue of Serapis so vast that the right hand touched one wall and the left the other" (*Hist.* 11.23; translation in Edward J. Watts, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria* [Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2006), 145; italics his).

This reconstruction and expansion necessitated the work of skilled architects, engineers, masons, and other laborers, all of whom had to be paid.[589] The skill involved in designing and building the Serapeum is seen in its orientation. The Roman Serapeum was oriented deliberately to the south/southeast so that the sun would shine directly on the face of the cult statue of Sarapis inside it (Rufinus, *Hist.* 2.23).[590] Reconstructing the Serapeum gave work to a number of skilled laborers and required the purchase and transport of expensive metals, stones, and other materials. Whenever its date, this reconstruction effort contributed to the growth of construction trades of Alexandria and its environs.

4.8.3 Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Temple Construction in the Contexts of John's Readers

Like the Jerusalem temple, the temples of Artemis and Sarapis were continually being maintained, expanded, and renovated. Even if the dates of their initial construction or officially designated reconstruction were long in the past, these temples were never "finished." Readers in these contexts would have well understood what the Jews in John 2:20 mean when, using οἰκοδομέω in a complexive sense, they say, "This temple has been under construction for forty-six years."

---

[589] According to a second-century C.E. papyrus from Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. 488), the daily wage was 4 drachmas for masons cutting 16 outer stones as well as for masons cutting 30 inner stones, and each mason had to be provided with a loaf of bread and relish each day. Other second-century papyri (BGU 143, 699) set the daily wage for builder's assistants at 2 drachmas; for carrying stone at 1½ drachmas; and for refurbishing temples at netted 4 artaba of wheat per day. See Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 255.

[590] Wild, "Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries," 1755–57.

The authority Jesus assumes by his claim to rebuild the temple in three days would have also communicated to readers outside of Jerusalem. Non-Jewish audiences may or may not have known that only priests were allowed to build the inner sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple. But they did know that in order to build any grand temple or an addition to a great temple, one needed access to substantial funding—usually supplied by a ruler (Ptolemy III Euergetes built the Serapeum in Alexandria, commemorated in one of its foundation-plaques) or a wealthy influential patron (as Damanius funded major projects to improve the Artemision)—as well as access to the best architects, engineers, laborers, and materials money could buy. Building a great temple was a laborious and sophisticated process that took decades (over a century in the case of the Artemision, according to the elder Pliny). Jesus' claim to rebuild the Jerusalem temple in three days could have struck ancient audiences as impossible or ludicrous, but in making the claim Jesus asserts the authority normally associated with a king or influential citizen, to fund and facilitate a grand project for the benefit of the people of a given city, an authority that would have justified an inscription bearing his name on the temple for all to see.

Readers in Ephesus in particular would have understood the special relationship one has with a temple when one is responsible for its construction. The Ephesian populace was proud of having declined Alexander the Great's offer to instead fund the temple's construction at the citizens' own expense. When reading 2:20, the citizens of Ephesus would have appreciated the skepticism displayed by the

Jews' question to Jesus about the possibility of him rebuilding the temple. Yet they knew it was possible for someone unexpected to build a temple.

The expense, length, and complexity of temple construction in Ephesus and Alexandria reinforces for readers in these contexts the distinction between the temple and Jesus' body in John's narration of 2:18–22, seen especially in the narrator's comment in 2:21. As in Jerusalem, temple construction, renovation, expansion, and maintenance in Ephesus and Alexandria defies completion and takes thousands of laborers, many of whom form their own communities of guilds and associations. No simple symbolic replacement reading is possible for those who live around the dramatic temple edifices of Asia Minor and Egypt; the grandeur of these temples makes Jesus' claim seem all the more ludicrous on the surface, and hence from John's perspective, an even bolder statement of his authority. In his words in 2:19, Jesus was indeed assuming the authority to build a temple, but that authority would be demonstrated through his resurrection, not the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. He was asserting his authority as temple builder, not as temple replacement.

The common features of temple construction in the ancient Mediterranean world allow the various intricacies of John's temple scene to communicate to ancient audiences who may not have been familiar with the specific construction context of the Jerusalem temple. The economics of temple construction between the Jerusalem temple and the temples of Artemis and Sarapis were similar, and that similarity allows 2:13–22's claims of Jesus' authority to come across to audiences with

knowledge of what it takes to build and maintain any grand and magnificent temple in antiquity.

4.9 The Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch

What has been demonstrated for Jerusalem, Ephesus, and Alexandria—that their major temples were economic engines to their cities and surrounding regions—is true for Antioch, though the data give only a glimpse of this reality. The cult of Zeus was prominent in Antioch, and so in this section I will draw from this cult, focusing in particular on the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, to show that temple commerce was as vital to the economy of this city as it was to the other cities examined in this study.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–163 B.C.E.) sought to develop the cult of Zeus in Antioch "as a means of unifying his subjects," and as part of this program he built, but appears to have left unfinished, a temple of Jupiter Capitolinus modeled on the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus that stood in Rome.[591] This temple was especially important for Antiochus because he identified himself with Zeus Olympius,[592] and he may have hired the renowned Roman architect Cossutius, who worked for

---

[591] Downey, *History of Antioch*, 100, 104 (104). On Antiochus IV's "vigorous effort to unify his people by political, religious, and cultural means" in the wake of recent political, military, and economic setbacks, see ibid., 96–97.

[592] Ibid., 96, 100. See E. R. Bevan, "A Note on Antiochos Epiphanes," *JHS* 20 (1900): 26–30; J. Tondriau, "Souverains et souveraines Séleucides en divinités," *Le Muséon* 61 (1948): 175–176.

Antiochus on the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens.[593] Livy describes it as "magnificent," mentioning that its ceiling was overlaid with gold and its walls covered with gold leaf, that is, with gilded plates (*History of Rome* 41.20.9). Sources do not specify the temple's location, but it likely stood in the new quarter of the city developed by Antiochus, dubbed Epiphania.[594] The city quarter known as Epiphania was completed and improved through a set of public works said to be conducted under Tiberius (though perhaps more accurately attributable to Augustus).[595] As part of this building program, Malalas claims that Tiberius "built" the temple of Jupiter

---

[593] Downey, *History of Antioch*, 102–03. Vitruvius notes that Cossutius's work on the temple of Jupiter Olympius at Athens was marked by "great skill and taste" and that, when completed, this temple was "not only universally esteemed, but [was] accounted one of the rarest specimens of magnificence" (*On Architecture* 7.15 [*The Architecture of Marcus Vitruvius Pollio*, translated by Joseph Gwilt, London: Priestley and Weale, 1826]). That Cossutius worked for Antiochus IV at Antioch is probable because his name appears twice in the cement wall (dated to the second century B.C.E.) of the channel of an aqueduct located on the mountain slope above the city (Elderkin et al., *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, 2:160–61 [no. 90]). Though no source mentions that Antiochus employed Cossutius to work on the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch, Glanville Downey supposes he did: "Since the aqueduct is independently dated in this period, the coincidence of the rather unusual name makes it seem certain that the Roman architect who was employed by Antiochus IV at Athens was also active at Antioch, and it is tempting to suppose that, having been in charge of the work on the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens, he also designed the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Antioch, if not other of Antiochus' buildings there as well" (*History of Antioch*, 103).

[594] Downey, *History of Antioch*, 100. On Epiphania, see ibid., 99–102. Downey describes Epiphania as Antiochus's "greatest benefaction to Antioch" (ibid., 99).

[595] The reigns of Augustus and Tiberius saw much building activity in Antioch, on which see Downey, *History of Antioch*, 169–84. The principle source on this activity is Malalas, whose attribution of building activity to Tiberius is problematic (see ibid., 174–76). On the completion and improvement of Epiphania attributed by Malalas to Tiberius, see ibid., 176–81.

Capitolinus (*Chronicle* 230.10–11), but it is much more likely for Tiberius to have "completed, restored, or redecorated" it.[596]

Even this little information pertaining to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus indicates its economic contribution. The temple had imperial support—and imperial funds—from its inception. Its initial construction provided work for many over a significant period of time.[597] It was large and "magnificent," built with expensive materials that had to be purchased and delivered, and designed and built by the most skilled architects, engineers, and laborers money could buy. It must have attracted crowds of locals, pilgrims, tourists, and other travelers to Antioch.[598] Festivals and games to honor Zeus were held at Antioch and nearby Daphne, and the large crowds that came to Antioch on account of these festivals presumably visited

---

[596] Downey, *History of Antioch*, 179; see ibid., 179 n. 76.

[597] This work did not cease upon the temple's completion, after which Antiochus commissioned a significant adornment or embellishment of the temple of Apollo at Daphne. It was a renovation so lavish that at least one ancient writer (Ammianus Marcellinus 22.13.1) mistakenly believed Antiochus IV was responsible for building the temple of Apollo, so it was really the work of Seleucus I (Downey, *History of Antioch*, 105; 105 n. 91). Downey suggests that "Antiochus executed this work in order to match his construction of a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch itself" (ibid., 105).

[598] Even apart from pilgrims, tourists, and traveling merchants Antioch was heavily populated (see Downey, *History of Antioch*, 582; Heichelheim, "Roman Syria," 158). Its population was comparable to that of Alexandria (Strabo, *Geogr.* 16.2.5), so that enough people lived there to provide a veritable number of worshipers and local visitors to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. The fourth-century C.E. comment by Libanios gives an indication of how bustling Antioch was on usual basis: "Who, seeing the city for the first time, would not think he had come to a festival?" (*Or.* 11.266; translation is from Glanville Downey, "Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch (Oration XI): Translated with Introduction and Commentary," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 103 [1959]: 680).

the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus to tour it and offer sacrifice.[599] Those who visited the temple patronized the shops surrounding it, and the temple's potential to spur economic activity is seen in Antiochus's city planning—he located this temple in his new city quarter of Epiphania, in which also stood a new agora for Antioch.[600] The temple's completion or renovation under Tiberius provided jobs for laborers and likely also stimulated the economy of Antioch and its environs, as we have seen was the case when the great temples of Jerusalem, Ephesus, and Alexandria underwent their own reconstruction efforts.

---

[599] We know one set of games in honor of Zeus held in about 167 B.C.E. at Daphne under the auspices of Antiochus IV was particularly extravagant. Downey describes it as follows: "The lavishness of his outlay has become almost proverbial through the magnificence of the games that he celebrated at Daphne ca. 167 B.C.; the awestricken accounts of the wealth displayed show the impression which the spectacle must have made on contemporaries. The procession included eight hundred ephebes wearing gold crowns, innumerable sacred images, six hundred royal pages bearing gold vessels, two hundred women sprinkling scented oils from gold vessels, and countless other displays of luxury" (*History of Antioch*, 97–98). See Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 5.194–195, 10.439; Polybius, *Histories* 30.25–27; cf. Diodorus, *Library of History* 31, frg. 16.1–2. While these games were perhaps more extravagant than usual, Downey cautions against the presumption that other games and festivals were not lavish celebrations in their own right: "However, even when allowance is made for the additional outlay planned for a special occasion, Antiochus IV must have been accustomed to indulge in public display on a remarkable scale, and we must not be misled, by the celebrated account of the games of ca. 167 B.C., into thinking that these were the only noteworthy games that Antiochus produced" (ibid., 98). By the Roman period, what became known as the Olympic games of Antioch were held regularly (ibid., 98 n. 56).

[600] Downey, *History of Antioch*, 100–02.

This brief look at the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus shows that temple commerce was an integral feature of city life in Antioch.[601] Because of its own emphasis on temple commerce, John 2:13–22's claims about Jesus' authority would have been communicable to audiences in ancient Antioch, as it was to audiences in Ephesus and Alexandria. The major temples of these cities were economic institutions, and as such they provided the verisimilitude necessary for 2:13–22 to be

[601] In addition to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Antioch proper, the nearby suburb of Daphne was a pilgrim and tourist magnet on account of its temple of Apollo and its healing springs. One of the few inscriptions we have from ancient Antioch is a letter of Antiochus III, dated 12 October 189 B.C.E., appointing a chief priest to Apollo and Artemis at Daphne and to the other sanctuaries at Daphne (H. W. Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* [Paris: F. Didot, 1870], no. 2713a; *OGIS* no. 244; C. Bradford Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934], 182–83 [no. 44; cf. xlviii–xlix]). This position "was an important one since the sanctuaries at Daphne were large and wealthy, requiring capable financial administration, and...attracted throngs of visitors from all over the ancient world" (Downey, *History of Antioch*, 93; cf. Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, 182–83). Zeus and Apollo were strongly tied to Antioch and Daphne; they played key roles in the foundation myths of these cities, had various temples and sanctuaries dedicated to them, and appeared on Antiochene coinage and statues (see Downey, *History of Antioch*, 67–68, 75–77, 82–86; Sarolta A. Takács, "Pagan Cults at Antioch," in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City* [ed. Christine Kondoleon; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000], 198). A third deity prominently associated with Antioch, with temples, statues, and coins of her own, was the goddess Tyche (Downey, *History of Antioch*, 73–76; Takács, "Pagan Cults at Antioch," 198). That cult and commerce associated with Tyche thrived in Antioch is evidenced by a number coins minted at Antioch featuring Tyche (see Elderkin et al., *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, 4:13; Downey, *History of Antioch*, 73 n. 88, 75 n. 93; Edward T. Newell, *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch* [New York: American Numismatic Society, 1918; repr., Chicago: OBOL International, 1978], 34–38; Takács, "Pagan Cults at Antioch," 198; Warwick Wroth, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria* [A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum; Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964], 166 [nos. 131–32], 167 [no. 137], 168 [nos. 140, 144, 146], 169 [nos. 147–49], 222, 225, 226, 229, 231, 232).

understood by audiences who had little or no connection to the first-century Judean context of the pericope.[602]

4.10 Temples as Economic Institutions and Physical Places

This survey of the temple commerce of the Artemision in Ephesus, the Serapeum in Alexandria, and the temple of Jupitor Capitolinus in Antioch has confirmed that economic identity and importance was not unique to the Jerusalem temple. Ancient readers encountering John 2:13–22 who had little or no knowledge of the particulars of Jewish temple worship could still grasp the import of John's temple scene. John constructs the scene so that Jesus' authority is demonstrated by his disruption of the Jerusalem temple's commerce, which resonated with the commerce of major temples across the Roman world.

One implication of this survey is that it reveals that the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 does not change the fact that for readers of John's Gospel in antiquity, temples were real places that made significant religious, social, cultural, political, and economic contributions to the cities in which they stood. In the case of major temples like those in Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch, their sphere of economic influence extended well beyond the city limits. Just as John could not expect his Jewish readers to view 2:13–22 as a claim for the temple's replacement with Jesus' body, neither could he expect this from his non-Jewish readers. This is

---

[602] For example, that the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was left incomplete by Antiochus IV provides one point of interference between the Antioch context and John 2:20, where the Jews refer to the fact that large temples in the ancient world were never really finished.

not the point of this narrative. For readers in Jerusalem and for readers beyond Jerusalem, the social, religious, economic, and political impact of temples was well known. Even after 70, audiences in places across Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria where John's Gospel was read would more readily see 2:13–22 as a passage that engages temple commerce to make the claim for Jesus' authority than as a pericope that portrays Jesus' body as the replacement of the Jerusalem temple.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Engaging Economics for Interpreting the Gospel of John

This study began with the thesis that attention to the Gospel of John with a focus on its economic context would make a significant contribution for its interpretation. Chapter 1 showed that foregrounding the Gospel's economic context rarely takes place in New Testament scholarship and proposed John 2:13–22 as an appropriate test case for determining whether doing so constitutes a worthwhile endeavor for the exegesis of the Gospel.

To this end, chapter 2 supplied an in-depth examination of the commerce of the Jerusalem temple, focusing on those particular aspects of temple commerce that appear in 2:13–22. This investigation of the economic impact of pilgrimage to the Jerusalem temple, of the temple's sacrificial animal trade, of money changing in the temple, of the temple's status as a source and center of commerce, and of the economic impact of temple construction illustrated that just as much as it was the center of Jewish worship, the Jerusalem temple was the economic engine of Judea.

Chapter 3 brought the results of the investigation of chapter 2 to bear on the interpretation of 2:13–22. Foregrounding the sacred economy of the Jerusalem temple in this exegesis showed the passage functions as a narrative demonstration of Jesus' authority as God's Son. The economic context helps more clearly show the progression of Jesus' characterization in the pericope from pilgrim, to hyper-pilgrim, to zealous Son. Jesus' temple piety surpasses that of all other pilgrims to the temple and even of the temple's leadership, taking control of the very mechanisms through

which Passover was celebrated. Both halves of the passage work together to reveal that Jesus' authority to act as he does in the temple comes from his identity as Son in his Father's house and that this authority is confirmed by Jesus' death and resurrection.

The exegesis in chapter 3 showed how difficult it would have been for John's Jewish readers to read 2:13–22 as an argument for the temple's replacement by Jesus' body. The temple was a real place, a complex multifaceted institution that does not function exclusively as a theological symbol. Chapter 4 illustrated that this would have been true for John's readers in non-Jewish contexts as well. For readers in Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch, all places where John's Gospel was read by the middle of the second century, temples were economic institutions vital to the economy of their cities and surrounding regions.

This was especially true in the case of grand temples on a par with the Jerusalem temple. Like the Jerusalem temple, the Artemision in Ephesus, the Serapeum in Alexandria, and the temple of Jupitor Capitolinus in Antioch were multifaceted institutions that contributed to the religious, social, cultural, and economic fabric of these cities and their environs. Readers in these cities were apt to interpret John's temple scene as a demonstration of Jesus' authority. The communicability of John's temple scene across geographic and religio-cultural borders is successful precisely because of the passage's focus on the economic context of temple worship.

In chapter 1, I stated that studying 2:13–22 in light of its economic context would (a) provide a more cohesive interpretation of the passage; (b) demonstrate that reading John engaged with ancient economic factors is a fruitful undertaking for the exegesis of the Gospel; and (c) have ramifications for understanding other parts of John's Gospel. Each of these aims was met over the course this project.

5.2 The Cohesiveness of John's Temple Scene

Though its history of interpretation is marked by replacement readings, turning to the economic background of 2:13–22 reveals the passage to be a tautly composed narrative wherein both halves of the passage are directed toward the same ends: communicating Jesus' authority. By focusing on Jesus' temple logion in 2:19 and the narrator's interpretation of it in 2:21, replacement readings hold that the scene functions as John's narrative claim for the replacement or fulfillment of the Jerusalem temple by Jesus' body. But these readings explain Jesus' actions in the first half of the pericope in ways difficult to reconcile with the zeal for the temple that the text ascribes to Jesus in 2:17. Why would John view the temple as worthy of zeal in 2:17, but in need of replacement in 2:21?

Chapter 1 showed how the economic details in first half of the passage unique to John's version of the temple scene—details like the selling being the focus of Jesus' temple act, Jesus' pouring out the moneychangers, Jesus' saying in 2:16, and the passage's unique commerce-related vocabulary—invite readers to interpret Jesus' actions in the temple in light of temple commerce in first-century Judea (explored in chapter 2). When one does, the zealous nature of Jesus' actions in the temple

becomes more apparent. Clarity about the nature of Jesus' zeal for the temple makes the temple as a real place more, not less, important in John.

The exegesis in chapter 3 supplied a reading from this perspective. John 2:13–22 begins with Jesus expressing his temple piety by making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for Passover. Like the thousands of pilgrims who went to Jerusalem for its pilgrimage feasts, Jesus participates in a major religious, social, and economic phenomenon of Jewish cultic life. The signs of commerce he finds in the temple is what any pilgrim would expect to find. John uses the expectations established in the opening verses of this pericope to then develop how Jesus' devotion to the temple exceeds that of all other pilgrims. Jesus' piety leads him to disrupt common temple-economic practices that were convenient for both pilgrims and the temple's priestly authorities, and beneficial to the economy of Jerusalem and Judea. He removes the sheep and cattle whose presence in the temple would violate the temple's sanctity, disrupts the sale of doves and the money changing, and commands that the temple should cease being a house of commerce. For him, the temple's sanctity trumps all other conveniences and benefits related to the economic components of temple worship.

The text makes no indication that his disciples (fellow pilgrims) and the Jews (religious authorities) who witness Jesus' actions see them as an attack on the temple, a fact difficult to account for if one understands the rhetoric of the passage as arguing for the replacement or supersession of the temple. The disciples see Jesus' actions as a demonstration of Jesus' zeal for the temple and the Jews see them as a

claim that he has the authority to challenge how business is conducted in the temple. This explains why the presenting issue in the second half of the pericope is whether or not Jesus has the authority to dictate what can and cannot take place in the temple. The narration resolves the question of Jesus' authority by explicitly affirming Jesus' death and resurrection as the sign validating his authority as Son in his Father's house. Reading Jesus' actions in light of temple commerce in first-century Judea makes clear that the whole passage centers on Jesus' authority. His actions in the first half make a claim for it, and everything that follows is structured to show the reader this claim is valid.

Another look at the structure of 2:13–22 shows how its interaction with temple commerce reinforces the unity of the passage:

- 2:13: Introduces the Passover setting, presenting Jesus as a temple pilgrim
    - 2:14–17: Jesus sees commerce in the temple and disrupts it, demonstrating a zeal for the temple that stems from his authority as Son in his Father's house
        - 2:14: Jesus finds commerce in the temple, as any temple pilgrim would
        - 2:15–16a: By removing the sheep and cattle from temple grounds but only temporarily disrupting the dove-selling and money changing, Jesus disrupts the commerce he finds in the temple in a manner that demonstrates an extreme passion for the sanctity of the temple space and sets him apart from all other temple pilgrims
        - 2:16b: The first temple saying reveals Jesus' passion for the temple's sanctity stems from his identity as Son in his Father's house
        - 2:17: the disciples remember a Ps 69:9, a verse of Scripture that shows they understand Jesus' disruption of temple commerce as an act of zeal
    - 2:18–22: the question of Jesus' authority to disrupt commerce in the temple

- 2:18: The Jews ask Jesus for a sign of his authority to disrupt commerce in the temple, indicating they understand Jesus' temple act in the first half as a demonstration of authority
- 2:19: The second temple saying claims Jesus can rebuild the temple in three days, a bold assertion of Jesus' authority as temple builder in light of the massive scale of temple construction and its prolonged nature
- 2:20: the Jews question Jesus' proclaimed authority to build the temple
- 2:21–22: the narrator states Jesus was talking about the resurrection of his body from death, a sign that so conclusively confirms his authority to speak and act for God in the temple, it causes the disciples to believe in Jesus' words as they do in Scripture

The context of temple commerce presents Jesus' temple act in the passage's first half as a demonstration of authority. Stopping commerce in the temple sets Jesus apart from all other pilgrims who benefited from the commerce taking place in the temple. By the end of the first half, the text makes clear that Jesus is no mere pilgrim, but God's zealous Son, revealing the source of Jesus' actions in the temple. The background of temple construction in the second half of the passage provides the context by which Jesus continues to assert his authority in the temple in a manner that reinforces the distinction the narration makes between the Jerusalem temple and Jesus' body. By the end of the second half, the text makes clear that the ultimate source of Jesus' authority is his resurrection. The economic context of the scene informs how both halves of the passage work in a unified fashion to present a narrative demonstration of Jesus' authority at the start of his public ministry in John.

5.3 Reading John in Light of its Economic Context as a Fruitful Undertaking for Exegesis of the Fourth Gospel

This study has demonstrated that reading John 2:13–22 in light of its economic context produces a reading of the passage that integrates the actions in the passage's first half with the debate over Jesus' authority in the second half. In addition to illustrating the cohesiveness of this passage, reading John in light of its economic context generates an interpretation of this passage that makes better sense of real life in antiquity than replacement readings that reduce the temple to its theological significance. The theological significance of the temple is undeniable, but for ancient audiences the temple was more than a theological symbol. It was a full-fledged institution that influenced many arenas of life and society in first-century Jerusalem.

Its economic impact was dramatic, as chapter 2 showed. Pilgrims came in droves to worship at the temple, especially during its pilgrimage feasts, which sustained the economy of Jerusalem. This was especially the case for Passover. Not only did this festival attract the most pilgrims, but also religious obligations associated with this feast required the spending of money within the city limits of Jerusalem.

Temple merchants like the sellers of sacrificial animals and moneychangers thrived on the business provided by this pilgrimage activity. The sacrificial animal industry depended on the temple, especially that sacrificial bird industry, since birds were sacrificed by the majority of pilgrims, and the sheep industry, since lambs were sacrificed daily in the temple and were a rather costly sacrifice required of Passover pilgrims. Moneychangers could expect a boost in their income as they helped

facilitate the purchase of sacrificial animals and the payment of the temple tax by these pilgrims.

This increased economic activity during its pilgrimage feasts, in addition to its year-round expenses, established the temple as a major source and center of commerce, with enough funds in its treasury to pay for its extensive liturgical needs and even to aid the city in times of trouble. The temple's ongoing construction and maintenance also made it an essential contributor to the Jerusalem economy, as it led to the purchasing of many and expensive materials and the hiring of thousands of laborers over an extended period of time.

As the survey of the temple's sacred economy in chapter 2 illustrated, the temple was not an easily replaceable institution, given the complexity of the temple's economic significance (not to mention its social and political significance). As plausible as replacement readings of 2:13–22 might appear today, such readings would be much more difficult for ancient audiences to accept, and it is attention to the economic context of this passage that allows us to appreciate this difficulty. Reading John 2:13–22 in light of its economic background is fruitful for reconstructing the context within which this passage was originally written and read, and guards against anachronistic interpretations more amenable to readers who never experienced the temple as such an economic powerhouse.

Of course, the temple was destroyed in 70, so that at the time the Gospel was written, it was no longer an economic presence in Jerusalem. But the void left by the temple's absence was not one that could be quickly and smoothly filled by

anything other than a rebuilt temple. It took over a century for rabbinic Judaism to articulate a vision of Judaism that could survive well after the temple's destruction (the Mishnah was codified in ca. 200–220). Moreover, chapter 4 showed that accepting the passage as an argument for the temple's replacement by Jesus' body would have been an unlikely interpretative move for John's audiences outside of Judea to make, even well after 70. For ancient readers across the Roman Empire, major temples were complex institutions that influenced city life on a number of levels. Examining the temple commerce of the Artemision in Ephesus, the Serapeum in Alexandria, and the temple of Jupitor Capitolinus in Antioch showed that the communicability of John's temple scene hinges on the reality of ancient temples as economic institutions. The pericope can make its central claim of Jesus' authority precisely because of its focus on temple commerce, which provides the verisimilitude between the Jerusalem temple and other great temples in the ancient world, including those cities that were the likely provenance of the Gospel. Like the Jerusalem temple, major temples in places where John's Gospel was read attracted pilgrims and tourists, maintained a steady demand for animal sacrifices, required the work of moneychangers to facilitate temple commerce, were sources and centers of commerce with considerable funds in their treasuries, and were in constant need of construction, maintenance, expansion, and repair.

Delving into these economic realities for the interpretation of John 2:13–22 allows us to read the passage more akin to how ancient readers would have read it, that is, as a narrative demonstration of Jesus' authority without the attendant claim

that Jesus' body to replaces the temple. Looking at the Gospel's economic context is both necessary and beneficial for a more complete exegesis of John, as this one test case has shown.

5.4 Implications of Reading John 2:13–22 in Light of Temple Commerce for Understanding the Gospel as a Whole

John's Gospel "is without question the most Temple-centered of the canonical Gospels."[603] A clear understanding of how the temple functions in John is essential for its interpretation, and 2:13–22 is a key passage in this regard. This dissertation has demonstrated that no exegesis of John 2:13–22 is complete without accounting for the economic realities that it presumes and incorporates into the text. Any exegesis that neglects the economic identity of the Jerusalem temple risks reading the passage in ways that John and his ancient readers—all of whom experienced temples as both religious and economic institutions—would have found impossible.

Examining the temple's complex economic identity in the first century suggests the importance of interpreting John's use of the temple within the narrative and theological framework of the Gospel as a whole. If in this one key passage John does not reduce the temple to a theological symbol that can be smoothly replaced in the wake of its absence, then John's narrative use of the temple throughout the Gospel is more sophisticated and dynamic than replacement readings suggest. As

[603] Kinzer, "Temple Christology," 447.

chapter 3 showed, the temple in John is not replaced by Jesus, but is a pivotal space that illumines Jesus' authority, character, and identity in the Gospel.

For example, after the events of 2:13–22 Jesus teaches openly and with freedom in the temple.[604] In John 8:20 Jesus teaches from the temple treasury. Only the priest-treasurers and Roman procurators had access to the temple treasury, and the treasury storerooms were constructed in a manner that restricted entry, but this passing comment assumes Jesus can be in the treasury without fear of arrest.[605] Just as 2:13–22 reveals that Jesus has the authority to determine temple activity while he is there, 8:20 reveals that Jesus has the authority to enter any room in his Father's house. Reminiscent of his words in 2:16, Jesus' teaching in 8:12–20 concerns, among other things, his filial relationship to the Jewish God, reaffirming that his authority to speak and act openly in the temple stems from his identity as God's Son. The motif of Jesus' ability to speak and act openly in the temple is expressed by Jesus explicitly in 18:20, where he says, "I have spoken openly to the world; I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come together. I have said nothing in secret."

John 2:13–22 marks the first moment in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus displays his authority to speak and act for God openly in the temple. Replacement readings

---

[604] Lieu has shown the temple in John to be a space where Jesus reveals himself publicly ("Temple and Synagogue," 51–69).

[605] "He spoke these words while he was teaching in the treasury (γαζοφυλάκιον) of the temple, but no one arrested him, because his hour had not yet come" (8:20).

view 2:13–22 as providing the hermeneutical key for understanding the temple in John as being superseded by Jesus, but this misreads its hermeneutical significance. The hermeneutical key lies in the revelation of Jesus' authority as Son in his Father's house to teach and act openly as he does in the temple.

It is because this authority is presented at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, in Jesus' first trip to the temple, that the later verse 8:20 can make any sense. The zeal he demonstrates for the temple in 2:13–22 also explains Jesus' many trips to the temple in John, which is a distinctive feature of the Fourth Gospel. If John sees the temple as replaceable, then why have Jesus go to it regularly? Why omit the early Jesus traditions, such as those found in the Synoptic Gospels, that place the temple under judgment? Why designate the temple as a space where Jesus speaks and teaches openly to the world, which 18:20 explicitly reveals to be an intentional feature of John's Gospel? In 18:19 the high priest Annas questions Jesus after his arrest about his disciples and teaching, to which Jesus responds in 18:20 by saying the temple is a space where he has taught openly to the world. John 2:13–22—which shows Jesus acting and speaking authoritatively in the temple, pronouncing that his authority comes from his filial relationship to God, and pointing to his resurrection as confirmation of his authority—first establishes the temple as a space in John's narrative wherein Jesus displays an authority to speak and act for God greater than the authority held even by the high priest.

Reading John 2:13–22 against its economic background shows this to be the scene where Jesus' authority to teach and act in the temple as he does is established.

This allows for a proper understanding of Jesus' relationship to the temple in the rest of the Gospel without succumbing to the exegetical pitfall of reading the temple in John under the influence of how the temple functions in the Synoptics. In John the temple is the house of Jesus' Father, in which Jesus can teach and be openly. It stands worthy of zealous devotion, not replaceable by another temple "not made with hands" (Mark 14:58).

In conclusion, engaging economics has untapped possibilities for the interpretation of the Gospel of John. Just as knowledge of its economic identity affects our understanding the Gospel's narrative use of the temple, then it seems likely that knowledge of beggary in the ancient world would add to our understanding of those passages featuring beggars in John 5 and 9; the economics of food in antiquity to our understanding of the bread of life discourse in John 6; the economics of shepherding to our understanding of the good shepherd discourse in John 10. These are just a few examples. Scholarly attention to economic matters has the potential to provide new avenues for examining the Fourth Gospel and situating it more concretely in its ancient context, and should be carried out more often and more systematically than it traditionally has been. This dissertation has shown that engaging economics merits a more prominent place in the scholarly study of this important and influential Gospel.

Bibliography

Aberbach, Moshe. *Labor, Crafts and Commerce in Ancient Israel*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1994.

Abrahams, Israel. *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. First and second series. Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav, 1967.

Ådna, Jostein. *Jerusalemer Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins 25. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1999.

Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Alston, Richard. "Trade and the city in Roman Egypt." Pages 168–202 in *Trade, Traders, and the Ancient City*. Edited by Helen Parkins and Christopher Smith. London: Routledge, 1998.

Anderson, Paul N. *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus: Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. Library of New Testament Studies 321. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

———, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 44. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

———, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel.* Society of Biblical Literature Early Christianity and Its Literature 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

Applebaum, S. "Economic Life in Palestine." Pages 631–700 in vol. 2 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Ariel, Donald T. "A Survey of Coin Finds in Jerusalem (Until the End of the Byzantine Period)." *Liber annuus Studii biblici franciscani* 32 (1982): 273–326.

Arnold, Irene Ringwood. "Festivals of Ephesus." *American Journal of Archaeology* 76 (1972): 17–22.

Augustine. *Tractates on the Gospel of John, 1–10*. Translated by John W. Rettig. Fathers of the Church 78. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988.

Avi-Yonah, M. "Archaeological Sources." Pages 46–62 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

———. "Historical Geography of Palestine." Pages 78–116 in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by Safrai, S., and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Bahat, Dan. "The Herodian Temple." Pages 38–58 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism, Volume 3: The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–1993.

Barker, Margaret. *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

Bauckham, Richard. "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple." Pages 72–89 in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1988.

Bauer, Johannes Baptist. "Drei Tage." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 354–58.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the*

Dwelling Place of God. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 2004.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.

Bernard, J. H. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928.

Betlyon, John W. "Coinage." Pages 1076–1089 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Bevan, E. R. "A Note on Antiochos Epiphanes." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 20 (1900): 26–30.

Bickerman, E. J. "Héliodore au Temple de Jérusalem." Pages 159–91 in vol. 2 of *Studies of Jewish and Christian History*. 2 vols. New ed. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bieringer, R., D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds. *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001

———. "Wrestling with Johannine Anti-Judaism: A Hermeneutical Framework for the Analysis of the Current Debate." Pages 3–37 in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Revised and translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bokser, Baruch M. "Unleavened Bread and Passover, Feasts of." Pages 761–65 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Bonino, José Míguez, and Néstor Oscar Míguez. *That You May Have Life: Encounters with Jesus in the Gospel of John*. New York: The General Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church, 1991.

Brenton, C. L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986.

Brooten, Bernadette, J. "The Jews of Ancient Antioch." Pages 29–37 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Broshi, Magen. "Estimating the Population of Ancient Jerusalem." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 4, no. 2 (June 1978): 10–15.

———. "Methodology of Population Estimates: The Roman-Byzantine Period as a Case Study." Pages 420–25 in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June – July 1990*. Edited by Avraham Biran, Joseph Aviram, and Alan Paris-Shadur. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993.

———. "The Role of the Temple in the Herodian Economy." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987): 31–37.

Broughton, T. R. S. "Roman Asia Minor." Pages 499–918 in vol. 4 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Edited by T. Frank et al. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938.

Brown, Michael Joseph. *The Lord's Prayer Through North African Eyes: A Window into Early Christianity*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 29–29A. New York: Doubleday, 1966–1970.

Brown, Raymond E., and John P. Meier. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. New York: Paulist, 1983.

Buford, A. M. "The Economics of Greek Temple Building." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 191 (1965): 21–34.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Burkert, Walter. "Greek Temple-builders: Who, Where and Why?" Pages 21–29 in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992*. Edited by Robin Hägg; Stockholm:

Paul Åströms, 1996.

———. "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece." Pages 27–47 in *Temple in Society*. Edited by Michael V. Fox. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1988.

Burnett, Andrew, Michel Amandry, and Pere Pau Ripollès. *Roman Provincial Coinage*. 2 vols. London: British Museum Press, 1992.

Busink, Th. A. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem, von Salomo bis Herodes: Eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus*. 2 vols. Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970–1980.

Carroll, R. P. "So What Do We *Know* about the Temple? The Temple in the Prophets." Pages 34–51 in *Temple and Community in the Persian Period*. Edited by T. C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards. Vol. 2 of *Second Temple Studies*. Edited by Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 175. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Carter, Warren. *John and Empire: Initial Explorations*. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

———. *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2001.

———. *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*. The Bible & Liberation Series. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2000.

Cassidy, Richard J. *John's Gospel in New Perspective: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1992.

Chanikuzhy, Jacob. *Jesus, the Eschatological Temple: An Exegetical Study of Jn 2,13–22 in the Light of the Pre-70 C.E. Eschatological Temple Hopes and the Synoptic Temple Action*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Chilton, Bruce. "[ὡς] φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων (John 2:15)." Pages 330–44 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Chwolson, D. *Das letzte passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes nach den in Übereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangelium Johannis*. St. Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des sciences, 1892.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Jesus' Action in Herod's Temple." Pages 45–61 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy: Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Coloe, Mary L. *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007.

———. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001.

———. Review of Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective*. *Review of Biblical Literature* (2006). No pages. Cited 22 June 2011. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5000_5266.pdf.

———. Review of Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. *Review of Biblical Literature* (2008). No pages. Cited 29 August 2011. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/6241_6701.pdf.

Comblin, José. *Sent from the Father: Meditations on the Fourth Gospel*. Translated by Carl Kabat. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1979.

Congar, Yves. *The Mystery of the Temple: The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*. Translated by W. Roberts. London: Burns & Oates, 1962.

Crossan, John Dominic, and Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus's Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2004.

Croy, N. Clayton. Review of Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009): 899–900.

———. "The Messianic Whippersnapper: Did Jesus Use a Whip on People in the Temple (John 2:15)?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 (2009): 555–68.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

———. *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend*. Studies on the Personalities of the New Testament. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

Daise, Michael A. *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' 'Hour' in the Fourth Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah*. Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Davies, John K. "Rebuilding a Temple: The Economic Effects of Piety." Pages 209–29 in *Economies Beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*. Edited by David J. Mattingly and John Salmon. London: Routledge, 2001.

Demetriou, Denise. "What is an Emporion? A Reassessment." *Historia* 60 (2011): 255–72.

Dignas, Beate. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Dillon, Matthew. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses 31–36*. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Dodd, C. H. "A Hidden Parable in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 30–40 in *More New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.

———. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

———. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.

———. "Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch (Oration XI): Translated with Introduction and Commentary." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical*

Society 103 (1959): 652–88.

Dubarle, André Marie. "Le signe du temple (Jo. II, 19)." *Revue biblique* 48 (1939): 21–44.

Elderkin, G. W., Richard Stillwell, Frederick O. Waagé, Dorothy B. Waagé, and Jean Lassus. *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*. Publications of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity. 5 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934–1972.

Elliot, John H. *A Home for the Homeless: A Social-Scientific Criticism of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. With a new introduction. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Elliot, Neil. *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1994.

———. *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Elowsky, Joel C. *John 1–10*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament 4a. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2006.

Elsner, Jas′ and Ian Rutherford, eds. *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Epstein, Victor. "The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 55 (1964): 42–58.

Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005.

Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake and J. E. L. Oulton. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–1932.

Feldman, Louis H., and Meyer Reinhold, eds. *Jewish Life and Thought among Greeks and Romans: Primary Readings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

Finnestad, Ragnhild Bjerre. "Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts." Pages 185–237 in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*. Edited by Byron E. Shafer. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Frankfurter, David, ed. *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 134. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Frey, P. Jean-Baptiste. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum: Recueil des Inscriptions Juives qui vont du III^e Siècle Avant Jésus-Christ au VII^e Siècle de Notre Ère: Vol. II: Asie – Afrique.* Sussidi Allo Studio Delle Antichità Cristiane 3. Roma: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1952.

Frühwald-König, Johannes. *Tempel und Kult: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Johannesevangeliums*. Biblische Untersuchungen 27. Regensburg: Pustet, 1998.

Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald. *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 119. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Gabba, Emilio. "The Finances of King Herod." Pages 160–68 in *Greece and Rome in Eretz-Israel: Collected Essays*. Edited by A. Kasher, U. Rappaport, and G. Fuks. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1990.

———. "The Social, Economic and Political History of Palestine, 63 BCE–CE 70." Pages 94–167 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism, Volume 3: The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Goodman, Martin. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome, A.D. 66–70*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Grant, Frederick C. *The Economic Background of the Gospels*. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1926.

———. "The Economic Significance of Messianism." *Anglican Theological Review* 6 (1923): 196–213.

———. "The Economic Significance of Messianism." *Anglican Theological Review* 7 (1924): 281–289.

———. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. The Haskell Lectures 1940. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

Haas, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Ancient Society and History. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Haas, N. "Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv'at ha-Mivtar." *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970): 38–59.

Haenchen, Ernst. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Edited by Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse. Translated by Robert W. Funk. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Robin Hägg, ed. *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms, 1996.

Handler, Susan. "Architecture on the Roman Coins of Alexandria." *American Journal of Archaeology* 75 (1971): 57–74.

Hann, Robert R. "Antioch: Charisma and Conflict in the First Century." *Journal of Religious History* 14 (1987): 341–60.

Hanson, K. C., and Douglas E. Oakman. *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985.

Harl, Kenneth W. *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Harris, W. V. and Giovanni Ruffini, eds. *Ancient Alexandria Between Egypt and Greece*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 26. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Hayward, C. T. R., ed. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Head, Barclay V. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia*. Edited by Reginald Stuart Poole. Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. Bologna:

Arnaldo Forni, 1964.

Heichelheim, F. M. “Roman Syria.” Pages 121–257 in vol. 4 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Edited by T. Frank et al. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938.

Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1989.

Herzog, Frederick. *Liberation Theology: Liberation in the Light of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Seabury, 1972.

Hesychius of Alexandria. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Rev. and updated by Kurt Latte. 2 vols. Hauniae: Ejnar Munksgaard/Copenhagen: Commission for the Corpus Lexicographorum Graecorum, 1953–1966.

Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hinge, George, and Jens A. Krasilnikoff, eds. *Alexandria: A Cultural and Religious Melting Pot*. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 9; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2009.

Horbury, William. “The Temple Tax.” Pages 265–86 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Edited by Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Horsley, G. H. R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Linguistic Essays*. With cumulative indexes to vols. 1–5 newly prepared by S. P. Swinn. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 5. Macquarie University, N. S. W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1989.

———. “The Silversmiths at Ephesos.” Pages 7–10 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979* Edited by G. H. R. Horsley. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 4. Macquarie University, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1987.

Horsley, Richard A. *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.

———. *Hearing the Whole Gospel: The Politics of Plot in Mark’s Gospel*. Louisville:

Westminster John Knox, 2001.

———. *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

———, ed. *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

———, ed. *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2004.

Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Paternoster, 2006.

Hoskyns, E. C. "Adversaria Exegetica: The Old and New Worship of God (John II. 13–22)." *Theology* 1 (1920): 143–148.

———. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. 2nd ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1947.

Hosni, Yousrya Abdel-Aziz. *Alexandria: Historical and Archaeological Guide*. Cairo: The Supreme Council of Antiquities, 2009.

Howard-Brook, Wes. *Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship*. The Bible & Liberation Series. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1994.

Isaac, Benjamin. "A Donation for Herod's Temple in Jerusalem." *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983): 86–92.

Isager, Signe. "Sacred Animals in Classical and Hellenistic Greece." Pages 15–19 in *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990*. Edited by Tullia Linders and Brita Alroth. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21; Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992.

Jameson, Michael H. "Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece." Pages 87–119 in *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*. Edited by C. R. Whittaker. Supplementary Volume 14. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1988.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Die Einwohnerzahl Jerusalems zur Zeit Jesu," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina–Vereins* 66 (1943): 24–31. Repr., pages 335–41 in *Abba.*

Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

———. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period*. Translated by F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

John Chrysostom. *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist, Homilies 1–47*. Translated by Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin, S.C.H. Fathers of the Church 33. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1957.

Johnson, Allan Chester. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. Vol. 2 of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Edited by T. Frank et al. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936.

Johnston, Sarah Iles, ed. *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*. Harvard University Press Reference Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

Jones, C. P. "A Deed of Foundation From the Territory of Ephesos." *Journal of Roman Studies* 73 (1983): 116–25.

Jonge, M. de. "The New Testament." Pages 37–43 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Jördens, A. "Sozialstrukturen im Arbeitstierhandel des kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten." *Tyche* 10 (1995): 49–52.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Kahl, Brigitte. *Galatians Re-imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.

Kaizer, Ted. *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*. Oriens et Occidens 4. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002.

Karris, Robert J. *Jesus and the Marginalized in John's Gospel*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Keil, Joseph. *Ephesos: ein Führer durch die Ruinenstätte und ihre Geschichte*. 5th ed. Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut. Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1964.

Kerkeslager, Allen. "Jewish Pilgrimage and Jewish Identity in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt." Pages 99–225 in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*. Edited by David Frankfurter. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 134. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 220. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

Kim, Seon-Jeong. "The Johannine Jesus and Its Socio-political Context." *Yonsei Review of Theology and Culture* 6 (2001): 209–21.

Kinzer, Mark. "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John." Pages 447–64 in volume 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998*. 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromily. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Klose, Dietrich O. A. "Festivals and Games in the Cities of the East during the Roman Empire." Pages 125–33 in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*. Edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, Andrew Burnett; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Knibbe, Dieter. "Via Sacra Ephesiaca: New Aspects of the Cult of Artemis Ephesia." Pages 141–55 in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Harvard Theological Studies 41. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Knust, Jennifer Wright, and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, eds. *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Koester, Craig. "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 327–48.

———. "The Savior of the World (John 4:42)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 665–80.

Koester, Helmut, ed. *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to*

Its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture. Harvard Theological Studies 41; Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Kondoleon, Christine. "The City of Antioch: An Introduction." Pages 3–11 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

———, ed. *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. "The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John's Christology." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 5 (1995): 87–103.

Kraeling, Carl Hermann. "The Jewish Community at Antioch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51 (1932): 130–60.

Kraybill, J. Nelson. *Imperial Cult and Commerce in John's Apocalypse*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 132. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Krencker, Daniel M., and Willy Zschietzschmann. *Römische Tempel in Syrien, nach Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen von Mitgliedern der Deutschen Baalbekexpedition 1901–1904, Otto Puchstein, Bruno Schulz, Daniel Krencker*. Denkmäler antiker Architectur 5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1938.

Kysar, Robert. *John*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986.

Labahn, Michael. " 'Heiland der Welt': Der gesandte Gottessohn und der römische Kaiser—ein Thema johanneischer Christologie?" Pages 147–73 in *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und römische Herrschaft*. Edited by Michael Labahn and J. Zangenberg. Tübingen: A. Franke, 2002.

Léon-Dufour, Xavier. "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean." *Recherches de science religieuse* 39 (1951–1952): 155–75.

Leroy, Herbert. *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannes-evangeliums*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 30. Bonn: Peter Hansteins Verlag, 1968.

Lewis, Naphtali. *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars, with a revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Liebeschutz, J. H. W. G. *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Lieu, Judith. "Temple and Synagogue in John." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 51–69.

Ligt, L. de. *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire: Economic and Social Aspects of Periodic Trade in a Pre-Industrial Society*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 11; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1993.

——— and P. W. de Neeve. "Ancient Periodic Markets: Festivals and Fairs." *Athenaeum* 66: 411–13.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

———. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972.

Linders, Tullia. "Sacred Finances: Some Observations." Pages 9–13 in *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990*. Edited by Tullia Linders and Brita Alroth. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21; Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992.

——— and Brita Alroth, eds. *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990*. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 21. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1992.

Ling, Timothy J. M. *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Longenecker, Bruce W., and Kelly D. Liebengood, eds. *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Lopez, Davina C. *Apostle to the Conquered: Reimagining Paul's Mission*. Paul in

Critical Contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

López Rosas, Ricardo. *La Señal del Templo, Jn 2,13-22: Redefinición Cristológica de lo Sacro*. Biblioteca Mexicana 12; Mexico: Departamento de Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de México, A.C., 2001.

Lyttelton, Margaret. "The Design and Planning of Temples and Sanctuaries in Asia Minor in the Roman Imperial Period." Pages 38–49 in *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*. Edited by Sarah Macready and F. H. Thompson. London: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1987.

Maas, Michael. "People and Identity in Roman Antioch." Pages 13–21 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1981.

Magie, David. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Malatesta, Edward. *St. John's Gospel, 1920–1965: A Cumulative and Classified Bibliography of Books and Periodical Literature on the Fourth Gospel*. Analecta biblica 32. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

Malina, Bruce J. Review of Timothy J. M. Ling, *The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel. Review of Biblical Literature* (2007). No pages. Cited 1 July 2010. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5587_5883.pdf.

Marchal, Joseph A. *The Politics of Heaven: Women, Gender, and Empire in the Study of Paul*. Paul in Critical Contexts. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Marshall, J. "Flaccus and the Jews of Asia (Cic. Pro Flacco 28.67–9)." *The Phoenix* 29 (1975): 139–54.

Mastin, B. A. "The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title θεός to Jesus (John XX.28)." *Studia evangelica* 6 (1973): 352–65.

Mattingly, David J. and John Salmon, eds. *Economies Beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*. London: Routledge, 2001.

McCaffrey, James. *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2–3*. Analecta biblica 114. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.

McHugh, John F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1–4*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

McInerney, Jeremy. *The Cattle of the Sun: Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McKenzie, J. S., S. Gibson, and A. T. Reyes. "Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archeological Evidence." *Journal of Roman Studies* 94 (2004): 73–121.

Meeks, Wayne A. and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study 13; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1978.

Menken, Maarten J. J. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Meshorer, Ya'akov. *Ancient Jewish Coinage*. 2 vols. Dix Hills, N.Y.: Amphora, 1982.

Metcalf, William E. "Antioch and Christianity." Pages 105–111 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

———. *The Cistophori of Hadrian*. Numismatic Studies 15. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1980.

Meyers, Carol. "Temple, Jerusalem." Pages 350–69 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Miller, J. Innes. *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire, 29 B.C. to A.D. 641*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Miranda, José Porfirio. *Being and the Messiah: The Message of St. John*. Translated by John Eagleson. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1977.

Mitteis, L., and U. Wilcken. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912.

Moloney, Francis J. "Reading John 2:13–22: The Purification of the Temple." *Revue biblique* 97 (1990): 432–52.

———. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina 4. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 40A. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Moore, Stephen D. " 'The Romans Will Come and Destroy Our Holy Place and Our Nation': Representing Empire in John." Pages 45–74 in *Empire and Apocalypse: Postcolonialism and the New Testament*. The Bible in the Modern World. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006.

Morenz, Siegfried. *Egyptian Religion*. Translated by Ann E. Keep. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Motyer, Stephen. "Jesus and the Marginalised in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 70–89 in *Mission and Meaning: Essays Presented to Peter Cotterell*. Edited by Antony Billington, Tony Lane, and Max Turner. Carlisle, United Kingdom: Paternoster, 1995.

Moulton, Harold Keeling. "*pantas* in John 2.15." *The Bible Translator* 18 (1967): 126–27.

Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *St. Paul's Ephesus: Texts and Archaeology*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2008.

Naveh, Joseph. "The Ossuary Inscriptions from Giv'at ha-Mivtar." *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970): 33–37.

Nereparampil, Lucius. *Destroy This Temple: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the*

Meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2:19. Bangalore: Dharmaram, 1978.

Netzer, Ehud. *The Architecture of Herod, the Great Builder*. With the assistance of Rachel Laureys-Chachy. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 117. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1988.

———, ed. *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew*. 6 vols. New York: Ktav, 1977–1986.

Newell, Edward T. *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch*. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1918. Repr., Chicago: OBOL International, 1978.

Nongbri, Brent. "The Use and Abuse of P^{52}." *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005): 23–48

Norris, Frederick W. "Antioch of Syria," Pages 265–69 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

O'Day, Gail R. "The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 491–865 in vol. 9 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.

Oakes, Peter. "Methodological Issues in Using Economic Evidence in Interpretation of Early Christian Texts." Pages 13–27 in *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.

Oakman, Douglas E. "BTB Readers Guide: The Ancient Economy in the Bible." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 21 (1991): 34–39.

Obermann, Andreas. *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Oren, Eliezer D. "Herodian Doves in the Light of Recent Archaeological

Discoveries." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 100 (1968): 56–61.

Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. 2 vols. Fathers of the Church 80. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989–1993.

Orlin, Eric M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Mnemosyne Supplements 164. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Osiek, Carolyn. *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

Oster, Jr., Richard E. *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus*. ATLA Bibliography Series 19; Philadelphia: American Theological Library Association; Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1987.

———. "Acts 19:23–41 and An Ephesian Inscription." *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984): 233–37.

———. "Ephesus." Pages 542–49 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

———. "Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I: Paganism before Constantine." *ANRW* 18.3:1706–11. Part 2, *Principat*, 18.3. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1990.

———. "Holy Days in Honour of Artemis." Pages 74–82 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979*. Edited by G. H. R. Horsley. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 4. Macquarie University, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1987.

Pastor, Jack. *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Pearson, Birger A. "Alexandria." Pages 152–57 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Perrin, Nicholas. *Jesus the Temple*. Grand Rapids: Backer Academic, 2010.

Petropoulou, Maria-Zoe. *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Greek Religion, Judaism, and Christianity, 100 BC–AD 200*. Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2008.

Philo. *On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws, Books 1–3*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Philo. *On the Embassy to Gaius. General Indexes*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Index by J. W. Earp. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Picard, Charles. *Éphèse et Claros: Recherches sur les sanctuaires et les cultes de l'Ionie du nord*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 123. Paris: de Boccard, 1922.

Piper, Ronald A. Review of Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*. *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 463–64.

Pliny. *Natural History, Volume IX: Books 33–35*. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Poole, Reginald Stuart. *Catalogue of the Coins of Alexandria and the Nomes*. Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964.

Rahner, Johanna. *„Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes": Jesus von Nazaret als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 117. Bodenheim, Germany: Philo, 1998.

Ramsay, W. M. *The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.

Rathbone, Dominic W. "Roman Egypt." Pages 698–719 in *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris, and Richard Saller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Rayan, Samuel. "Jesus and the Poor in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblebhashyam* 4 (1978): 213–28.

Reinhardt, W. "The Population Size of Jerusalem and the Numerical Growth of the Jerusalem Church." Pages 237–65 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian*

Setting. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Reinhartz, Adele. *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John*. New York: Continuum, 2001.

———. "The Johannine Community and its Jewish Neighbors: A Reappraisal." Pages 111–138 in *What is John? Volume II: Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Fernando F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Rensberger, David K. *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.

———. Review of Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 541–42.

———. "The Politics of John: The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 395–411.

Rhoads, David M. "Zealots." Pages 1043–1054 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992.

Richardson, Peter. *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Studies on the Personalities of the New Testament. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.

Richey, Lance Byron. *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 43. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.

Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.

———. *The Priority of John*. Edited by J. F. Coakley. Oak Park, Ill.: Meyer Stone Books, 1987.

Rogers, G. M. "Demetrios of Ephesos: Silversmith and Neopoios?" *Belleten* (1987): 877–82.

Rogers, Guy MacLean. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Rowe, Alan. *Discovery of the Famous Temple and Enclosure of Serapis at Alexandria*. With an Explanation of the Enigmatical Inscriptions on the Serapeum Plaques of Ptolemy IV by Étienne Drioton. Supplément aux *Annales du Service des Antiquités de L'Égypte* 2. Le Caire: Imprimerie de L'Institut Français D'Archéologie Orientale, 1946.

Rowe, Alan, and Rees, B. R. "A Contribution to the Archaeology of the Western Desert: IV: The Great Serapeum of Alexandra." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 39 (1956–1957): 485–520.

Roth, Cecil. "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah xiv 21." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 174–81.

Wroth, Warwick. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria*. Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964.

Safrai, S. "Early Testimonies in the New Testament of Laws and Practices Relating to Pilgrimage and Passover." Pages 41–51 in *Jesus' Last Week: Jerusalem Studies in the Synoptic Gospels—Volume One*. Edited by R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage, and Brian Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

———. "Hebrew and Aramaic Sources." Pages 1–18 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

———. "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period." Pages 12–21 of *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. O. Michel, S. Safrai, R. Le Déaut, M. de Jonge, J. van Goudoever. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.

———. "The Temple." Pages 865–907 in vol. 2 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Safrai, S., and M. Stern, eds. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Safrai, Ze'ev. *The Economy of Roman Palestine*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Salier, Bill. "Jesus, the Emperor, and the Gospel According to John." Pages 284–301 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Edited by John Lierman. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Salmon, John. "Temples the Measures of Men: Public Building in the Greek Economy." Pages 195–208 in *Economies Beyond Agriculture in the Classical World*. Edited by David J. Mattingly and John Salmon. London: Routledge, 2001.

Sanders, E. P. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM Press, 1990.

———. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

———. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.

Sauneron, Serge. *The Priests of Ancient Egypt*. Translated by David Lorton. New ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Scheidel, Walter, Ian Morris, and Richard Saller, eds. *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Scherrer, Peter. *Ephesus: The New Guide*. Translated by Lionel Bier and George M. Luxon. Authorized by Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut and Efes Müzesi Selçuk. Rev. ed. Instanbul: Ege Yayinian, 2000.

Schlier, Heinrich. "Jesus und Pilatus. — Nach dem Johannesevangelium." Pages 56–74 in *Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge*. 4th ed. Vienna: Herder, 1966.

———. "The State according to the New Testament." Pages 215–38 in *The Relevance of the New Testament*. Translated by W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

Schmidt, Andreas. "Zwei Anmerkungen zu P. Ryl. III 457." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 35 (1989): 11–12.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Translated by Kevin

Smyth. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1968–1982.

Schnelle, Udo. "Die Tempelreinigung und die Christologie des Johannesevangeliums." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 359–373.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black, and Martin Goodman. Translated by T. A. Burkill et al. 3 vols. Rev. English ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–1987.

Scott, Martin. *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 71. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1992.

Segovia, Fernando F. "Johannine Studies and the Geopolitical: Reflections upon Absence and Irruption." Pages 281–306 in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*. Edited by Tom Thatcher; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Shafer, Byron E., ed. *Temples of Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Sheppard, Beth. "The Rise of Rome: The Emergence of a New Mode for Exploring the Fourth Gospel." *American Theological Library Association Summary of Proceedings* 57 (2003): 175–187.

Sloyan, Gerard S. *What Are They Saying About John?* Rev. ed. New York: Paulist, 2006.

Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Smith, D. Moody. *John among the Gospels*. 2nd ed. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.

———. Review of John A. T. Robinson, *The Priority of John*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1989): 156–58.

Stambaugh, John E. *Sarapis Under the Early Ptolemies*. Etudes préliminaires aux

religions orientales dans l'empire romain 25; Leiden: Brill, 1972.

———. "The Functions of Roman Temples." *ANRW* 16.1:554–608. Part 2, *Principat*, 16.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1978.

Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch. *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*. Library of Early Christianity 2. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W., and Wolfgang Stegemann. *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*. Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Steinsapir, Ann Irvine. *Rural Sanctuaries in Roman Syria: The Creation of a Sacred Landscape*. BAR International Series 1431. Oxford: John and Erica Hedges Ltd., 2005.

Stern, M., ed. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984.

———. "Papyri." Pages 43–45 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

———. "The Greek and Latin Literary Sources." Pages 18–37 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern; 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

———. "The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty." Pages 216–307 in vol. 1 of *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. 2 vols. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1974–1976.

Stevens, Marty E. *Temple, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006.

Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 107. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Stillwell, Richard, ed. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1917–1932.

Strange, James F. "Late Hellenistic and Herodian Ossuary Tombs at French Hill, Jerusalem." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 219 (1975): 39–67.

Tacitus. *The Histories and The Annals.* Translated by C. H. Moore and J. Jackson. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Takács, Sarolta A. "Pagan Cults at Antioch." Pages 198–200 in *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Taylor, Nicholas H. Review of Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John. Review of Biblical Literature* (2008). No pages. Cited 29 August 2011. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/6241_6701.pdf.

Tamez, Elsa. *Struggles for Power in Early Christianity: A Study of the First Letter to Timothy*. Translated by Gloria Kinsler. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2007.

———. *The Scandalous Message of James: Faith Without Works is Dead*. Translated by John Eagleson. Rev. ed. New York: Crossroad, 2002.

Tkaczow, Barbara and Iwona Zych. *Topography of Ancient Alexandria: An Archaeological Map*. Travaux du Centre d'archéologie méditerranéenne de l'Académie polonaise de sciences 32. Warsaw: Zakład Archeologii Śródziemnomorskiej, Polskiej Akadmii Nauk, 1993.

Temporini, Hildegard, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Gesichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*, 16.1. New York: de Gruyter, 1978.

———. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Gesichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*, 17.4. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

———. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Gesichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*, 18.3. New York: de Gruyter, 1990.

Tenney, Frank et al., ed. *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. 6 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933–1940.

Thatcher, Tom. *Greater than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.

———, ed. *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Thomas, Christine. "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period." Pages 81–117 in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Harvard Theological Studies 41. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Tilborg, Sjef van. *Reading John in Ephesus*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 83. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Tondriau, J. "Souverains et souveraines Séleucides en divinités," *Le Muséon* 61 (1948): 171–81.

Um, Stephen T. *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel*. Library of New Testament Studies 312; London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Van Belle, Gilbert. *Johannine Bibliography, 1966–1985: A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 82. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988.

Van den Heever, Gerhard A. "Finding Data in Unexpected Places (or: From Text Linguistics to Socio-rhetoric). Towards a Socio-Rhetorical Reading of John's Gospel." *Neotestamentica* 32 (1999): 343–64.

Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997. Reprint of *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961. Translation of *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1958–1960.

Vitruvius. *The Architecture of Marcus Vitruvius Pollio*. Translated by Joseph Gwilt, London: Priestley and Weale, 1826.

Vrettos, Theodore. *Alexandria: City of the Western Mind*. New York: Free Press, 2001.

Vouga, François. *Le cadre historique et l'intention théologique de Jean*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.

Waddington, H. W. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*. Paris: F. Didot, 1870.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Wallace-Hadrill, D. S. *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Walker, Peter. *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Wankel, Hermann et al. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 11.1–17.4 Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1979–1984.

Wardle, Timothy. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 291. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Welles, C. Bradford. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

Wild, Robert A. "The Known Isis-Sarapis Sanctuaries from the Roman Period." *ANRW* 17.4:1739–1851. Part 2, *Principat*, 17.4. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

Williams, Margaret. "The Contribution Jewish Inscriptions to the Study of Judaism." Pages 75–93 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism, Volume 3: The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Winter, Frederick E. "Towards a Chronology of the Later Artemision at Ephesos."

American Journal of Archaeology 84 (1980): 241.

Xenophon of Ephesus. *The Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes*. Translated by Graham Anderson. Pages 125–69 in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Edited by B. P. Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Yadin, Yigael, and Joseph Naveh, eds. *The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions*. Vol. 1 of *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965: Final Reports*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989.

Zorilla, Hugo C. *La Fiesta de Liberación de los Oprimidos: Relectura de Jn. 7.1–10.21*. San José, Costa Rica: SEBILA, 1981.

———. "The Feast of Liberation of the Oppressed: A Rereading of John 7:1–10:21." *Mission Focus* 13 (1985): 21–24.