EJT (2018) 27:1, 18–30 0960–2720

Worshipping God in the Eschatological Age: The Contest over Jewish Sacred Space and Time in the Book of Acts

A.J. (Arco) den Heijer

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der vorliegende Artikel will darlegen, dass Gottesdienst und Anbetung in der Apostelgeschichte innerhalb eines jüdischen Musters von heiligem Raum und Zeit stattfinden. Innerhalb dieses Rahmens werden heilige Orte zu Schauplätzen der Auseinandersetzung zwischen der Jesus-Bewegung und der jüdischen herrschenden Gesellschaft; dies ist quasi eine Neuauflage des Konflikts zwischen den Propheten und dem Volk Israel, wie in Israels Schriften berichtet. Die „Häresie" des Nazareners erscheint in der Apostelgeschichte als eine prophetische Bewegung, welche das Volk Israel und die Nationen dazu aufruft, in die eschatologische Anbetung Gottes miteinzustimmen. Der Konflikt um den Tempel weist nicht nach vorne auf dessen Abschaffung zugunsten einer höheren Form von Hausgemeindegottesdienst, sondern auf dessen Zerstörung; letztere wird von Lukas als ein beklagenswerter Akt göttlichen Gerichts angesehen. Über die Zerstörung hinaus erwartet Lukas die Wiederherstellung aller Dinge als die letztendliche Erfüllung der Schriften Israels.

* * * * * * * *

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article vise à montrer que, dans le livre des Actes, le culte prend sa place à l'intérieur d'une matrice juive de l'espace et du temps sacrés. Dans ce cadre, les espaces sacrés deviennent des lieux de conflit entre le mouvement de Jésus et l'establishment juif, d'une manière qui reproduit le conflit entre les prophètes et le peuple d'Israël dont les Écritures d'Israël font état. L'hérésie nazaréenne se présente dans le livre des Actes comme un mouvement prophétique appelant le peuple d'Israël et les nations à se joindre au culte eschatologique rendu à Dieu. Le conflit au sujet du Temple ne pointe pas vers son abandon pour être remplacé par une forme supérieure de culte dans des Églises de maison, mais bien plutôt vers sa destruction que Luc considère comme un acte de jugement divin. Au-delà de cette destruction, Luc a l'espérance de la restauration de toutes choses constituant l'accomplissement ultime des Écritures d'Israël.

* * * * * * * *

SUMMARY

This article aims to show that worship in the Book of Acts takes place within a Jewish matrix of sacred space and time. Within this framework, sacred spaces become sites of contest between the Jesus movement and the Jewish establishment, in a re-enactment of the conflict between the prophets and the people of Israel recorded in Israel's Scriptures. The Nazarean *haeresis* appears in the book of Acts as a prophetic movement that calls the people of Israel and the nations to join in the eschatological worship of God. The conflict concerning the temple does not point forward to its abandonment in favour of a superior form of house church worship, but rather to its destruction, regarded by Luke as a lamentable act of divine judgement. Beyond its destruction, Luke expects the restoration of all things as the final fulfilment of Israel's Scriptures.

* * * * * * * *

1. Introduction[1]

In his recent book, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ'*, David Moessner has gathered the fruit of several decades of study of Luke–Acts, which, taken together, clearly demonstrate that the author of Luke–Acts was a Hellenistic historian familiar with the poetics and historiographical values of historians such as Polybius and Diodorus Siculus.[2] At the same time, Moessner shows Luke–Acts to be firmly rooted in the Jewish tradition of historiography, as it seeks to understand history as the unfolding of God's plan (*boulē*) and displays a rich intertextuality that highlights recurring patterns in the history of the people of Israel. These patterns point to the *telos* of history, its culmination in the eschatological age that has come through Jesus, the Messiah.

Following this perspective, this article examines the religious practices of the Jesus movement, the 'disciples' of the 'Nazarean school', or the *Christianoi*, Christ-adherents, as they are called in Acts,[3] within the Jewish matrix of sacred spaces and times in which they were practised.[4] It will be argued that these practices are interpreted by Luke, the probable author of Acts,[5] according to Jewish eschatological expectations. Although modern scholars have trawled the book of Acts for the 'origins' of early Christian worship and liturgy, and highlighted, for example, a movement from the temple to the house,[6] it will be shown here that Luke presents the Jesus movement as a Jewish movement that claimed the three central sacred spaces of Judaism for the Name of Christ: the temple, the synagogue and the domestic table. The Jesus movement prophetically called the people of Israel and the nations to join in the eschatological worship of God. This claim was contested, however, by other Jews and the ensuing conflict points forward to the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, the prediction of which in Luke 21 hovers as a dark cloud over the book of Acts. Thus, this paper suggests reading Acts from an eschatological, rather than aetiological, perspective.

2. Sacred time in Acts

The activities of the disciples in the book of Acts take place on a temporal axis that is structured according to the rhythms of Jewish religious life, as becomes clear when one examines the daily, weekly and annual rhythms that are recorded.

2.1 The daily rhythm

The first five chapters of Acts depict the apostles and disciples in Jerusalem as being continuously together, as becomes clear from the summary statements 2:46-47 and 5:42. They worshipped in the temple and broke bread in the houses, continuing the practice of Jesus and his disciples before his crucifixion.[7] Acts 2:46-47 describes their daily pattern in a chiastic sentence:

A And daily persisting with one accord in the temple,
B and breaking bread at home,
B' they took their food with gladness and simplicity of heart,
A' praising God (*ainountes ton theon*) and having the favour of all the people.[8]

In this chiasm, the outer lines (A and A') describe the public life of the disciples, which took place in the temple, and the inner lines (B and B') describe their domestic life around the meals. Hence, *ainountes ton theon* refers to public temple worship, as Jervell has rightly pointed out,[9] which took place at the prayer hours accompanying the daily morning and afternoon sacrifices: during the burning of incense following the whole offering, at dawn and around 3:00pm in the afternoon.[10]

That temple worship structured the daily rhythm of the apostles is confirmed in a number of texts. According to Acts 3:1, Peter and John go up to the temple at the hour of prayer, which is specified as the ninth hour (3:00pm). According to 5:21, the apostles enter the temple at dawn, the time of the morning sacrifice. Cornelius, the God-fearing centurion, prays at the ninth hour as well (10:3, 30). Perhaps, the 'serving (*leitourgountōn*) the Lord and fasting' of the prophets and teachers in Antioch also refers to regular prayer at fixed prayer times; in combination with 'the Lord' as object, *leitourgeō* evokes the Septuagint usage of this verb for temple worship.[11] Apostolic prayer is not confined to the hours of temple worship, though. Peter is recorded as praying at the sixth hour, at noon (10:9). Other sources do not cite this time as being a fixed time for prayer, so this probably indicates how Peter has devoted his life to prayer as one of the apostle's core tasks (alongside the ministry of the word, 6:4).[12]

Between and after the times of temple worship the disciples gathered in houses for meals. Meals in Palestine regularly took place at around 10-11am (breakfast, *ariston*) and in the late afternoon, after the afternoon prayer hour (supper, *deipnon*).[13]

Since the apostles are depicted as being together all day in Jerusalem, there is no reason why both these meals should not be involved when Luke mentions the breaking of bread and the partaking of food in Acts 2:46.

2.2 The weekly rhythm

Whereas the daily rhythm of the apostolic life is structured around the temple liturgy, the weekly rhythm is structured around the Sabbath. The Sabbath is frequently mentioned in the second half of Acts. Acts 13:14-42 describes at length a synagogue gathering on the Sabbath: first, the Law and the Prophets are read aloud (13:15), and then Paul is allowed to address the assembled community of Jews and God-fearers (13:16) with a word of exhortation (13:15). As Paul and Barnabas are leaving they are requested to speak again on the following Sabbath (13:42).[14] There is no indication that the sermon of Paul on the following Sabbath took place in a different location: the synagogue was the appropriate place for both Jews and interested gentiles to hear a public speech by a Jewish teacher like Paul. That the whole city convened for Paul's second synagogue sermon is hyperbolic, of course, but Luke states it as the motive for the enmity of the Jews against Paul: they were envious of his popularity (13:45).

After his elaborate description of the Sabbath meetings in Pisidian Antioch, in Acts 17:1-2 Luke merely states that Paul went into the synagogue in Thessalonica on the Sabbath according to his custom, and spoke to the Jews on the basis of the Scriptures. Surely the reader is supposed to imagine a similar process here. In Thessalonica, it takes three Sabbaths for envy and enmity to rise against Paul (17:5). In Athens, Paul speaks to the Jews in the synagogue (17:17); a particular day is not mentioned but the contrast to the 'daily' discussions on the Athenian agora and the precedents of Antioch and Thessalonica imply that the Sabbath is meant. Likewise in Corinth, Paul speaks 'every Sabbath' in the synagogue, seeking to persuade both Jews and Greeks (18:4).

In marked contrast to the Fourth Gospel (John 20:1, 19, 26), the book of Acts does not emphasise weekly Christian gathering on Sundays. For Luke, the rhythm of the week is determined by the Sabbath. When Paul and his companions ('we')[15] gather with disciples in Troas to break bread on the first day after the Sabbath,[16] Luke does not say explicitly that the Christian community in Troas gathers every Sunday. The reason that a lot of people (20:8: many lamps, proportional to the size of the room) attend Paul's daily meal in the insula apartment of his host on this particular day, and that Paul speaks with them for such a long time, is that Paul intends to leave on Monday morning.[17] The meeting is one of a series of farewell gatherings for him before he leaves for Jerusalem (20:1, 17-38; 21:5).

De Jonge has argued that weekly Christian meal gatherings on Sunday evenings originated as early as the 40s, and readers of Acts may have connected the story of Eutychus' revivification with such gatherings.[18] But Luke does not place any emphasis on this and certainly does not view Sunday as replacing the Jewish Sabbath, as some Christian authors from circa AD 100 onwards start to do (Barn. 15.7-8; Ign. *Magn.* 9.1).

2.3 The annual festival rhythm

According to Acts, for the disciples of the Nazarean school the rhythm of the day was determined by prayer at the times of the daily temple sacrifices, and the rhythm of the week was determined by the Sabbath. The year was marked by the great Jewish pilgrimage festivals, two of which are mentioned in Luke–Acts: Pesach, followed by the feast of Unleavened Bread, and Pentecost or Shavuot. These feasts have an important literary function in both books: the Pesach feasts frame the book of Luke (2:41-42; 22:1, 7) whereas the Pentecost feasts frame the book of Acts (2:1; 18:21; 20:16). Diaspora Jews were not required to travel to Jerusalem every year[19] but Paul still expresses his wish to be in Jerusalem for the Pentecost feast of – presumably – AD 57,[20] in order to bring alms and to offer sacrifices (24:17).[21]

Peter was arrested during the feast of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3-4), paralleling the passion narrative of Jesus (Lk 22:1); but whereas Jesus was killed, Peter is freed on the night before his trial (Acts 12:6-11). Luke does not elaborate on the death of James mentioned in Acts 12:2. The feast of unleavened bread is also mentioned in Acts 20:6, where its main function seems to be simply to indicate the date in the itinerary report,[22] which only confirms the extent to which the Jewish festivals mark the rhythm of the year for Luke.

3. Sacred space in Acts

The sacred times mentioned above correspond with sacred spaces. At regular times set apart from everyday life observant Jews gathered in spaces rit-

ually marked as pure and holy to various degrees, according to nearness to the deity whose presence radiated out from the temple's holiest innermost shrine. During pilgrimage festivals they left their villages and gathered in the temple to offer sacrifices and to worship at appointed times. Each Sabbath they gathered in the communal hall of the village or of the Judaic diaspora community: the synagogue. And for their meals they came together around the domestic table and sanctified the moment and the place by giving thanks to God and breaking bread. The temple, the synagogue and the home are important spaces throughout Acts.[23]

3.1 The temple

Sacred space *par excellence* for the majority of first-century Jews was the temple in Jerusalem.[24] In contrast to other peoples in the ancient world, for whom the topography of the inhabited world was littered with sacred trees, crossroads, simple *temenoi* and magnificent temple complexes, Jews were obliged to acknowledge one place only as the dwelling place of the Name of YHWH, the only God to be worshiped. Herod had initiated the transformation of the temple into a state-of-the-art Hellenistic temple complex, though the completion of this major building project would take until the 40s AD, according to Josephus (*AJ* 20.219).[25] Josephus praises the beauty of the temple as a reflection of its cosmic counterpart, depicted in the astral design on the temple's magnificent veil (Josephus, *BJ* 5.207-214). The huge temple courts functioned at the same time as the centre of Jerusalem's public life and the temple's economy.[26] The courts were surrounded by porticoes where, as on all Greco-Roman public squares, teachers could be seen in discussions with their students.

We find all these functions of the temple in the Gospel of Luke: a site of prayer and worship (Lk 1:10; 19:46; 24:53), a site of teaching (Lk 2:46; 19:47; 20:1; 21:47-48) and a site of business, severely criticised by Jesus (Lk 19:45-46). This pattern continues in Acts. The temple was not only the place where the apostles went to worship at prayer hours, as seen above, but it was more generally the public gathering place for the community of disciples in the city. More precisely, Solomon's portico is mentioned as a gathering place in Acts 3:11 and 5:21, a portico identified by Josephus as being on the east side of the temple square (Josephus, *BJ* 5.184-185; *AJ* 15.396-401) and mentioned in the Gospel of John as the place where Jesus used to teach (Jn 10:23); in Jesus' days, the grand Royal Stoa may still have been under construction.

The temple figures again in Acts 21:26-30 when Paul, after his arrival in Jerusalem, spends his days going around the city together with his travelling companions (including Trophimus from Ephesus). He appears to frequent the temple (without Trophimus, according to Luke), as indeed any diaspora Jew coming to Jerusalem for Pentecost would do. In his defence speech following his arrest, Paul recalls a time soon after his return from Damascus when he had a vision during prayer in the temple (Acts 22:17). Clearly, the temple remained important sacred space for the apostles, not only as shown in the beginning of Acts but throughout the period the book describes.

3.2 The synagogue

Scholars increasingly agree that synagogues in the first century AD were essentially community buildings[27] which did not compete with the temple;[28] the extent to which they imitated the temple in terms of architecture and organisation remains debated.[29] Especially in the Diaspora, however, they were regarded as sacred spaces. This was perhaps 'an attempt on the part of Jewish communities to accord their synagogues and *proseuchai* the prestige enjoyed by temples throughout the Hellenistic and Roman worlds',[30] and also, quite plausibly, a reflection of the desire of Jewish diaspora communities to experience nearness to their God, despite his earthly dwelling place being in far-away Jerusalem.[31] The synagogues' main function was to host the Scripture reading on Sabbath mornings. As such, they may have functioned

> de facto, if not necessarily by design, as vehicles that transported the worshipers closer to the centre; … they served in effect as distant courts of the Temple, wherein a congregation had some sense of being near to the *axis mundi*.[32]

Throughout Acts, the synagogue is Paul's preferred venue for addressing both Jewish and non-Jewish inhabitants of the cities he visited. As an itinerant Jewish teacher and prophet, Paul based his message on the Scriptures, and the synagogues in these cities were the places where Scripture – the Law and the Prophets – was publicly read (13:27; 15:21). In a world where few people could read

and write, and private ownership of scrolls was scarce, the synagogue as a place of public reading of the Scriptures was vital to the growth of the Jesus movement.

3.3 Domestic space

The summary statements of Acts 2:46 and 5:42 depict the life of Jerusalem's early Christian community as moving between temple and home. As seen above, the temple was the locus for worshiping together with other Jews, and the house was used for sharing meals. Both locations were used by the apostles as venues for teaching (5:42). This was in line with general Mediterranean custom: philosophers as well as rabbis are known to have taught groups of pupils during the day in public spaces while attracting a wider audience of occasional bystanders, and then to have continued their discussions over a meal in the more intimate setting of a dining room.[33]

Thus homes (*oikos/oikia*, not necessarily a private *domus* but any form of dwelling-space, including *insulae* apartments)[34] were important meeting places for disciples of Jesus, according to Acts, but Adams has rightly warned against attributing too much importance to this.[35] Public meeting spaces, such as the Jerusalem temple, are just as important. Only in a public space could the entire community of disciples meet. On the three occasions that Luke mentions the convocation of a particular locality's entire Christian community (6:2; 14:27; 15:30),[36] he does not specify the location. In Jerusalem, the temple square would have been the most likely setting for a gathering of this size. In Antioch, we might think of the coastal plains of the Orontes, a rented barn (as in *Acta Pauli* 11:1) or a (semi-)public garden.[37]

That being said, however, homes as meeting places are seen to be important throughout Acts. The home is the location where 'the breaking of bread' takes place (2:46; 20:11). In Jewish homes breaking bread is part of the ritual that marks the beginning of a meal: the host, or a guest of honour, takes the bread, breaks it, and gives thanks over it.[38] It is this ritual that renders the home a sacred space, effecting 'the domestic table's transformation into a ritually evocative location analogous to the temple altar'.[39] The sanctity of the domestic table is derived from the sanctity of the temple: Rabbi Simeon (mid-second century AD) likened the domestic meal where scholars discuss the Torah to being seated around the table of showbread in the temple, experiencing communion with God and being instructed by him.[40] Hence Jervell is right to conclude that the meals were not a new and specifically Christian supplement to temple worship, but an extension of life in the temple.[41]

4. Sacred spaces as spaces of contest

Peter Wick has explored how early Christian gatherings originated within the triangle of Jewish worship, between temple, synagogue and home. He emphasises the different configurations of Christian worship within the various books of the New Testament. With regard to Luke–Acts he concludes that whereas the disciples participated in temple and synagogue services together with other Jews, the Christian movement's identity developed within homes, concentrating on the private sphere.[42] However, I will argue below that the disciples claimed all three sacred space domains for the Name of Jesus, and that the book of Acts shows how this claim was contested by other Jews. This contestation has important political aspects, showing that sacred space cannot be isolated from the larger world in which it is located, as scholars of religious studies have argued in the wake of the 'spatial turn' in the humanities.[43]

4.1 Teaching in the Name of Jesus in the temple

As we saw, the temple was not only the place for prayer and worship, but also for instruction and proclamation. Not only the disciples who gathered under Solomon's portico heard the apostles, but all who happened to be within hearing distance. In Acts 3–5, Luke presents us two Jewish parties (*haereseis*), the Sadducees and the Nazareans,[44] competing for hegemony over the instruction of the people in the temple.[45] From the apostles' perspective the eschatological era had dawned (Acts 2:16-17), in which the word of the Lord would 'go out from Jerusalem' (Isaiah 2:3). This rendered their presence and proclamation in the temple more than merely a matter of custom: they had received the divine command to preach in the temple (5:20).

The contest over the temple described in the opening chapters of Acts finds its preliminary climax in the speech of Stephen, who is accused (falsely, according to Luke) of speaking against the temple. Stephen recounts the history of Israel from the forefathers through until Solomon who built the temple. Then Stephen quotes Isaiah to support the claim that the Most High does not dwell in

things made by (human) hands; rather, the cosmos is God's dwelling, made by his own hand (which, in fact, echoes Solomon's own prayer in 1 Kings 8:27).[46] Stephen accuses his audience of persecuting the prophets, aligning his own position with that of Isaiah.[47] Stephen is not being critical of Solomon or of temple worship as such,[48] but of the temple authorities who sought to silence the Spirit speaking through the prophets. Read with an eye to recurrences in Israel's history, the rejection of Stephen indeed recalls the rejection of Israel's prophets which prompted the destruction of the first temple, and thus points to the threat of the destruction of the second temple.[49] As the earthly temple authorities turn in anger against Stephen, the heavenly temple opens and he sees the glory of God and Jesus standing at God's right hand as the high priest of the new covenant.[50]

4.2 Preaching Jesus as Messiah from the Scriptures in the synagogue

The synagogue provides a second arena for contest. As the Sabbath synagogue assembly centres around the reading of Scripture, the apostles (following Jesus) use this location to assert the correct interpretation of Scripture, i.e. the fulfilment of God's promise through the resurrection of Jesus (13:32). The response to the apostolic message varies from synagogue to synagogue, but often turns eventually into enmity against Paul.[51]

Particularly noteworthy is the process described in Acts 18:4-6, where Paul, after having sought to convince Jews and Greeks on a number of Sabbaths, drives his efforts to a climax when Silas and Timothy come from Macedonia: 'Paul was constrained by the Word, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.'[52] Paul does not grant his audience the leisure to remain neutral towards his argument. Challenged by his powerful speech, they oppose him and blaspheme (18:6),[53] upon which Paul dramatically shakes the dust out of his garments and declares himself clean of their blood: he has done his duty as prophet in exhorting this assembly of Israelites to repent (Ezek 3:18-21; 33:1-9).[54] The result of this powerful contest over the local synagogue is that Paul has to move next door to carry on preaching – 'as close to the synagogue as can be'[55] – and also, notably, that one of the Corinthian *archisynagogoi*, along with his entire household, comes to faith in Jesus (Acts 18:7-8). Paul's prophetic act has not been in vain.

4.3 Sanctifying the domestic table in remembrance of Jesus

The home is claimed for Jesus through the ritual of breaking bread. References in Acts to this ritual should be understood in the light of Jesus' practice of breaking bread with his disciples, and especially in light of Luke's account of the Last Supper, where Jesus used the sharing of bread to symbolise the giving of his body for his disciples (Lk 22:19). He urged them, 'continue doing this, in remembrance of me',[56] where *poieite* can only refer to the act of breaking bread: the recitation of the words of interpretation is not necessarily implied.[57] The meaning cannot be merely that the disciples are urged not to forget to say grace before meals: the emphasis must rather be that they continue to do this together, also when Jesus would no longer be with them physically. His exhortation is thus to remember him as the one who inaugurated the eschatological covenant by pouring out his blood for them (Lk 22:20). Hence, references to the 'breaking of bread' in Acts, read in the light of the Last Supper narrative in Luke, indicate that the shared meals of the disciples are held in obedience to Jesus' command and in remembrance of him. They do not refer to a new Christian ritual but rather to a Jewish ritual performed in the Name of Jesus.

Even the claim on domestic space is not left uncontested, however: Acts records how Saul entered homes to arrest men and women of the Jerusalem community (8:3). We should not construe the house in the book of Acts to be a private domain where Christianity could be practised without disturbing public order, as Wick asserts.[58] At Pentecost, when the disciples are gathered together and the sound of a rushing violent wind fills 'the entire house (or: the entire room)[59] where they were sitting' (2:2), curious pilgrims come crowding around the entrance of the house, just like the crowds who gathered at the houses where Jesus taught and performed his miracles.[60] Nor is the breaking of bread a secret ritual, in contrast to subsequent developments in early Christian liturgy. The fullest description of the ritual is given in Acts 27:35-36, where Paul performs it 'in the presence of all' on board the ship taking him to Rome. Barrett remarks, 'the Christians did not withdraw to hold a special, still less a secret, rite of their own. ἐνώπιον πάντων is clear'.[61]

5. Worship in Acts as eschatological worship of Israel and the nations

Thus far, it has been argued that according to Luke the religious life of the disciples moved within the spatio-temporal structure of first-century Judaism. They claimed all Jewish sacred spaces for the Name of Jesus, garnering popular admiration but also evoking the jealousy and enmity of Jewish leaders. How should we interpret this contest over the central institutions of Judaism?

Peter's speech at Pentecost indicates that we should not read Acts as a story of Christian origins, but one of Jewish endings: what is happening at Pentecost and throughout the book is what was foretold by the prophets to happen 'in the last days' (2:17). The day of the Lord is imminent, as both Peter (2:20) and Paul (17:31) tell their Jewish and gentile audiences.

Hence, Acts presents the worship of a restored house of David, a remnant seeking the Lord together with the nations (15:16-17).[62] The book of Isaiah, quoted at crucial places in Acts,[63] closes with the participation of the nations in the worship of the eschatological age: 'And it will be that month after month, and Sabbath after Sabbath, all flesh will come before me to worship (*proskunēsai*) in Jerusalem, says the Lord' (Isa 66:23 LXX). In the book of Acts, gentiles are likewise called to join Israel in worshipping God: Paul explicitly addresses both the Israelites and all those (non-Jews) who fear God, when the leaders of the synagogue in Antioch invite him to speak a word of exhortation to 'the people' (*ton laon*; Acts 13:15-16). Moreover, the disciples open their ritually-sanctified domestic tables to gentile diners (11:3)[64] because God has given gentiles the opportunity to repent (11:18), cleansing their hearts through faith (15:9) so that they should not be burdened by the obligation of circumcision when they turn to God (15:19). Such was the decision of the halakhic authorities of the eschatological era, the apostles and the elders of Jerusalem (15:23-29; cf. 21:25).[65] In view of this eschatological expectation the climax would be that Jews and gentiles, having acknowledged Jesus as Messiah, would worship together in the temple of Jerusalem. There is no indication in Acts that temple worship is regarded as obsolete, or merely a matter of custom for Christians who knew no better – as later Christian tradition would have it.[66] Nevertheless, harmonious worship of God together in the temple never takes place in Acts.

6. An eschatological perspective on the contest for the temple and its destruction

In the final chapters of Acts (20–28), the contest for Israel's sacred space reaches a climax. The rumour about Paul bringing Trophimus of Ephesus into the temple suffices to cause complete chaos and leads to the closing of the temple gates (21:28-31). This act might well have been intended by Luke as symbolic of the way the temple authorities barred the disciples of Jesus from the temple. The temple authorities enact a politics of space along ethno-religious boundaries which precludes the temple (this temple, at least) from becoming the inclusive space of eschatological worship which Isaiah prophesied.[67] However, even if they barred the apostolic message from the temple, they had been unable to stop the message of salvation from being sent to the nations, and they would not stop the nations from hearing it. With this provocative proclamation the book of Acts closes (28:28).

According to many scholars, Luke–Acts indicates a gradual transition from the temple to the house. In the wake of the destruction of the temple Luke would present the house church as the place where God dwells through his Spirit. According to Taylor,

> The Holy Spirit as manifested in the life and expansion of the Church transcends and supersedes the notion of sacred space associated with the Zion traditions.[68]

But when Acts is read as a history of the eschatological age and in the light of patterns of recurrence throughout the history of Israel, another interpretation suggests itself. Although the contest over the temple is narrated in Acts, the outcome of the contest and a pointer on how it should be interpreted are provided in the prequel to Acts, the Gospel of Luke, where the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple is predicted by words and signs.

6.1 The destruction of Jerusalem

In Luke 19:41-44, Jesus announces the destruction of Jerusalem. Verse 44 cites the reason for Jerusalem's destruction as being that the city 'has not acknowledged the time of [God's] visitation to you (*ton kairon tēs episkopēs sou*)'. This 'time of God's visitation' is the driving force behind the urgency of the apostolic call to repentance in Acts (e.g. 3:19-21). However, the reader of Acts will know from reading the Gospel of Luke that the majority of the Jews in Jerusalem would not take

the opportunity to 'be rescued from this wicked generation' (2:40), even though thousands of them would repent (2:41) and the Nazarean community in Jerusalem would remain vibrant throughout Acts (many thousands of Jews believed, according to 21:20).

6.2 The destruction of the temple

Luke 21:5-38 contains Jesus' famous eschatological discourse on the destruction of the temple. Although a synoptic comparison with Mark is diachronically instructive, a synchronic analysis should be the basis for interpreting its meaning in Luke. Incorporating Markan material (or pre-Markan oral tradition), Luke has created a coherent apocalyptic narrative that speaks about events to happen before the time of the end. Triggered by a saying of Jesus pronouncing the destruction of the temple, the disciples ask 'what will be the sign (*to sēmeion*) that these things will happen?' (21:7). In response, Jesus warns the disciples not to expect the end (*to telos*) too soon. This is presented by Luke as a preliminary remark, followed by a longer discourse introduced by the phrase 'then he said to them' (21:10). This longer discourse (21:10-28) starts by announcing that there would be great signs in heaven, apparently referring to the time of the end (21:10-11). Before that, however, there would first be a period of persecution of the disciples, which would serve as testimony (*marturion*). In this period, perseverance is crucial (vs. 19). These verses (21:12-19) cover the period described in Acts, which likewise stresses testimony through persecution (e.g. Acts 9:16) and the importance of perseverance (Acts 1:14; 2:42, 46; 5:42).[69] The verses are followed by the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem (Lk 21:20-24). It fulfils 'all that has been written' (21:22) and there would be 'wrath on this people' (*orgē tōi laōi toutōi*, 21:23). Jerusalem would be trampled upon by the nations 'until the times of the nations will be fulfilled' (21:24). The reference to the fulfilment of Scripture and to (divine) wrath suggests that Luke applies the prophecies concerning the destruction of the first temple to the destruction of the second, and views the destruction of Jerusalem as divine judgement on the sins of Israel, as does Josephus.[70] In line with this, a limited period of 'times of the nations' probably refers to a fixed period of judgement, followed by the judgement of the nations and the creation of a new heaven and earth.[71] After the 'times of the nations', there would be signs (*sēmeia*) in heaven and on earth, when the Son of Man would come on the cloud: a clear *inclusio* with the reference to *sēmeia* in verse 10. Jesus concludes with a word of encouragement: 'When these things begin to happen, stand up and lift up your heads, for your redemption is near.' This discourse of Jesus fits a form familiar from apocalyptic literature in which the time of the end is predicted as being imminent after a number of events that are narrated as prophecies by a figure from the past.[72] Hence, Fuller concludes that 'one of Luke's main aims is simply to bring eschatology up-to-date rather than lessen it *per se*'.[73] Whereas for Mark the return of Christ is intertwined with the events surrounding the destruction of the temple, Luke expects his return after a fixed time following its destruction, analogous to the period of exile following the destruction of the first temple.[74] The idea that the end is now near suggests that Luke and his audience were already living in these 'times of the nations'.

6.3 The temple curtain torn in two

Finally, Luke 23:44-45 presents a sign that foreshadows these eschatological events: darkness over all the earth and the tearing of the temple curtain. The *Lives of the Prophets,* a collection of short biographies of the biblical prophets dating (except for some later additions) to the first century AD, connects the tearing of the curtain to the destruction of the temple by the Romans,[75] and it should be interpreted in Luke, in connection with the darkness and the solar eclipse, as an eschatological portent of the temple's destruction as well. It does not indicate 'that the temple had already completed its purpose', as Taylor claims,[76] because it will continue to be a central place for worshipping God in Acts. Rather, in connection to Jesus' crucifixion, it anticipates the destruction of the temple as judgement for the rejection of Jesus by the Jews.

7. Conclusion: Hope for restoration

According to Moessner, the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history is central to Luke–Acts.[77] If that is the case, there will be hope beyond judgement. Instead of directing his audience to the house church as a viable (or even superior) alternative to temple worship, Luke shows how Jesus lamented over the fate of Jerusalem (Lk 19:41) and points forward to the 'restoration of all things' which will fulfil the words of all God's holy prophets throughout the ages (Acts 3:21). Coming together

in homes, in the meantime, retains an element of longing for the temple in Jerusalem. Luke's theology is not anti-Jewish, as some have claimed,[78] although it is as earnest as Israel's prophets had been in announcing judgement on those who reject Jesus – the one Luke deeply believed was the promised Messiah of Israel. It would only have been anti-Jewish if Luke had presented domestic, non-sacrificial, spiritual Christian worship as superior to the Jewish temple cult.[79] However, as has been argued in this article, this is not his perspective. Luke presents the Nazarean school as a prophetic movement that claims temple, synagogue and house for the Name of Jesus. Even as the Gospel spreads over the Mediterranean world, the narrative returns time and again to Jerusalem, the metropolis of the Jews, including those living far away in the diaspora.[80] In the urban centres of the Roman Empire, the synagogue, as the local representation of the holiness of the temple in Jerusalem, is the starting point for the proclamation of the Gospel. When the disciples are barred from the temple and expelled from the synagogue, only the homes remain: not as the way forward into a glorious Christian future, but as 'interim worship centers'[81] where Jewish and non-Jewish disciples of Jesus expect the final demonstration of God's loyalty to his covenant with the forefathers.[82]

A.J. (Arco) den Heijer MA is a PhD student in New Testament at the Theological University of the Reformed Churches (Liberated) in Kampen, Netherlands. His address is ajdenheijer@tukampen.nl.

Endnotes

1 This article is based in part on research for my Master's thesis at the Theological University in Apeldoorn, Netherlands, entitled 'Volharden in gemeenschap – voor Israël en de volkeren. Samenkomsten van de Weg volgens Handelingen' (supervisor: Dr Michael C. Mulder), which is available for download at http://tukampen.academia.edu/ArcoDenHeijer/. I thank Koert van Bekkum (Theological University Kampen), Rob van Houwelingen (Theological University Kampen), Michael Mulder (Theological University Apeldoorn) and the anonymous peer reviewer for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper, and Sally Davis (Peerwith) for a critical eye to issues of English language.

2 David P. Moessner, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's Christ: A New Reading of the Gospel Acts of Luke (*Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016).

3 Luke's preferred designation for the followers of Jesus in Acts is *mathētai*, 'disciples', or *adelphoi*, 'brothers'; cf. Paul Trebilco, *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 50–53, 225–229. Both terms reflect the logion of Mt 23:8: 'One is your teacher, Christ; you are all brothers.' Byrskog calls attention to important parallels in Qumran: Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994) 52. On the Nazarean school, cf. C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,* ICC; 2 vols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998) 1:140; on the meaning of *Christianoi* (Acts 11:26), cf. Barrett, *Acts,* 1:556–557. On ancient conceptions of 'school', cf. Loveday Alexander, 'Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence from Galen' in Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994) 60–83.

4 On the concepts of sacred times and spaces, cf. F. Graf , 'Sacred Times and Spaces: Introduction' in S.I. Johnston (ed.), *Religions of the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004) 243–244. Graf, 244, emphasises that the simple dichotomy of sacred and profane should be called into question when considering the ancient world, because 'most ancient religions prefer multiple gradations of space' and 'the same holds true for time'.

5 On the superscript of Luke's Gospel, cf. Martin Hengel, *Die vier Evangelien und das eine Evangelium von Jesus Christus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 87–95. On the authorship of Acts, cf. e.g. Claus-Jürgen Thornton, *Der Zeuge des Zeugen: Lukas als Historiker der Paulusreisen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte,* KEK 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 79–86; for a good exploration of the identity of Luke, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke. Vol. 1: 1–9,* AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981) 35–52.

6 Daniel Marguerat, 'Du temple à la maison suivant Luc–Actes' in C. Focant (ed.), *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* (Paris: Cerf, 2003) 285–318; J.C. Verrecchia, *God of No Fixed Address: From Altars to Sanctuaries, Temples to Houses* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015) 113–122; John H. Elliott, 'Temple versus Household in Luke–Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions' in Jeffrey H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke–Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991) 211–240; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary,* Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009) 94.

7 Cf. Lk 21:37. Spending the night on the Mount of Olives may refer to lodging in the house of acquaintances in Bethany near the Mount of Olives (Lk 19:29), cf. Mk 14:3; Jn 12:1-2.

8 Greek text is taken from NA28 and translations are the author's own, unless otherwise stated.

9 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte,* 157.

10 Cf. Num 28:3-8; Josephus, *AJ* 14.65; Emil Schürer a.o., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Vol. 2* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979) 300–307; Samuel Safrai, 'The Temple' in S. Safrai, M. Stern a.o. (eds) *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions. Volume 2* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976) 865–907, esp. 887–890. Lk 1:10 mentions the people praying specifically during the burning of incense.

11 Cf. Heb 10:11; Lk 1:23. In the Septuagint, the verb is used not only for temple sacrifice but also for temple singing (1 Chron 6:32; 16:4; 2 Chron 31:2). Cf. C.S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary,* 4 vols (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012–2015) 2:1991.

12 Keener, *Acts,* 2:1269–1270; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte,* 218.

13 Joachim Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 39 refers to b. Šabb 10a; m. Šabb 1:2; Lk 24:29; Jn 1:29. On breakfast, cf. also Jn 21:12. Josephus, *BJ* 2.129-131 records meal practices of the Essenes.

14 Thus, rightly, the interpretation of the NRSV: *autōn* (13:42), as part of the genitive participle clause, cannot refer to the same persons as the subject of *parekaloun*. The Western text is an interpretation of the shorter text: it identifies the *autōn* as Jews and the subject of *parekaloun* as gentiles. This cannot be the original meaning, however: the next verse makes clear that the initial response of the Jews to Paul's message is positive. Only when Paul attracts large crowds of gentiles on the next Sabbath, the Jews are filled with envy and turn against Paul, accusing him of blasphemy (13:45).

15 *hēmōn*, Acts 20:7. The variant reading *tōn mathētōn*, unmentioned in the apparatus of NA28, but used in Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* and hence in the King James version and the Dutch Statenvertaling (not in the Vulgate), is attested in a number of majuscules and minuscules from the ninth century onwards only (ninth century majuscules: H, L, P, 049, 056): cf. R.J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. The Acts of the Apostles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 352. The older reading *hēmōn* is to be preferred, since it is also the more difficult reading: it leaves *autois* in the main clause without a clear referent.

16 There has been some discussion concerning when the breaking of bread took place: on the evening preceding the first day of the week (Saturday after sundown) or on the late afternoon of the first day of the week. The arguments in favour of the latter option are far more convincing: S.R. Llewelyn, 'The Use of Sunday for Meetings of Believers in the New Testament', *Novum Testamentum* 43 (2001) 205–223, esp. 210–213; J. Tromp, 'Night and Day. A propos Acts 20:7' in R. Buitenwerf, H.W. Hollander and J. Tromp (eds), *Jesus, Paul and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 363–375; V.A. Alikin, *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering. Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries*, VCSup 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 41–42; Keener, *Acts*, 3:2967–2968.

17 Keener, *Acts,* 3:2968.

18 H.J. de Jonge, *Zondag en sabbat. Over het ontstaan van de christelijke zondag.* Anniversary Lecture Leiden University, 8 February 2006, available at https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl / handle/1887/4312 [accessed 04-04-2017].

19 Cf. Josephus, *AJ* 4.203, where the biblical obligation of pilgrimage (Deut 16:16) is rephrased as follows: 'Let those *from the borders of the land* which the Hebrews shall possess, come to the city where the temple shall be displayed, three times in a year …' (author's emphasis). In practice, anyway, Palestinian Jews were not expected to attend every feast every year either. Cf. Samuel Safrai, 'Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel' in S. Safrai, M. Stern a.o. (eds), *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions. Volume 1* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974) 184–215, esp. 191.

20 If, as many scholars now argue, Felix replaced Festus as governor of Judea in 59 CE. Cf. Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 40–44.

21 The prescribed sacrifices for any pilgrim who came to Jerusalem for the feast, cf. Lev 23:15-22 and Safrai, 'Temple', 893.

22 Pervo, *Acts,* 509 suggests that the reference evokes death, in light of the parallels with Jesus and Peter.

23 On temple, synagogue and house as the three 'ritual centres' of early Judaism, cf. M.S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism. Religious Worlds of the First Judaic Millennium* (Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 2006) 172–229.

24 Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002) 226–253.

25 Levine, *Jerusalem,* 219–223; E. Netzer, *Architecture of Herod, the Great Builder* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008) 137–178. On the duration of the building project, cf. John 2:20, Josephus,

AJ 20.219 and the 2011 findings preliminarily reported in www.antiquities.org.il/Article_eng.aspx?sec_id=25&subj_id=240&id=1882&hist=1 [accessed 19-10-2017].

26 M. Goodman, 'The Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem' in Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: Continuum, 1999) 69–76.

27 R. Hachlili, *Ancient Synagogues – Archaeology and Art: New Discoveries and Current Research* (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 54.

28 Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue. The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005) 78–80, rightly finds Flesher's argument for temple and synagogue as representing two different Judaisms, questionable.

29 Levine, *Synagogue*, 79. Especially Donald Binder, following James Strange, has argued for the modelling of the synagogues after the temple courts: Donald D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts. The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (Atlanta: SBL, 1999). His thesis seems to be supported by the finding of a relief with a menorah flanked by two columns in the Migdal synagogue excavated in 2009: Jürgen Zangenberg, 'Archaeological News from the Galilee: Tiberias, Magdala and Rural Galilee' in *Early Christianity* 1 (2010) 471–484, esp. 475–477.

30 Levine, *Synagogue,* 134.

31 Binder, *Courts.*

32 Binder, *Courts,* 478.

33 Keener, *Acts,* 1:1010–1011, 1030–1032.

34 Edward Adams, *The Earliest Christian Meeting Places. Almost Exclusively Houses?* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016) 51–66.

35 Adams, *Places,* 63–67.

36 One could include Acts 21:22, where a large number of early manuscripts (P74, ℵ, A, C^2, E, D, L, Ψ and the Latin versions) add *dei sunelthein plēthos* or *dei (to) plēthos sunelthein*. The NA28 prefers the *lectio brevior* of B, C* and the Syrian and Coptic versions, probably rightly so.

37 Adams, *Places,* 146–149, 181–188, 203–206.

38 Cf. Lk 9:16; 22:19; 24:30 (and synoptic parallels); Jos. Asen. 8.5; Sib. Or. 4.26; 1QS 6.4-5; Josephus, *BJ* 2.131. m. Ber. 6:1-3 prescribes which blessings should be said over various types of food, but these need not have been fixed in the first century CE.

39 Jaffee, *Judaism,* 86. The connection of the domestic table with the temple altar predates the destruction of the temple, as evidenced by Philo, *Contempl.* 10.81.

40 M. 'Avot 3:3: 'But three who ate at a single table and did talk about teachings of Torah while at that table are as if they ate at the table of the Omnipresent, blessed is he, as it is said, *And he said to me, This is the table that is before the Lord* (Ezek. 41:22).' Translation Joseph Neusner, *The Mishnah. A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) 678, italics original. Cf. the emphasis on communion and instruction in Exod 25:22.

41 Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte,* 157.

42 Peter Wick, *Die urchristlichen Gottesdienste. Entstehung und Entwicklung im Rahmen der frühjüdischen Tempel-, Synagogen- und Hausfrömmigkeit* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002) 271.

43 Cf. K. Knott, 'Religion, Space, and Place: The Spatial Turn in Research on Religion' in *Religion and Society: Advances in Research* 1 (2010) 29–43. An overview of the spatial turn in the study of culture in general is given in D. Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016) 211–244; for the 'spatial turn' in relation to New Testament studies, cf. David Balch and Annette Weissenrieder (eds), *Contested Spaces: Houses and Temples in Roman Antiquity and the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012) v–viii.

44 Acts 24:5; cf. 28:22. On the interpretation of *Nazōraioi* cf. Barrett, *Acts,* 1:140.

45 For the temple as scene and subject of conflict, cf. Elliott, 'Temple', 216.

46 Cf. Heb 8:2. Likewise, Philo of Alexandria distinguishes the cosmos as the highest and truest temple of God from the temple made with human hands (*cheiropoiētos*), which God has given to allow humankind to show its gratitude to him, *Spec.* 1.66-67.

47 On the motif of the persecution of the prophets, cf. Odil H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967); Moessner, *Luke,* 272.

48 Jakob Thiessen, 'Die Stephanusrede im Kontext des hellenistischen Judentums' in Jakob Thiessen (ed.), *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas in ihrem historischen Kontext – drei Fallstudien* (Wien: LIT, 2013) 29–130, esp. 82–102.

49 Josephus, in his speech in Josephus, *BJ* 375-419, draws parallels between the destruction of the first and second temple as well, and argues that God had fled from the temple because it had been defiled by the sins of the Judeans. Cf. *infra*, the penultimate section of this article.

50 On Jesus as priest in Luke–Acts, cf. already Augustine, *Cons.* 1.4-6.

51 Acts 13:42-47 (Pisidian Antioch: Jews slander Paul out of *zēlos*, seeing the large crowds attracted to Paul's synagogue sermons); 16:13-15 (Philippi: positive response); 17:1-5 (Thessalonica: enmity from the Jews due to *zēlos*); 17:10-13 (Beroea: positive response; but confusion after the arrival of Jews from Thessalonica); 17:17 (Athens: response not

mentioned); 18:4-7 (Corinth: resistance to Paul's repeated attempt to persuade the Jews); 19:8-9 (Ephesus: after three months of speaking in the synagogue, persistent resistance to his words leads Paul to withdraw to the school of Tyrannus). The interpretation of *zēlos* is disputed: Eckhard J. Schnabel, 'Jewish Opposition to Christians in Asia Minor in the First Century', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18 (2008) 233–270, esp. 239–241, gives a survey of arguments for interpreting it as zeal for the law, envy over Paul's popularity, or a combination of the two. The reaction of Jewish opponents to Paul parallels that of the high priest and the Sadducees to Peter when he heals large crowds in the temple (Acts 5:17: *eplēsthēsan zēlou*). In each case, Luke ties the *zēlos* closely to the large numbers of people attracted to the gospel. To interpret *zēlos* as pure jealousy towards a popular speaker seems to be too shallow an interpretation, especially in the case of the high priest. 'Indignation' may be a better rendering, as it has both an emotional and a cognitive aspect: they are indignant that so many people are drawn to the proclamation of Jesus as the Christ. 'Zeal for the law' is somewhat too restrictive: it does not fit the instance of Acts 5:17. Cf. also Bart J. Koet, *Five Studies on the Interpretation of Scripture in Luke–Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters, 1989) 102–106, who concludes that in the LXX *zēlos* among humans 'is usually "zeal for God's honour" rather than "jealousy". It is concerned with a particular attitude: a zeal with regard to the Jewish identity and faithfulness to the one God' (103).

52 LSJ s.v. *sunechō* translates *sunechesthai tini* as 'to be constrained, distressed, afflicted, and, generally, to be affected by anything whether in mind or body' and refers to Acts 18:5 under that idiom. BDAG and many commentaries and modern translations translate the variant reading *suneicheto tōi pneumati* as 'compelled by the Spirit', but translate *suneicheto tōi logōi* as 'devoted himself fully to the word', in contrast to having had to work as tentmaker before the arrival of Silas and Timothy (cf. 2 Cor 11:8-9). However, in that case, an ingressive aorist would have made more sense than an imperfect tense (Barrett, *Acts,* 2:866), and anyway, the text does not present *suneicheto tōi logōi* as a contrast with Paul's work at the work place of Aquila and Priscilla, but as background information to explain the (prophetic) clash between Paul and his Jewish audience in verse 6. Hence, the sense must be that Paul is pressed to preach to a point of emotional affliction (cf. 2 Cor 5:14); cf. Barrett, *Acts,* 2:866.

53 There is challenge-riposte dynamic going on in these verses, on which cf. Bruce J. Malina and Jeffrey R. Neyrey, 'Honor and Shame in Luke–Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World' in Jeffrey H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke–Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991) 25–66.

54 Cf. Keener, *Acts,* 3:2743; H.J. Cadbury, 'Dust and Garments' in Kirsopp Lake, H.J. Cadbury and F.J. Foakes-Jackson (eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*, 5 vols (London: MacMillan, 1933) 5:269–277; Bart J. Koet, 'As Close to the Synagogue as Can Be. Paul in Corinth (Acts 18,1-18)' in Reimund Bieringer (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996) 397–415, esp. 405–409.

55 The title of Koet, 'As Close to the Synagogue as Can Be. Paul in Corinth (Acts 18,1-18)'.

56 The present imperative emphasises iteration (Alikin, *History,* 118).

57 Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 240–241.

58 Wick, *Gottesdienste,* 271. Jaffee, *Judaism,* 315, rightly warns against viewing the home as private space.

59 LSJ s.v. *oikos.* In marked contrast to the final Jerusalem episode in the book of Acts (when Luke was present with Paul), where Paul's host in Jerusalem is identified by name, Luke is remarkably vague about the location of the events occurring in Acts 1 and 2: references to 'the upper room where they were staying' (Acts 1:13, cf. Adams, *Places*, 55–56) or 'the house/room where they were sitting' (2:2) are completely indiscriminate. The articles are not used because the rooms are known to the reader, as some commentators assert (Keener, *Acts,* 1:739; Rainer Riesner, 'Synagogues in Jerusalem', in Richard Bauckham [ed.], *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting. Vol. 4 of The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] 179–212, esp. 206), but because they are identified by the subsequent relative clause. It is not even certain that the upper story (*huperōion*) of Acts 1:8 is the same as the upper room (*anagaion mega*) of the Last Supper (Lk 22:12; Barrett, *Acts* 1:86). Luke is not interested in marking these places as holy sites of the earliest church, in contrast to later sources (e.g. Epiphanius, *De Mens.* 14-15); cf. William Horbury, 'Beginnings of Christianity in the Holy Land' in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006) 7–89, esp. 69–74.

60 Cf. e.g. Lk 5:17-26.

61 Barrett, *Acts,* 2:1209.

62 Moessner, *Luke,* 325.

63 Bart J. Koet, 'Isaiah in Luke–Acts' in Bart J. Koet (ed.), *Dreams and Scripture in Luke–Acts* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006) 51–79.

64 Cf. Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 71–109, on the importance of table fellowship in Luke–Acts.

65 On the importance of the Twelve as eschatological judges in Jerusalem, cf. M.E. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-Gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke–Acts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006) 239–264.

66 The letter to the Hebrews is often cited as evidence for the idea that temple worship had become obsolete with the death of Christ. The author does not consider it as wrong, however, that the earthly priests continue to bring their sacrifices (Heb 10:2). That the old covenant is now 'near to extermination' (Heb 8:13) is so in view of the imminent return of Christ (Heb 13:6): now that the eschatological covenant has been inaugurated, the old order of the world and the old covenant of the law and of temple worship are fading away (cf. Jörg Frey, 'Die alte und neue διαθήκη nach dem Hebräerbrief' in Friedrich Avemarie (ed.), *Bund und Tora. Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 263–306, esp. 301–302). In the meantime, Hebrews (assuming a date before AD 70) does not imply that its readers should consider the earthly temple as no longer a fitting place for worshipping God, or that they would be forbidden from bringing sacrifices for the feasts, like Paul does (Acts 24:17). Indeed, that is an integral part of the Mosaic law by which Jewish Christians continued to live (Acts 21:20).

67 Pervo, *Acts,* 551, interprets the closing of the temple gates as indicating 'that official Judaism at its center has closed itself to the message of Paul'. However, I disagree where he states that 'the sacred place has lost its soteriological relevance and shown itself unworthy' (Pervo, *Acts,* 551). In Luke–Acts the soteriological function of the temple is not emphasised; rather, it functions as a place to worship (Acts 8:27). And it is not the sacred place itself, but the temple authorities that show themselves unworthy.

68 Nicholas H. Taylor, 'The Jerusalem Temple in Luke–Acts' in *HTS Theological Studies* 60 (2004) 459–485, quote on 459.

69 Acts uses the verb *proskartereō*. Louw and Nida classify the verb *kartereō* in the same semantic domain as *hupomonē* (Lk 21:19) even though they relegate the compound *proskartereō* to another domain. In the passages mentioned, however, *proskartereō* clearly has a strong connotation of perseverance and endurance.

70 W. den Hollander, 'Jesus, Josephus, and the Fall of Jerusalem: On Doing History with Scripture' in *HTS Theological Studies* 71.1 (2015).

71 John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53,* WBC 35C (Dallas: Word, 1993) 1005.

72 Cf. A.S. van der Woude, 'Prophetic Prediction, Political Prognostication, and Firm Belief: Reflections on Daniel 11:40–12:3' in C.A. Evans, J.A. Sanders and S. Talmon (eds), *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 63–74.

73 Fuller, *Restoration,* 202, referring to J.T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke–Acts* (diss. Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986).

74 On this analogy, cf. Moessner, *Luke,* 367–368.

75 *Vitae Prophetarum* 12.10-12, text and commentary in A.M. Schwemer, *Vitae Prophetarum* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997) 626–628. On the dating, cf. Schwemer, *Vitae Prophetarum,* 547–548.

76 Taylor, 'Temple', 477.

77 Moessner, *Luke,* 272.

78 Most notably Jack T. Sanders, 'The Salvation of the Jews in Luke–Acts' in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke–Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 104–128.

79 On supersessionist tendencies in scholarship on temple worship in Jewish and Biblical studies, cf. J. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

80 Cf. Philo, *Flac.* 46.

81 The term is taken from http://pohick.org/sts/faqs.html#What was the relationship [accessed 04-04-2017] where Donald Binder uses it to describe the synagogues of the Essenes, which were not meant to supplant temple worship, but 'as interim worship centers while they waited for God to restore to their sect the Temple leadership'.

82 With the passing of time, the Christian house church gathering became more similar to the synagogue meetings: the evening meal was transformed into a eucharistic liturgical ritual in a morning service, and readings from Scripture acquired a central place in the liturgy. Recent scholarship emphasises, however, that this transition took place only over the course of several centuries, and that initially, Christian gatherings and synagogue assemblies were 'qualitatively different and complementary events'; see A.B. McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014) 71, whose overview of early church practices testifies to the huge paradigm shift in scholarship on early Christian liturgy over the past decades.