



**HAL**  
open science

## Reading Luke in Rome: The Temple and Pietas

Mina Monier

► **To cite this version:**

Mina Monier. Reading Luke in Rome: The Temple and Pietas. *Studia Patristica*, 2018, *Studia Patristica* (99), pp.115-138. hal-03338951

**HAL Id: hal-03338951**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03338951>**

Submitted on 14 Sep 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

# Reading *Luke* in Rome: The Temple and *Pietas*

Mina MONIER, King's College, London, UK

## ABSTRACT

This paper aims to identify *Luke's* attitude toward the Temple of Jerusalem in the light of his interest to introduce Christianity in consistency with the Roman value of piety (*Pietas*). I will show *Luke's* editorial work which led him to give an image of Christianity's attitude to the Temple that is different to his sources. This peculiar view connects the elements of God's visitation to the Temple through the person of the *Kurios* who also brings peace to the Temple. The image is then defended in a series of speeches in *Acts* against any allegation of disrespect towards the Temple by the peculiar expression 'the customs of our ancestors' which appears prominently in *Luke-Acts* (in the New Testament) and in Augustus' definition of the *Pietas* in his *Res Gestae*. The possibility of such reading could be supported by its clearer existence in *1Clement*, which is another contemporaneous and independent text. The text makes a direct connection between the Roman *Pietas* and Christian theology which is manifest in the author's apology against novelty as well as devotion to the Temple of Jerusalem and its centrality as an expression of allegiance to the customs of the ancestors. I will show that the *Pietas* elements in *Luke-Acts* and *1Clement* could justify speaking of a common interest to reconcile the Gospel with Roman moral conduct proclaimed in Trajanic Roman literature, and most importantly featured in the Lukan materials unattested in the Evangelion, which is the Gospel text traditionally attributed to Marcion.

## Introduction

The unprecedented rise in literature produced on Marcion and his legacy in the last three years reflects the significance of this topic for scholarship today.<sup>1</sup> One of the most important achievements of its debates is the strong mobilisation

<sup>1</sup> In the past three years only: M. Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, *Studia Patristica Supplement 2* (Leuven, 2014); M. Klinghardt, *Das Älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der Kanonischen Evangelien*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 2015); D. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel* (Leiden, 2015); J. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic* (Cambridge, 2015); see also the recent issue of *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1 (2017), 1-199, which was dedicated to that topic. Most recently, Andrew Hayes, *Justin against Marcion: Defining the Christian Philosophy* (Minneapolis, 2017). Works of earlier years include S. Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen, 2010); J. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Minnesota, 2013); J. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-acts: A Defining Struggle* (South Carolina, 2006); M. Gerhard and M. Katharina (eds), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung* (Berlin,

of both branches of scholarship in early Christianity: New Testament and Patristics, a hypothetical division that this topic has justifiably deemed irrelevant. In a recent collection of essays that aimed to problematise that division,<sup>2</sup> James Carleton Paget's essay on 'the Second Century from the Perspective of the New Testament' unfolded a list of the different approaches of the scholarship that aim to explain the evolution of early Christianity during that formative period. Paget concluded his list with contemporary scholarship on Marcion: 'the study of Marcion brings many of the different perspectives into focus'.<sup>3</sup> This view is not a new trend within scholarship, but a truth known to Christian writers from as early as the second century. In his debate with Marcion, Tertullian himself distinguishes clearly between the Gospels of the apostles and the Gospels of the apostolic men who belonged to a later generation that cannot claim the same authority,<sup>4</sup> and particularly *Luke's Gospel*, which is late enough not to have authority on its own.<sup>5</sup>

It is in the spirit of these words that I present this article. The historical developments and literary production of at least the first half of the second century should not be seen posterior, and consequently irrelevant, to the composition and transmission of the Gospels, and particularly *Luke-Acts*. I will study the theme of the Temple, which is a problem in Lukan scholarship, as a case that could be assessed against that historical milieu that witnessed the activities of Marcion in Rome. In order to make this comparative method helpful, I will focus on what could be seen as characteristically Lukan to examine it in the Roman milieu of historical and literary developments. Without presuming a traditional two-source hypothesis or taking a firm position on the relationship between Marcion's *Evangelion* and *Luke*, I will offer the comparisons between *Luke* and these different texts whenever it could be necessary for our case, which will eventually provide insights that contribute to the current debate.

In this article, I will argue that *Luke's* Temple attitude is part of his wider strategy to present a Christianity that is not a novelty, not a *superstitio* and hence not a *religio illicita*, but one that is firmly rooted in one of the ancient religions that existed and was accepted in the Roman Empire. The nature of the legitimation appears mostly in *Luke's* treatment of the Temple, in which the elements of Roman piety are fulfilled. This fits the historical developments in Trajanic Rome, attested in a Christian Roman text of 1*Clement*, and most important featured prominently in the materials unattested for Marcion's *Evangelion*.

2001). On a list of views in earlier scholarship see D. Roth, 'Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008), 513-27.

<sup>2</sup> James C. Paget and Judith Lieu (eds), *Christianity in the Second Century* (Cambridge, 2017).

<sup>3</sup> James C. Paget, 'The Second Century from the Perspective of the New Testament', in J.C. Paget and J. Lieu (eds), *Christianity in the Second Century* (2017), 102.

<sup>4</sup> *Marc.* 4.2.2.

<sup>5</sup> *Marc.* 4.2.2, see also *Marc.* 4.2.4-5, and 4.3.1-2.

## The Problem of Luke's Temple Attitude

Scholarship on the Lukan view of the Temple is deeply divided due to the complexity of the task to provide a single definition of that attitude throughout the double work. There are mainly three opinions: the supersessionist one which stems from Hans Conzelmann's salvation-history hypothesis; *Luke* abandons the Temple on the road towards a universal Gospel proclaimed in the capital of the Empire.<sup>6</sup> Van der Waal for example suggested that *Luke* 'replaces Israel who would not listen, by the faithful form of the Gentiles'.<sup>7</sup> The same conclusion was reached from the perspective of sociological analysis of the contrast between the Temple and the Household.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, some scholars of late 70's and 80's acknowledged the eschatological voice of *Luke* which was toned down earlier under Conzelmann's influence, and this led them to a more positive view of the Temple and its role in the eschatological community of *Luke*.<sup>9</sup> Bradley Chance's dissertation set the most comprehensive case for *Luke*'s view of a literal restoration of the Temple as part of the eschatological

<sup>6</sup> This is the classic view of Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York, 1982), 75

<sup>7</sup> C. Van der Waal, 'The Temple in the Gospel According to Luke', *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973), 49-59. He took the argument from terminology to provide an understanding of supersessionism in which the Temple is no longer a ναός but merely a ἱερόν just as any gentile temple (*ibid.*) The terms appear together 45 times in *Luke-Acts*; ναός (6) and ἱερόν (39). See Peter Head, 'The Temple in Luke's Gospel', in T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole (eds), *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (London, 2004), 101-19. Cautiously, Nicholas H. Taylor, 'The Jerusalem Temple in Luke Acts', *HTS Theologese Studies* 60 (2004), 459-85. J.H. Elliot, 'Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts', *HTS* (1991), 88-120. However, the location and usage of the terms do not suggest what van der Waal implied. Hence, Conzelmann rejects it: 'Er (Lukas) unterscheidet nicht zwischen den verschiedenen Vorhöfen, sondern sieht das ἱερόν als einheitlichen Bezirk, zu dem nur die Juden Zugang haben' [*Die Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1963) 23].

<sup>8</sup> J.H. Elliot, 'Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts' (1991), 90: 'The Household which is capable of embodying socially, symbolically and ideologically the structures, values and goals of an inclusive gospel of universal salvation [...] which is contrasted to the Temple, the bankrupt seat of Jewish power and piety, and to the city, the area of 'Caesar's network' and locus of social control.' Elliot's work relied heavily on cultural anthropology and particularly the work of Bruce Malina [*Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta, 1986)] and hence I do not find it convincing. In response, see A.G. van Aarde, 'The Most High Does Live in Houses, But not Houses Built by Men', *Neotestamentica* 25 (1991), 51-64. This approach was faithfully followed by M.C. McKeever, *Sacred Space and Discursive Field: The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts*, Dissertation (California: Graduate Theological Union, 1999) (also projecting a social map from Industrial Europe on *Luke*, based on Robert Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse* [Massachusetts, 1989]). Young-San Jung, *From Temple to House-Church in Luke Acts*, unpublished dissertation (University of St. Andrews, 2000).

<sup>9</sup> See Francis Weinert, *The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke*, unpublished dissertation (Fordham University, 1979); *id.*, 'The meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts', *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 11 (1981), 85-9; *id.*, 'Luke, Stephen, and the temple in Luke-Acts', *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 17 (1987), 88-90; M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel: die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (Stuttgart, 1980).

hope of Jesus and his movement.<sup>10</sup> The problem of identifying the background of *Luke* that led to this peculiarly positive perspective of the Temple remains as a challenge.<sup>11</sup> The third and more contemporaneous opinion is acknowledging the ambiguity of *Luke's* attitude. J. Tyson<sup>12</sup> acknowledged the centrality of the Temple in the *Luke-Acts*,<sup>13</sup> yet the Temple sometimes appears as the place of peace and, on the other hand, of conflict. This creates ambivalence<sup>14</sup> or, in the words of Nicholas Perrin, a 'deeply paradoxical' image.<sup>15</sup>

Therefore, it seems that scholarship reached a dead end with this question. However, this spectrum of opinion shares the same problem which is not taking the leap of reading the Temple attitude of *Luke-Acts* alongside its contemporaneous Roman challenges that *Luke* must have felt the need to address. However, the problem of establishing a link between the *Gospel of Luke* and the imperial cult has been a challenging task due to the fact that *Luke* never explicitly mentions it in his double work.<sup>16</sup> This makes the process of finding connections in terminology and possible allusions a cautious process lest we fall into parallelomania, as C. Rowe states.<sup>17</sup> Further, the seemingly contradictory impressions in these connections make us less confident in offering a single coherent view of the image of Rome, whether it was positive or negative. On the one hand we find examples of the Roman rulers and officials such as the centurions in *Luke* 7 and 23 and Julius of the Augustan Cohort in *Acts* 27 in a relatively decent way.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, Jesus' image as the 'Lord above all who preaches peace' (*Acts* 10:36-7)<sup>19</sup> is unavoidably a serious challenge to the Roman one. Further difficulties arise from understanding *Luke's* intention; whether he was offering an *apologia pro ecclesia* or *pro imperium*.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>10</sup> B. Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple and the New Age* (Georgia, 1988); Christopher Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin, 2006) and Joshua W. Jipp, *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts* (Leiden, 2013). Both works paved the way for Gregory Lanier, 'Luke's Distinctive Use of the Temple: Portraying the Divine Visitation', *JTS* 65 (2014), 433-62.

<sup>11</sup> Neither Chance nor Dawsey found a solution to the source of *Luke's* Temple attitude.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (South Carolina, 1986).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 87-9.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* 107-53.

<sup>15</sup> Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Michigan, 2011), 61. The same position is taken by Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge, 1997), 131.

<sup>16</sup> I accept the widely agreed opinion that *Luke* and *Acts* are two volumes of the same work.

<sup>17</sup> See C.K. Rowe, *JSNT* 27 (2005), 279-300.

<sup>18</sup> Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ* (London, 1987). Joshua Yoder, *Representatives of Roman Rule* (Berlin, 2014).

<sup>19</sup> τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος.

<sup>20</sup> In his comprehensive work on this topic, Allen Brent offered a more dynamic route by suggesting that the Church, as it appears in *Luke*, was more concerned to justify its position to itself, see his 'Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult in Asia Minor', *JTS* 48 (1997), 411-38, 412.

## Luke's view of the Temple

1) The third Gospel starts and concludes in the Temple of Jerusalem. The birth of John is foretold by a vision in the Temple.<sup>21</sup> The angel's key statement in *Luke* 1:19 was redacted to include the Lukan εὐαγγελίσασθαι.<sup>22</sup> Thus, for *Luke* the Gospel is declared inside and from the heart of Israel's Temple, not in the Jordan River outside Jerusalem as the Evangelion that starts from *Luke* 3. The Temple then functions as the womb of the good news and this assures the reader of the continuance of the same Israelite salvation history.<sup>23</sup> Jesus' circumcision and the announcement of the details of his ministry in Simeon's canticle is another step taken after the angel's announcement of the Gospel in the same place (the Temple).<sup>24</sup> Through the infancy section, boy Jesus and his family show devotion to the Temple and ancient customs.<sup>25</sup>

2) The preparation for the ministry section concludes with the Temptation narrative. The author rearranged his source to make the climactic scene on the pinnacle of the Temple.<sup>26</sup> The pericope shows Jesus' loyalty to the law and the Temple, which was considered by Kloppenborg as a special unit added to Q at some point to tone down the language that could be considered against the Law and the Temple.<sup>27</sup> The Temptation unit reflects the entirety of the Lukan narrative in which Jesus' arrival in the Temple is the climax of his mission. This is confirmed by the Lucan concluding remarks: the devil will leave Jesus at the Temple temporarily (and returns to him in *Luke* 22:3).<sup>28</sup> It is not surprising that Marcion's *Evangelion* did not have it.

3) In the vein of *Mal.* 3:1-4 (*Luke* 3:1-6) and *Is.* 58:6, 61:1-2 Jesus 'sets his face toward Jerusalem' with an uncompromising determination.<sup>29</sup> Attempts

<sup>21</sup> *Luke* 1:5-24.

<sup>22</sup> It appears only in *Luke Acts* (23 times). Jeremias correctly observes that "3 Hinzufügungen zur Markus Vorlage (*Lk.* 4:43 dif. *Mk.* 1:38; *Lk.* 9:6 dif. *Mk.* 6:13 und *Lk.* 20:1 dif. *Mk.* 11:27) die Vorliebe des dritten Evangelisten für das mediale εὐαγγελίσασθαι" [*Die Sprache des Lukas-evangeliums* (Göttingen, 1980)].

<sup>23</sup> Hence scholars saw the continuum of Judaism and Christianity in *Luke*: Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Tübingen, 1984), 46; Walter Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Tübingen, 1980), 24; François Bovon rules out the possibility of the Essenes to be behind the pre-Lukan source due to its positive language regarding the Temple and priesthood [*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Bd. 1 (Einsiedeln, 1996), 50, 61]. Also Raymond E. Brown, *Birth of the Messiah* (Yale, 2007), 267-8.

<sup>24</sup> *Luke* 2:21-38.

<sup>25</sup> His presentation in the Temple (*Lk.* 2:22-40) and his presence there as it is the house of his father (*Lk.* 2:41-52).

<sup>26</sup> *Luke* 3:1-4:13.

<sup>27</sup> This is Q<sub>3</sub> in his stratification of the sayings source. John S. Kloppenborg, 'Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q', *HTR* 80 (1987), 287-306.

<sup>28</sup> See Walter Grundmann, Paul Althaus, and Erich Fascher, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. *Evangelium* (Berlin, 1974), 117.

<sup>29</sup> *Luke* 9:51,54; 13:22; 18:31; 19:28.

to understand the expression of setting the face to Jerusalem as a judgment against the Temple hastily connect it with Ezekiel's application for bringing judgment,<sup>30</sup> which is not the case.<sup>31</sup> In the light of the mentioned prophecies Jesus was fulfilling God's visitation to his people and precisely to the Temple.<sup>32</sup> The term ἐπισκοπή is characteristically Lukan where it is also used to identify God's visitation to his people with Jesus' ministry.<sup>33</sup> That visitation (ἐπισκοπή) of God is associated with the visitation of Jesus himself to the Temple in an unmistakable Christological tone, whether in the response of the crowd as in the widow of Nain miracle (*Luke* 7:11-7) or in the final prophetic words Jesus said before his entrance to Jerusalem.<sup>34</sup> Most importantly, the words of Jesus right before his entrance (19:41-4) which declare that it is the things which make for peace (τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην) that Jesus brought with him to the Temple. Jerusalem's failure to recognise these things *and* the visitation of God (οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου), make its destruction imminent.

The scholars who read a negative Temple attitude in *Luke's* work focus on the judgment sayings of *Luke* 11:49-51 and 13:34-5 which depict the Temple as a crime scene that leads to its final abandonment.<sup>35</sup> However, the criticism is addressed against the sacrilegious murderers who profaned the Temple with

<sup>30</sup> See Michael C. McKeever, *Sacred Space and Discursive Field: The Narrative Function of the Temple in Luke-Acts*, Dissertation (California, 1999), 157. He relies on the apparition of this expression in some places in the LXX with the meaning of bringing judgment. See *Jer.* 4:10; *Ez.* 6:2; 13:17 and 21:2-4.

<sup>31</sup> The best representative of this case is McKeever's conjecture that Jesus' positive attitude towards the Samaritans is an indication of his negative attitude to the Temple [See the Good Samaritan parable *Lk.* 10:25-37; the healing of the Lepers has the only grateful one being Samaritan *Lk.* 17:11-9] contradicts his own interpretation of the expression 'set his face toward Jerusalem' because the same Samaritans refused to receive Jesus ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (*Lk.* 9:51-4). If *Luke* meant by this term judgment against the Temple, he would not have used it as an excuse for the Samaritan rejection of Jesus. Hence, both arguments of McKeever cancel each other.

<sup>32</sup> *Luke* 1:68,78; 7:16 and our discussed text 19:44. It should be noted that the theme of God's visitation appears in the Old Testament with two implications: bringing punishment (*Ps.* 88:39; *Sir.* 2:14), or salvation (*Gen.* 50:24-5; *Ex.* 3:16; 4:31; 13:19; 30:12; *Isa.* 23:17). The Lukan Sondergut has only one consistent meaning which is the positive one. See F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (1996), 104-5; Gerd Petzke, *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas* (Zürich, 1990), 173.

<sup>33</sup> *Luke* 1:68, 78; 7:16; 15:14; 19:44; *Acts* 15:14; J. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukas-evangeliums* (1980), 281-2.

<sup>34</sup> *Luke* 19:41-4.

<sup>35</sup> A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (Edinburgh, 1922), 352. See Schulz's statement of what he calls Q's judgment (Gerichtswort): 'Die Stadt als Haus Israels wird von Gott verlassen werden, indem er den Zionstempel als seine Wohnung aufgibt', so Siegfried Schulz, *Q – die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich, 1972), 356; John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent opinion on the people behind the document', *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 1 (1993), 9-34; Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple* (Cambridge, 2016), 105; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1965), 110ff.

the blood of their victims. The Temple was not criticised as an obsolete or a heretical form of worship to be subject to the judgment, but it was the victim of its occupiers. This theme was used in Josephus' rhetoric against the zealots whose crimes eventually brought the destruction of the Temple.<sup>36</sup>

4) The Jerusalem section should actually be called the Temple section because Jesus, unlike other Gospels, remains in the Temple throughout it. A comparison between the Lukan and Markan accounts of Jesus' activity in Jerusalem shows that *Luke* carefully edits his source to ensure that Jesus never leaves the Temple which appears to be his final destination,<sup>37</sup> and bracketed the section with two Lukan additions emphasising that Jesus was everyday in the Temple.<sup>38</sup> In this section Jesus, as Conzelmann correctly states, seems to be claiming the Temple<sup>39</sup> and this brings conflict between him as an authoritative teacher against the Jewish authorities. Jesus' devotion to the Temple then glorifies the God of Israel who comes to his Temple through Jesus' own visitation, as Jesus himself declares in *Luke* 19:41-4. It is also important to note that *Luke* also refuses to sandwich Jesus' brief Temple action by the Markan cursing of the Temple, which was undoubtedly employed by Mark as a criticism of the Temple.<sup>40</sup>

5) In Jesus' trial (*Luke* 23:2), *Luke* does not share the charges found in other synoptic accounts (the charge made against Jesus threatening the Temple<sup>41</sup>), particularly in comparison with the Markan explanatory remarks that reflect his negative views about the Temple 'that is made with hands', being replaced with

<sup>36</sup> From the very beginning of the *Jewish War*, Josephus made his case clear: Josephus' country 'owed its ruin to civil strife' (στάσις οἰκεία), and that it was 'the Jewish tyrants who drew down upon the holy temple the unwilling hands of the Romans' (*B.J.* 1:10-2). The Temple's sancta was profaned by the bloodshed inside it (*B.J.* 2:424, 443-6; 4:314-25, 334-44 *et al.*). Most importantly is his speech to the Zealots in 5:380 in which he explicitly accuses them of polluting the Temple. His conclusion of the consequences of these acts on the Temple is made clear in the last book of *Ant.* 20:165-6, and this clearly squares with *Lk.* 11:49-51.

<sup>37</sup> *Luke* omits *Mark's* account for Jesus' leaving to Bethany twice (*Mk.* 11:11,19), the prophecy of the Temple's destruction is brought inside it by removing the reference to leaving it (*Mk.* 13:1) and the last activity (the third flight to Bethany) in *Mk.* 14:1 is pushed back to 7:36-50.

<sup>38</sup> *Luke* 19:47-48; 21:37-8.

<sup>39</sup> H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (1982), 75. See also Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke* (Atlanta, 1957), 297-8.

<sup>40</sup> *Mk.* 11:16-7 with the cursing of the fig tree 11:12-4 and its interpretation 11:20-5.

<sup>41</sup> It is important to observe that that accusation appears in Marcion's *Evangelion* and several Latin MSS with an extension: καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας. Exegetes either ignored it or dismissed it as a Marcionite interpolation or a harmonisation with *Matth.* 5:17, so Joseph Fitzmeyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (New York, 1981), 1475; F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (1996), 257. However, it is well attested in western manuscripts that are not dependent on Marcion. Further, this is the only Marcionite attestation that is longer than *Luke's* equivalent; Marcion is always shorter and it would be odd to think that he left the entire *Evangelion* without additions except for this verse. Besides, we have no evidence on a Marcionite tendency to harmonise *Luke* with *Matthew*.



another ‘not made with hands’.<sup>42</sup> The offensive term χειροποίητον is well attested in Second Temple writings in which it had a sharply negative connotation.<sup>43</sup>

In the light of this, it is not surprising to see *Luke*’s revision of the Markan eschatology known as the little apocalypse (*Mark* 13) through which *Luke* uses what seems to be a pre-lukan eschatological discourse and avoiding the clear Markan reference to the desecration of the Temple (The Desolating Sacrilege *Mark* 13:14). Since the peace has a cosmic dimension, *Luke* carefully avoids the apocalyptic judgment for a more historical eschatology that would fit the message of the peace just as we saw in his editorial work on the hymns in the infancy section. It would be peculiar to enquire why *Luke* would omit the desecration of the Temple, which was indeed destroyed in 70 AD. *Luke* completed the eschatological shape of the oracle with the Markan insertions. Beside the theological coherence between this unit and *Luke* 19:41-4, as we will see, I confidently join the scholars who think of a single continuous source behind this section *only*.<sup>44</sup> Michael Bachmann’s thesis was one of the strong voices against separating the Temple from Jerusalem in the Lukan theology.<sup>45</sup> While he finds: ‘auffällig ist es ohne jede Frage’ that the Lukan version of the eschatological discourse (*Luke* 21:20-4) shifts the reference from the destruction of the Temple (as in *Mark*) to Jerusalem,<sup>46</sup> he made nothing of it.

The *Gospel* ends with the apostles being continually in the Temple praising God.<sup>47</sup> This ending connects the *Gospel* with the book of *Acts* perfectly. Peter is commissioned by ‘the Lord’ to teach in the Temple<sup>48</sup> and with John they perform healing in the Temple<sup>49</sup> while the apostles are arrested for their ‘many signs’ in the portico of Solomon.<sup>50</sup> The Temple remains as the house of both teaching and prayer even in the existence of the households as places of worship: ‘And every day in the temple and at home they did not cease to teach

<sup>42</sup> *Mk.* 14:58.

<sup>43</sup> For example see Philo’s *Legat.* 292; *Sib.Or.* 4, 6-11 and *2Baruch* 4:2-7.

<sup>44</sup> Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford, 1926). *Id.*, ‘A Cry from the Siege: a Suggestion Regarding a Non-Markan Oracle Embedded in Luke xxi 20-36’, *JTS* 26 (1925), 136-44; Charles H. Dodd, ‘The Fall of Jerusalem and the “Abomination of Desolation”’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947), 47-54; Paul Winter, ‘The treatment of his sources by the third evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV’, *Studia Theologica – Nordic Journal of Theology* 8 (1954), 138-72; Marie-Émile Boismard, *En Quête du Proto-Luke* (Paris, 1997); W. Nicol, ‘Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21’, *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973), 61-71; François Bovon, ‘Le récit Lucanien de la Passion’, in C. Focant (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (Leuven, 1993), 393-423; Thomas W. Manson, *Sayings of Jesus* (London, 1949); Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another* (Leiden, 1970); J. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg, 1977), 561; G. Schneider, *Lukas* (1984), 423. T. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff* (Cambridge, 1971), 178-80.

<sup>45</sup> M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel* (1980).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 135.

<sup>47</sup> *Luke* 24:53.

<sup>48</sup> *Acts* 5:20, see also 3:11-26.

<sup>49</sup> *Acts* 3:1-10.

<sup>50</sup> *Acts* 5:12-6.

and proclaim Jesus as the Messiah'.<sup>51</sup> Paul's arrest was due to his act of bringing gentiles to the Temple in a clear Isaianic eschatological image.<sup>52</sup> There, he himself shaves his head, presents his offerings<sup>53</sup> and, upon his arrest, he defends himself by saying that he in no way spoke against the Temple.<sup>54</sup> Thus, ritual piety extends to the early Church. Most importantly, Paul defended himself against the Jewish accusations, we mentioned before, by affirming his belief in 'the God of our ancestors' (*Acts* 24:14) and in his final speech he makes it clear that he 'had done nothing against our people or the customs of our ancestors'.<sup>55</sup>

In his double work, *Luke* offered an image of Christianity that emerges within the womb of Israel and lives in its commitment to the Temple, whether in the life and ministry of Jesus himself or his movement. Despite the destruction of the Temple, *Luke*, like post-destruction Jewish literature, preserves the admiration and respect of the Temple, not as an obsolete symbol that belongs to the past but also as a target for the eschatological hope realised in the life of the post-Easter community. To achieve this, *Luke* carefully redacted his sources and rooted the beginning of the *Gospel* (by adding the infancy section) as well as the experience of the first community (in *Acts*) in the Temple.

### Lukan Characteristic Language

But why was *Luke* keen on delivering such an image of the Temple? This requires a wider search for the possible historical circumstances that might have driven him to deliver this image as a message for his addressee(s). In the following section, I will aim to show what evidence could help us to see the nature of the rhetoric in which this Temple image was part of. There are three observations that could build a case for *Luke's* intention to address Imperial ideology through his Temple attitude. Testing the Temple notions in *Luke-Acts* leads us to three major observations that are peculiarly Lukan and have resonance in the Imperial Cult.

1. The Temple scenes in *Luke* are associated with Jesus as the *Kurios* who fulfils the virtue of *Pietas*.
2. Throughout the double work, the Temple is associated with the special Lukan term 'customs' (τὰ ἔθη).
3. *Luke* introduces the Temple as a model for 'Peace and Concord', against the model of 'Sedition' of the opponents. 1*Clement* also provides an example on how such a model is maintained.

<sup>51</sup> πᾶσαν τε ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ κατ' οἶκον οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, *Acts* 5:42; see also *Acts* 2:46-7b.

<sup>52</sup> *Acts* 21:30. See *Isa.* 42:6; 49:6,22 *et al.*

<sup>53</sup> *Acts* 21:26; 24:18.

<sup>54</sup> *Acts* 25:8.

<sup>55</sup> *Acts* 28:17.

*First Observation*

The first two chapters show the strongest devotion to the Temple of Jerusalem. Yet, the Temple scenes are interwoven with allusions to the Imperial Cult that cannot be explained otherwise. *Luke* carefully edited his sources to provide us with the same features of the *Pax Romana*, with resonance in *1Clement* as well. This is obvious in announcements of both Mary's *Magnificat* and, later, Simeon's canticle. The God of Israel is praised for his final salvation,<sup>56</sup> which launches the dawn<sup>57</sup> of a new age of peace,<sup>58</sup> social justice<sup>59</sup> and Messianic reign.<sup>60</sup> Most importantly, this view is not an innovation, but *Luke* was keen on rooting it in antiquity.<sup>61</sup> These eschatological elements comprise the *Gospel* which was announced inside the Temple.<sup>62</sup> The deliberate inclusion of Augustus' name in the narrative<sup>63</sup> and the angelic announcement to the shepherds which are loaded with references connecting Jesus with Augustus<sup>64</sup> should also draw our attention to what context his Temple piety is read within. Since *Luke*'s intention to bring Augustus into his narrative is obvious, this should also lead us to think of Jesus' divine sonship (by the virtue of his birth, not his ministry<sup>65</sup>) to have Augustus' own birth as the closest parallel that could come to the Roman reader's mind.<sup>66</sup> The second and third Temple scenes in the infancy

<sup>56</sup> Zechariah *Lk.* 1:68b,71, 77; Mary *Lk.* 1:54-5; Simeon *Lk.* 2:30; *1Clem.* 60.3.

<sup>57</sup> Zechariah *Lk.* 1:78 (ἀνατολή); *1Clem.* 60.4.

<sup>58</sup> Zechariah *Lk.* 1:79b; Simeon *Lk.* 2:29; the angels *Lk.* 2:45; *1Clem.* 60-1.

<sup>59</sup> Mary *Lk.* 1:51-3; *1Clem.* 59.3. On the *Magnificat* see Allen Brent, *Imperial Cult* (Leiden, 1999), 98-9.

<sup>60</sup> Zechariah *Lk.* 1:69; Gabriel to Mary *Lk.* 1:34-5; the angels to the shepherds *Lk.* 2:11; Simeon *Lk.* 2:29-32; *1Clem.* 59.3, 60.3, 20.11.

<sup>61</sup> Zechariah *Lk.* 1:70; Mary *Lk.* 1:55; *1Clem.* 23.3, 30.7, 60.4.

<sup>62</sup> The angel's key statement in verse 19 is redacted to include the important verb (εὐαγγελίσασθαι) in its middle voice which he will use frequently later. It appears only in *Luke Acts* (23 times).

<sup>63</sup> *Luke* 2:1. The lack of evidence on such a universal census strongly suggests *Luke*'s intention to include Augustus' name for a reason other than history.

<sup>64</sup> *Luke* 2:8-14; The angel announces the Evangelion (εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν) of the birth of the σωτήρ, κύριος (and the υἱὸς θεοῦ in 1:34) who brings εἰρήνη for the οἰκουμένη (2:1). The latter is clearly defined by *Luke* as the Roman Empire (*Acts* 11:28). These have striking parallels with the imperial cult. See particularly the Priene inscription as published in W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae, Supplementum Sylloges inscriptionum graecarum* (Leipzig, 1905), vol. 2, 48-60. See F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (1996), 83; G. Schneider, *Lukas* (1984), 65-6; John M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London, 1930), 35-6; see K. Wengst, *Pax Romana* (1987), 103-4.

<sup>65</sup> A. Brent, *Imperial Cult* (1999), 96-7 shows that not every exegesis on the same scripture leads to such a striking similarity with imperial cult. Hence, *Luke*'s Divine sonship differs significantly from *Matthew*'s which is not by the virtue of miraculous birth. Hence see John Nolland, 'No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25', *JSNT* 62 (1996), 3-12.

<sup>66</sup> *Aug.* 94:4; see also Dio 45.1.2: ὅτι ἡ Ἀττία δεινῶς ἰσχυρίζετο ἐκ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος αὐτὸν κεκυηκέναι; several scholars went to suggest Egypt legends (Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.* 12, 355 e); Creed and Bovon rely on H. Gressmann, *Das Weihnachtsevangelium auf Ursprung und Geschichte untersucht* (Göttingen, 1914).

narratives<sup>67</sup> continue the theme of piety in keeping the customs and unfolding the allusions to the Imperial Cult. The finding of boy Jesus in the Temple has the best parallel in Augustus' finding in the Temple at the same age and with the same message which identifies the sonship in the Temple of his Father.<sup>68</sup> The relationship between Jesus' mission as the κύριος who brings God to his Temple is not far from Augustus' mission to restore Jupiter's worship back to his restored temples. The association of Jesus as the Lord who performs the last divine visitation to the Temple is also shared with 1*Clement*.<sup>69</sup>

Similar to *Luke*'s Christologised visitation, Augustus' divinity was developed in his devotion to Jupiter's glory: from the exceptional offerings he made at the restored Capitoline temple which revived the Secular Games onwards.<sup>70</sup> However, the most interesting feature is the fact that both *Kurioi* (Jesus and Augustus) identify their mission with bringing peace to their temples. It is difficult to extract the Temple from the Lukan references to the Imperial Cult and therefore it is legitimate to ask whether his insistence to show Jesus and his family in their *Tempelfrömmigkeit* being part of his programme to interact with the Roman cultic piety.

*Pietas* is not simply a moral virtue, but it had a larger set of elements making it one of the most prominent Roman virtues that should be acquired by the Roman citizen as well as the Emperor. According to Cicero's classic definition, *Pietas* is the loyalty towards the fatherland, the parents and blood-related people.<sup>71</sup> However, *Pietas* could be expanded towards unwavering loyalty to the gods and emperors as we find it in Suetonius and Tacitus respectively.<sup>72</sup> Whether the one is an average Roman citizen, a noble or the Emperor himself, he is expected to show *Pietas* as an expression of mindfulness and goodness, and this could be manifested in the respect offered to the Temples. In his final work, known as *Res Gestae*, in which he enlists his accomplishments shortly

<sup>67</sup> *Luke* 2:21-38, 41-52.

<sup>68</sup> In search for similar stories, scholars suggested examples from the Greco-Roman world beside Philo's account of Moses' childhood and Josephus' own story, and went as far as Buddha, for example Alexander (Plut., *Alex.* 5), or Apollonius (Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* I 7), Philo's *Vita Mos.* 1, Josephus' *Vita* 2. See the suggestions of J.M. Creed, *Luke* (1930), 44-5; Walter Radl, *Der Ursprung Jesu* (Wien, 1996), 257. On its biographical form see F. Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (1996), 154. However, if *Luke*'s story hinges on the Temple and divine sonship as we illustrated earlier, then Augustus' story fits the bill (Suet., *Aug.* 94.8; Loeb's Latin text and translation, 268-71). Another version of the story appears in Dio., *Hist.* 45.2:3-4. In fact the 12 years old Augustus gave the oration of his mother's funeral, according to Suet., *Aug.* 8.

<sup>69</sup> See 1*Clem.* 29.3; 50.3 where he christologises the visitation (τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς), which is a feature only found in *Luke* as said before (see fn. 32 above).

<sup>70</sup> Suet., *Aug.* 30.2, see also *Res Gestae* 21.2. On how he became associated with Jupiter see Horace's *Odes* III 5:1-4, Manilius 1.9.916, Ovid, *Tristia* V 2:25-50 and later coinage (see D. Fishwick, 'On the Temple of Divus "Augustus"', *Phoenix* 46 [1992], 232-55).

<sup>71</sup> *De Inventione* II 66. See also Gertrude Emilie, 'Cicero and the Roman Pietas', *The Classical Journal* 39 (1944), 536-42.

<sup>72</sup> Suet., *Vit.* 3; Tac., *Ann.* III 53.

before his death, Augustus Caesar concludes with the golden shield which bore an inscription of the four virtues of courage, clemency, justice and *Pietas*. This shield was presented to him by the senate in acknowledgement of what he achieved in his rule.<sup>73</sup> This is what we find throughout that book. Augustus identifies *Pietas* as the devotion to ancient temples, respect to the ancestors and preserving their customs.<sup>74</sup> As for the devotion to ancient temples, Augustus was keen to show his conservative approach by restoring ancient temples that were destroyed, founding new ones to commemorate ancient traditions and declaring the climactic achievement of his career there. The temple is where the ultimate message of the *PAX* is declared. Augustus' interest to declare his greatest accomplishment, that is peace, was through the symbolic act of shutting the Temple of Janus Quirinus.<sup>75</sup> Intertwining both concepts: legitimacy through allegiance to the cult of the ancestors and celebrating peace, Augustus' name was included to the hymn of the Salii: an ancient hymn by the so-called 'leaping priests'.<sup>76</sup> This particular hymn was sung for the safety and peace of Rome.<sup>77</sup>

His particular interest in relating himself to Jupiter made him found three temples on his name and to restore the Capitoline in the occasions of his successive victories and pacification of the different areas in the Empire.<sup>78</sup> Hence Horace explains the Roman worldview by associating the satisfaction of the gods in the temples with peace in the age of Augustus,<sup>79</sup> while Livy describes him as 'the founder and restorer of all the temples' (Livy IV 20). His religious devotion went as far as to become the Augur, the *Pontificex* and the *quindecimviri*, the chief supervisor over foreign cults as well.<sup>80</sup> His evolving divinity is a consequence to his special relationship with Jupiter who apparently receives most dedication in Augustus' restoration of his temples and ancient cultic practices that were long lost.<sup>81</sup>

One of Augustus' most important deeds on this matter was showing his piety against the impiety of his enemies. Augustus replaced the ornaments despoiled

<sup>73</sup> *Res Gestae* 34.

<sup>74</sup> *Res Gestae* 34. Interestingly, a copy of the shield (*clupeus virtutis* of Arles) explicitly dated to 26 BCE (when Augustus was appointed consul for the eighth time) adds further that his piety was shown to the gods and country: '*pietatis erga Deos patriamque*'; see A. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge, 2009), 266-7. This addition shows how piety is addressed towards the realms of politics and religion.

<sup>75</sup> *Res Gestae* 13; Livy, *Hist.* 1.19; Horace, *Odes* IV 15.9.

<sup>76</sup> *Res Gestae* 10.

<sup>77</sup> P. Brunt's commentary, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford, 1969), 52.

<sup>78</sup> *Res Gestae* 19-20.

<sup>79</sup> *Odes* III 6.

<sup>80</sup> *Res Gestae* 7. See P. Brunt, *Res Gestae* (1969), 48-9.

<sup>81</sup> *Res Gestae* 8.

from the Temple of Asia Minor by his ‘adversary’ with new ones.<sup>82</sup> Surviving Greek inscriptions suggest that it was forbidden by law to confiscate anything from ‘public or sacred places in cities or in the territory of a city in every province’<sup>83</sup> and that whoever is in charge of the province must provide replacements for these lost vessels. This inscription shows that the piety and respect for the temples is not just a Roman imperial law but reflects a culture that includes all recognised sanctuaries – and they are specific ones – not imperial ones only (another part of the inscription in Latin shows how the magistrates of Cyrene in Aeolis were required to restore a shrine of Dionysius for a local-cult).<sup>84</sup> This culture of *Pietas* is expected to be appreciated regardless of the political stance of the evangelist. Indeed, *Luke* introduced Jesus’ life and ministry in a way that fulfils Roman *Pietas*.

### *Second observation*

Throughout the double work, *Luke* associates the term ‘customs’ with the Temple. This term is peculiarly Lukan. It appears 13 times in the New Testament, including 10 times in *Luke-Acts*.<sup>85</sup> But the more important fact is that the term appears only once in the Septuagint.<sup>86</sup> *Luke*, who is known to be loyal to the Septuagintal vocabulary chose to use this biblical *hapax legomenon* frequently in his expression of Christian piety. Further, looking outside the Jewish bible, we see little reference to it in rabbinic literature.<sup>87</sup> We start to see the term being used by a Jew in Josephus’ apologetic works addressed to the Romans, in which he defends the Jewish customs.<sup>88</sup> For Josephus, preserving Sabbath customs means preserving the ancestral laws (τὸν πατριον νόμον),<sup>89</sup> while keeping the Sabbath is appreciation of the ancestral customs (τὸν πατριῶν ἐθῶν).<sup>90</sup> The term ‘ancestral customs’ appears only in the book

<sup>82</sup> *Res Gestae* 8.

<sup>83</sup> Henri W. Pleket, *Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden* (Leiden, 1958), 49-50. See also K.M.T. Atkinson, *Revue Internationale des droits de l’antiquité*, 3<sup>e</sup> ser. VII (1960), 227.

<sup>84</sup> J.A. Crook, ‘An Augustan Inscription in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden’, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 8 (1962), 23-9.

<sup>85</sup> *Luke* 1:9; 2:42; 4:16; 22:39; *Acts* 6:14; 15:1; 16:21; 17:2; 21:21; 24:4; 25:16; 26:3; 28:17; see J. Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (1980), 29.

<sup>86</sup> *IV Macc.* 18:5 as part of the letter of the gentile Antiochus V.

<sup>87</sup> Zeev W. Falk, *Introduction to Jewish law of the second Commonwealth* 1 (Leiden a.o., 1971), 15-8; S. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge, 1983), 1-11.

<sup>88</sup> It appears in his works 166 times [S. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (1983), 6]. Josephus promised to provide an entire work (he did not survive to meet his promise) on the *Customs and Causes* which reflects his interest on this matter (*Bell.* V 237; *Ant.* IV 198).

<sup>89</sup> *B.J.* 2.392-3.

<sup>90</sup> *B.J.* 4.102.

of *Acts* as we saw earlier.<sup>91</sup> While the Lukan Paul used it in an apologetic context, Josephus mainly used it in addressing the Roman authorities to show the imperial right for the Jews to practise their ‘ancestral customs’.<sup>92</sup>

In the light of these points, it is right to look for an explanation to *Luke*’s frequent usage of the term in relation to the Imperial Cult. Here also the image of Augustus appears vividly. This particular expression of ‘the customs of our ancestors’ is a key one in Augustus’ *apologia* in defending his right to earn the virtue of *Pietas* in his *Res Gestae*. Being asked for handling the post of the supervisor of the law and morals without a colleague, he was reluctant to accept it because he saw that this new supreme authority could be inconsistent with ‘the customs of our ancestors’.<sup>93</sup> Historically, both Suetonios<sup>94</sup> and Dio<sup>95</sup> affirm Augustus’ acceptance of this position (around 19 BCE), which leads us to think that Augustus in this passage mainly wanted to emphasise his allegiance to ‘the customs of our ancestors *more maiorum*’. He says that via the new laws proposed by him he ‘brought back into use many exemplary practices of our ancestors (*exempla maiorum*) which were disappearing in our time’.<sup>96</sup> Not only in cultic matters but also in politics; Augustus shows that he had to change a decision that could have glorified him (which is taking over Armenia), preferring to follow the ‘example of our ancestors (*maiorum nostro exemplo*)’.<sup>97</sup> Augustus also stated how he pacified the land and the sea, and hence the doors of the temple of Janus Quirinus were shut thrice in his age while they were shut twice only before him.<sup>98</sup> Again, he presents his distinguished accomplishment to be in accordance with the will of ‘our ancestors (*maiores nostri*)’.<sup>99</sup> This form of piety must have been part of the Roman ethical code and not only of politics. To provide a culture that could be accommodated in Rome without offending its sensibilities, Christianity must have found the ancestral customs as an important matter to be dealt with. It is striking to see that not only Paul of *Acts* defended his affiliation to the Jewish ancestral customs,<sup>100</sup> but it was also the Roman customs that were Paul’s protective shield from the assault of his opponents. This appears in the explicit accusation made against Paul and Silas in Philippi: ‘These men are disturbing our city; they are Jews and are

<sup>91</sup> *Acts* 28:17.

<sup>92</sup> *Ant.* 14.213-6, 245-6; 16.171-6; 19.283-90, 306-11 – Piety: *Ant.* XVI 43-7. Interestingly, the Slavonic addition no.12 describes Jesus as a man who ‘did not obey the Law and kept not the Sabbath according to our *ancestral customs*’.

<sup>93</sup> *Res Gestae* 6.2.

<sup>94</sup> *Aug.* 27.

<sup>95</sup> *Historia* LIV 10:5.

<sup>96</sup> *Res Gestae* 8.5.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.* 27.2.

<sup>98</sup> Livy I 19; Horace IV 15:9.

<sup>99</sup> 13.

<sup>100</sup> *Acts* 28:17.

advocating customs that are not lawful for us as Romans to adopt or observe'.<sup>101</sup> The accusation here puts Paul's 'proclamation' as a violation of the 'customs of the Romans'. As in the case of Jesus,<sup>102</sup> the accusation is positioned in the scene in a way that the reader can easily infer its falsehood, yet it is of great importance for *Luke* to refute the idea of seeing Christianity as a peace disturbing (ἐκταράσσουσιν) new or anti-Roman cult.<sup>103</sup> Not only Paul does not offend 'the Roman customs', it is the 'Roman custom' (ἔθος Ῥωμαίους)<sup>104</sup> that is appealing to Caesar (Σεβαστός) which saved him from the Jewish rulers.

### Third observation

We also observed that the image of Christians in the Temple was introduced using two unique themes: peace and concord. For the latter *Luke* used a characteristic term: ὁμοθυμαδόν.<sup>105</sup> It expresses consensus in Josephus.<sup>106</sup> *Dio Cassius* registers the unanimous agreement of the senate members who voted 'in one accord for peace' with the Carthaginians.<sup>107</sup> However, *Luke* contrasts the state of the Christians in the Temple (εἰρήνη<sup>108</sup> and ὁμοθυμαδόν<sup>109</sup>) with the state of the Jewish factions: sedition and insurrection (στάσις), which appears

<sup>101</sup> Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες, καὶ ἔθῃ ἂ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν Ῥωμαίοις οὕσιν, *Acts* 16:20b-21. Paul's activity does not lead to such an accusation; Paul exorcised a slave-girl which led the owners to this hostility (16:11-40). Further, the remark Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες does not also offend the Roman customs since Judaism was a legitimate religion. Several scholars acknowledge the difficulty to find an easy solution. See Frederick F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Michigan, 1988), 362; J. Rolof, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1981), 246; Daniel Schwartz, 'The Accusation and the Accusers at Philippi (*Acts* 16,20-21)', *Biblica* 65 (1984), 357-63. Other suggestions such as considering the accusation being made against the practice of magic (exorcism), C.S. de Vos, 'Finding a Charge That Fits: the Accusation Against Paul and Silas at Philippi (*Acts* 16.19-21)', *JSNT* 74 (1999), 51-63 is unconvincing since the charge is made against 'the proclamation καταγγέλλουσιν' of Paul, not the exorcism. It appears to me that *Luke* aimed to show how the accusation was entirely baseless and that it was purely motivated by envy rather than any solid observation. As far as we are concerned, *Luke* aimed to address the problem of Christianity and Roman customs with the intention to deem the idea of setting the first against the latter as false insinuation.

<sup>102</sup> *Luke* 23:1-5.

<sup>103</sup> See A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford, 1963), 79-80. Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1998), 587-8: 'Luke so formulates the charge that Paul and Silas can easily repudiate it. The charge, however, raises a question about the legitimacy of Christianity then in the Roman Empire: was it *religio licita*?' On the problem of introducing a new cult see Cicero, *De legibus* 2.8.19; Dio Cassius, *History* 57.18.5; 67.14.2.

<sup>104</sup> *Acts* 25:16.

<sup>105</sup> Out of 12 times in the New Testament, it appears 11 times in *Luke-Acts*: *Lk.* 14:32; *Acts* 1:14; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12; 7:57; 8:6; 12:20; 15:25; 18:12; 19:29.

<sup>106</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.* 15.277 and *Apion* 1.241-2.

<sup>107</sup> Dio Cassius *History* 17.57[83]-8.

<sup>108</sup> *Acts* 9:35.

<sup>109</sup> *Acts* 1:14; 2:46 (προσκορτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδόν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ); 4:24; 5:12 (καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν ἅπαντες ἐν τῇ Στοῶν Σολομῶντος); see also 15:25 *et al.*



7 times in *Luke-Acts* out of the 8 times in the NT.<sup>110</sup> This appears in the image of the Pharisees and Sadducees being in the state of *στάσις* against each other when Paul tactically raises the resurrection issue amongst them and the insurrection even goes to the level of violence.<sup>111</sup> *Luke* does not leave the reader unaware of the consequence of this term. On the lips of the town clerk, the Ephesian mob are ‘in a real danger of being charged with rioting’ (*στάσεως*).<sup>112</sup> The Jewish leaders who met Felix accused Paul of stirring the Jews (*στάσεις πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις*),<sup>113</sup> in an attempt to win Felix on their side. Paul also denied that particular charge in the Temple.<sup>114</sup>

It is also important to observe that *Luke* uses this term to express the nature of dispute (*στάσεως*) of Barnabas and Paul with Jewish Christians<sup>115</sup> which was resolved by the council of Jerusalem that restored the state of concord (*γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν*).<sup>116</sup> This clear contrast between the two terms, with the legal understanding of *στάσις* leads us to understand that the *ὁμοθυμαδόν* should also be understood in the Roman context of stability and consensus as expressed in their attendance in the Temple and announced in the council of Jerusalem.

The contrast between the two terms is not unusual in the Roman world.<sup>117</sup> Most importantly is seeing this contrast as a quality of Caesar, whether it was Julius,<sup>118</sup> or the later achievement of Augustus who restored the ancestral ‘peace and harmony’ with no local ‘sedition’ to be reported in Rome.<sup>119</sup> This contrast also becomes the defining terms which stabilise the Greek islands under Rome.<sup>120</sup>

### ***Luke-Acts and 1Clement***

*Luke’s* post-destruction allegiance to the Temple is only found in *1Clement*. Clement of Rome’s letter shows admiration of the Temple as the manifestation of Divine order granted to the people of Israel. For *1Clement*, Israel is not to

<sup>110</sup> *Luke* 23:19, 25; *Acts* 15:2; 19:40; 23:7, 10; 24:5. Hence it is agreed that it is a characteristic of *Luke*. M.E. Boismard, *Le Texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1984); Adelbert Denaux, Hellen Mardaga, and R. Corstjens (eds.), *The Vocabulary of Luke* (Leuven, 2009), 567-8.

<sup>111</sup> *Acts* 23:7,10.

<sup>112</sup> *Acts* 19:40: κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως.

<sup>113</sup> *Acts* 24:5.

<sup>114</sup> *Acts* 24:12: οὔτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εἶδρόν με πρὸς τινα διαλεγόμενον ἢ ἐπίστασιν ποιούντα ὄχλου.

<sup>115</sup> *Acts* 15:2.

<sup>116</sup> *Acts* 15:25.

<sup>117</sup> See Diod. Sic. 3.64.7 in which Dionysius demolishes *στάσεων* and restores *ὁμόνοιαν* καὶ πολλήν εἰρήνην. See 12.35.1-3; 29.19.1 *et al.* Also Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 2.76.3. For more examples see O. Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, WUNT 143 (Tübingen, 1998), 86-91.

<sup>118</sup> Dio Cassius, *Hist.* 44.1-2,24.2-3.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.* 53.8.2.

<sup>120</sup> Dio Chrys., *Or.* 38-9; see Bakke, *Concord and Peace* (1998), 88-9.

be replaced by the Christian covenant, but it is the same covenant for the people God elects to become the shrine of the world, and whose Temple will see the visitation and the return of the Messiah.<sup>121</sup> Thus, we find no supersessionist gestures in the letter.<sup>122</sup> Despite his reverence of Paul and his *First Letter to the Corinthians*, Clement refuses to employ the Pauline images of the Temple as a community<sup>123</sup> or as an individual,<sup>124</sup> which could have served his case, if he was introducing a new form of post-Judaism existence. His knowledge of *Hebrews* must have also informed him with the allegorical image of the Temple of Jerusalem as a shadow of the real Temple in heaven.<sup>125</sup> Yet he also refrained from it, avoiding any statement that could compromise the validity of the Temple of Jerusalem as a reality for his community. The apocalyptic terror-free eschatology that resembles *Luke*'s hosts the expectation of Jesus' return to the Temple. The Lukan characteristic term (ἐπισκοπή) appears in *1Clement*<sup>126</sup> in the same sense of *Luke-Acts*, against the classic apocalyptic sense in *1Peter* 2:12. In *Clement* it bears the same concrete concept of the visitation in *Luke* (amending the concept of visitation in *Mal.* 3:1-3): the visitation of God through Jesus (Christologised) which brings peace, not apocalyptic judgment as in *1Peter*, and ends in the Temple.<sup>127</sup> This is what makes Knoch reluctant to connect *1Clem.* 50:3 with *1Peter* 2:12.<sup>128</sup> After exhorting his addressees for an inclusive unity that sustains the weak and the strong together,<sup>129</sup> the variety of spiritual gifts<sup>130</sup> and the financial difference,<sup>131</sup> *Clement* derives the Temple of

<sup>121</sup> See *1Clem.* 29-30.

<sup>122</sup> I fully agree with James Carleton Paget's recent publication on this point. J.C. Paget, '1 Clement, Judaism, and the Jews', *Early Christianity* 8 (2017), 218-50.

<sup>123</sup> *1Cor.* 3:16-7. The Temple-as-community image is not necessarily a pure Christian innovation. Its limited existence could be attested to in IQS. column VIII as a description of the *עצת היחד* and probably in the DSS community, Paul Swarup, *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community* (London, 2006), 171. This is not far from the conclusions in Judith L. Wentling, 'Unravelling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community', *Revue de Qumran* 53 (1989), 61-73. The *Epistle of Barnabas* was also aware of that imagery without the knowledge of Paul, see *Barnabas* 4:11. However, since *1Clement* knew of *1Corinthians* and used it, it is safe to conclude that he knew of the imagery and ignored it.

<sup>124</sup> *1Cor.* 6:19-20.

<sup>125</sup> *Heb.* 9:20-1.

<sup>126</sup> *1Clem.* 50.3.

<sup>127</sup> This hope in the Lord's return to the Temple can be seen in *Clement*'s redaction of *Isa.* 13:22b and *Mal.* 3:1b in *1Clem.* 23. He changed the present *ἐρχεται* to the future *ἔξει* and connected *κύριος* with *ἄγιος* with one relative clause in order to Christologise it; Harnack observes it as an 'absichtliche Korrektur (Christus ist höher als die Engel)' *Einführung*, 111. See also Horacio Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (Göttingen, 1998), 293.

<sup>128</sup> Otto Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes* (Hanstein, 1964), 175-7.

<sup>129</sup> Which reminds us of the same duality in *Rom.* 14:1,13,19; 15:1-2,5-7 and reflected the tension between Jewish and gentile forms of Christian communities.

<sup>130</sup> Which is also found in *1Cor.*

<sup>131</sup> *1Clem.* 36-9.

Jerusalem and its divinely instated worship as an evidence for God's will of this unity.

Chapter 40 shows Clement's understanding of hierarchical order as an order of ranks (προστάγμασιν),<sup>132</sup> just like the Roman political structure, while Chapter 41 offers a solid argument for following unity and order in worship which appeals to the divine system of worship as manifest in the Temple of Jerusalem:

In good conscience, brethren, let each one of us in his own rank become pleasing to God, and not transgress his assigned liturgical canons, but keeping them in all reverence. Not in every place, brethren, are the daily sacrifices or the free-willing offerings, or the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings offered, but only in Jerusalem; and not in every spot (place) offers are made, but before the shrine (Temple), at the altar, being inspected (for blemishes) by the high priest and the previously mentioned ministers (liturgists).<sup>133</sup>

This part of his argument limits the legitimate liturgical service to a specific place: the Temple of Jerusalem. The service is also officiated and the offers are inspected by the high priest, assisted by other priests. The authority of the Temple's τοπος is the core of the evidence: it is not anywhere or by anyone the offer could be presented legitimately.

The reference to the role of the high priests who inspects the validity of the sacrifice also implies the apostolic authority granted to the bishops who validate worship. The validity of Clement's argument hinges on the validity of the worship in the Temple of Jerusalem as God's will, which was not superseded by the Christian church. Since there is no evidence on supersessionism or any allegorical exegesis (as in *Hebrews*), this analogy shows that the Temple cult remained as an authoritative example of God's will regardless of its destruction.<sup>134</sup> Thus, Christians in Corinth are not called to look at the Temple of Jerusalem as a copy or a symbol of a higher reality as in *Hebrews* but as a reality in its own which manifests the genuine will of God which should be enacted. As H. Lona puts it: 'The reality of Jerusalem and its Temple grows immeasurably, when it cannot be measured by any existing parameter'.<sup>135</sup>

<sup>132</sup> 1Clem. 40.5, see also 1Clem. 37.3.

<sup>133</sup> Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐαριστεῖτω τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὀρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. 2. οὐπανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ ἢ εὐχῶν ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ πλημμελεία. ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κάκει δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν.

<sup>134</sup> See Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York, 1983), 170; Johannes Kleivinghaus, *Die Theologie Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (Gütersloh, 1948), 65-6.

<sup>135</sup> H. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (1998), 440: 'Die Wirklichkeit Jerusalems und seines Tempels wächst ins Unermessliche, wenn sie an keinem real existierenden Parameter mehr gemessen werden kann.'

But in what context does 1Clement provide his Temple rhetoric? *Pietas* appears throughout the epistle as the goal for his arguments that include allegiance to the Temple. It is the piety of Christ that the author reminds his Corinthian addressees of.<sup>136</sup> It is also the concluding goal of the epistle.<sup>137</sup> The concept of piety as a Roman virtue appears in his prayer for God to grant, twice, the Roman rulers harmony and peace (ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην),<sup>138</sup> whereas he prays for God to lead them to administer in piety (διέποντες εὐσεβῶς).<sup>139</sup> Within this context the Temple functions as a model that corresponds to the Roman structure of ranks as part of Clement's argument for a Christianity that appreciates the Roman empire and respects the Roman values. Clement calls allegiance to this ancient system of Temple worship as respect 'of our forefathers/ancestors',<sup>140</sup> calling it pious (ᾠσιος)<sup>141</sup> and warning his addressees from thinking that the Christian hierarchical system is a novelty: τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς.<sup>142</sup>

With the religious laws that control public and private services, this rhetoric is understandable as a legitimization process.<sup>143</sup> Another factor for a successful religion in the state lies in its ability to introduce its God with open access to the material world and to be publicly worshipped without barriers and this is achieved by adapting an institutional structure acceptable to the city's senate (in Rome), as Ando puts it: 'The institutional structures of such cults need not be heterologous with the social and political structures of the poleis in which they are practised',<sup>144</sup> regardless of its theological ideas about the invisible. The late republican works of Cicero and Varro confirm the distinction between religious order (*praxis*) and theology (*religiones*),<sup>145</sup> and hence an eastern religion could survive, if it could integrate itself into the city. It is important to observe, how the state and religious rite were both founded together according to Cicero, which has become a principle for justifying Augustus' adoption of

<sup>136</sup> 1Clem. 1.2.

<sup>137</sup> 1Clem. 59.3-61.3.

<sup>138</sup> 1Clem. 60.4; 61.1.

<sup>139</sup> 1Clem. 61.2.

<sup>140</sup> 1Clem. 23.3; 30.7; 60.4; 62.2.

<sup>141</sup> 1Clem. 40.3 [lit. pious manner].

<sup>142</sup> 1Clem. 42.5.

<sup>143</sup> Cicero's important definition (*De legibus* 2.8.19) has anchored the regulations of dealing with foreign cult. See Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich, 1902). In the Christian case particularly, Clifford Ando provides a host of patristic references to support the inference that earliest Christians must have understood the divine will for the coming of Jesus in a unified empire under Augustus to prepare it for the unifying message of Christianity. Clifford Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Los Angeles, 2000), 48 n. 148. I find his hypothesis justifiable in the case of *Luke-Acts* and 1Clement who showed the tendency to spread in the *oikomenē* of Rome as we saw before.

<sup>144</sup> C. Ando, 'A Religion for the Empire', in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image and Text*, eds. A. Boyle and W. Dominik (Leiden, 2003), 329.

<sup>145</sup> Varro, *Ant. div. frag.* 2a, 3; Cicero's *De natura deorum* 3.5.

the most prestigious religious posts.<sup>146</sup> Therefore, 1*Clement*'s analogy between the Temple and the organisation of the Church reflects a hierarchical order in which he needed to add a layer (λαϊκός) in his Temple order to perfectly match the Roman order. Here, the Temple service and its hierarchical order becomes the manifestation of the Divine will<sup>147</sup> which is also manifest in the Roman military order.

Most importantly, outside *Luke-Acts* the contrast between harmony and sedition and the role of the Temple in it is uniquely found (in Christian literature) in 1*Clement*. Clement sets out the antonym relationship between δμόνοια and στάσις throughout the letter.<sup>148</sup> He clearly sets out his worldview in relation to the concept of Imperial Peace. This is referred to in his doxology to the Roman Empire in chapters 60-1 and his frequent prayers for the typically Imperial formula: Peace and Concord (εἰρήνη καὶ δμόνοια) which is frequently attested in the epistle,<sup>149</sup> in contrast with στάσις which Clement warns the Corinthians against.<sup>150</sup> It is that εἰρήνη καὶ δμόνοια which bring cosmic stability (Chapter 20) by following God's will manifested in the structure of the Temple cult. After giving models that correspond to God's will (including the Roman army structure 37:2-4) he explains God's will in the structure of the sacrificial and hierarchical systems of the Temple as the model to be followed by Christians.<sup>151</sup> Hence, the Temple becomes the embodiment of the hierarchical system that guarantees εἰρήνη καὶ δμόνοια against the στάσις detected in the Corinthian ecclesiastical alternative. This is a clear analogy to the Roman system which Clement alludes to in Chapter 37.<sup>152</sup> This leads us to enquire whether 1*Clement* could offer us a model that would make our case for the Lukan interest in Imperial Cult plausible.

1*Clement* helps us to acknowledge two important issues related to *Luke-Acts*: First, the destruction of the Temple did not hinder some Christians, as in Rome, to look at the Temple of Jerusalem as the source of legitimacy and hope. Secondly, we note the fusion of the Temple as a model of piety and order with the Imperial Ideology. Both points provide the ground for claiming faith as a *religio licita*. Hence, it is not unjustifiable to understand *Luke*'s Temple attitude, with the three observations made before, in the light of what 1*Clement* offers.

<sup>146</sup> In *De natura deorum* 3.5, Cicero clearly attributes both the foundation of the state and its rites to Romulus and Numa.

<sup>147</sup> 1*Clem.* 40.3: ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὄρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάτῳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει, ἵν' ὁσίως πάντα γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκίῃσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ.

<sup>148</sup> 1*Clem.* 1.1. Cf. O. Bakke, *Concord and Peace* (Tübingen, 1998), 80-3.

<sup>149</sup> 1*Clem.* 20.10; 20.11; 60.4; 63.2. ὁμοφονίας; 51.2 *et al.*

<sup>150</sup> 1*Clem.* 1.1; 2.6; 3.2; 4.14; 14.2; 43.2; 46.7; 47.6; 49.5; 51.1; 51.3; 55.1; 54.2; 55.1; 57.1; 63.1.

<sup>151</sup> 1*Clem.* 40-1.

<sup>152</sup> See Aristides' *Eulogy of Rome*, *Or.* 12 88-9, see K. Wengst, *Pax Romana* (1987), 48-9.

## Reading *Luke* in the Trajanic Era

So far, we identified in Luke's Temple a characteristic language that features prominently in the special material and *Acts*, which finds its parallels in the Augustan imperial ideology, not in the Septuagint or other Jewish materials. We also saw that such rhetoric was employed uniquely by another text produced in Rome, 1*Clement*, which boosts the historical plausibility of this reading amongst Roman Christians. The next question is: would this resonate with historical developments in early second century? Can there be an explanation to the author's appeal to Augustan values in the life of Jesus and his followers?

Looking into the situation in that period, we will see that a considerable succession crisis after the assassination of Domitian and the short transitional period of Nerva necessitated a special response to maintain the legitimacy of Trajan; the first adopted Emperor after the familial rule of the Flavians. Lacking royal blood, Trajan had to justify his accession to power as an adopted successor, and the solution was championing the values and success story of the indisputably greatest adopted emperor, Augustus. This is what we can see in Pliny the Younger's *Panegyricus* which was meant, at least in its first edition, to be an expression of gratitude (*gratiarum actio*) to Trajan who appointed him as a consul in 100 CE.<sup>153</sup> Pliny's gratitude turned into a full ideological programme that offered the necessary propaganda to solidify Trajan's legitimacy,<sup>154</sup> and that was behind their long and strong friendship as it appears in their expansive exchange of correspondence afterwards. In this propagandist work, Pliny highlights the same elements that we found in the characteristic elements used by *Luke* in his attitude to the Temple: the necessity to show *pietas* towards the temples and the ancestral customs,<sup>155</sup> and the actualisation of peace and concord (*pacem, concordiam*).<sup>156</sup> This is all preceded by the divine proclamation of Trajan as a divine son and emperor in the temple of Jupiter, not in a marriage bed.<sup>157</sup> Like Augustus, and unlike the Flavians, Trajan was reluctant to accept the introduction of any form of glorification to himself (*Pan.* 52).<sup>158</sup> In a doxology similar to that of 1*Clement* in content and position (*Pan.* 94; cf. 1*Clem.* 60-1), Pliny repeats this point, praying not only for peace

<sup>153</sup> Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 3.18. See Julian Bennett, *Trajan: Optimus Princeps* (London, 1997), 65. Bennett suggests that this work is inspired by Cicero's *Pro Marcello* which appears to be a plausible suggestion when we compare the two texts and their historical conditions.

<sup>154</sup> For example, Pliny at some point advises Trajan to accelerate the process of deifying Nerva and to announce him as divine before the adoption of Trajan so that 'one day posterity might wonder whether he was already god when his last deed [adopting Trajan] was done' (*Pan.* 10.5).

<sup>155</sup> *Pan.* 11.1; *Pan.* 94.5. Pliny formally wrote a letter to seek Trajan's approval to add statues of him in the temple Pliny erected for the deified emperors (*Ep.* 10.8). Pliny calls this an act of piety (*pietatis*) which precisely resonates with the theme of temple piety we have discussed.

<sup>156</sup> *Pan.* 94.

<sup>157</sup> *Pan.* 5.4.

<sup>158</sup> This is also confirmed in the mail exchange between him and Pliny, *Ep.* 10.8, 9.

and concord (*pacem, concordiam*) but also to grant Trajan an adopted son who is worthy to be adopted in Jupiter's temple on the Capitol as well (*Pan.* 94.5).<sup>159</sup> The temple becomes the locus of legitimacy and its ideological manifestations (the restored Augustan values).

Pliny's reading of Trajan's life in such language found in *Luke's* Temple rhetoric is not a fanciful narrative that has no reality on the ground. In fact, this ideological reading of Trajan's life can be attested to by the most prominent biographers of this period, in a way that suggests how this language was not simply limited to a single propagandist work. J. Bennett rightly notes that the *Panegyricus* 'articulated a reality which was readily apparent to his [Pliny's] contemporaries'.<sup>160</sup> This appears in the works of the major historians and biographers of that period, including Suetonius, Tacitus, Plutarch and later Dio Cassius. Suetonius shows how the coming of Trajan overturned the dark age of the Flavians, whose vices that overtook virtues brought destruction and disputed their divine legitimacy.<sup>161</sup> This climaxed in the image of Domitian whose impiety reached the level of introducing 'many innovations in common customs'.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, the omens were reported against Domitian as his anxiety was fed with consecutive divine phenomena (strokes of lightning and dreams) that concluded only with his death.<sup>163</sup> We can see that disrespect to *pietas* in violating 'ancestral customs' was the situation that the adopted Trajan reversed. Tacitus is clearer on contrasting the situation before and through Trajan's reign. For him, the era of terror and oppression stretches from the death of Augustus to the assassination of Domitian, and this shows us that the 'happy age' (*Agr.* 3; *Hist.* 1.1-2) of Trajan is the restoration of that of Augustus. Tacitus shows that adoptive succession is not a novelty (*i.e.* impiety), but it is following the precedent of Augustus (*Hist.* 1.15, 18). Further, Rome apparently suffered under the succession within houses and adoption could turn the situation towards a better future in which the emperor is chosen according to his merits (*Hist.* 1.16). Dio Chrysostom, who was exiled under Domitian and restored by Nerva, took advantage of the *libertas*<sup>164</sup> of Trajan's reforms to write his orations *περὶ βασιλείας*, which seem to set out the ideals a ruler like Trajan should acquire.<sup>165</sup> Dio Cassius' account also confirms that Trajan's legitimacy stems from Nerva's appeal to the temple for such an announcement when shouting, 'May the good be for the Senate, the Roman people and me as I make him Markus Ulpius Nerva Trajan'.<sup>166</sup> In another account, Nerva declared him as a son after offering

<sup>159</sup> *Pan.* 8.1.

<sup>160</sup> J. Bennett, *Trajan* (1997), 65.

<sup>161</sup> Suetonius, *Vesp.* 7.2-3; *Dom.* 3.2; 11.1; 16.1-3; 18.2.

<sup>162</sup> *Dom.* 7.1.

<sup>163</sup> *Dom.* 14-6.

<sup>164</sup> This is also not a literary invention but it is attested in coins (see: RIC 123-4).

<sup>165</sup> *Orationes* 1-4.

<sup>166</sup> Dio Cassius, *Hist.* 68.3.4.

incense to Jupiter in the Capitole for offering victory to Trajan in Paeonia.<sup>167</sup> This also appears in the biographies of Plutarch, a Trajanic Greek writer as well.<sup>168</sup> It is important to refer to Jörg Rüpke's study which shows the increasing interest in the narratological approach of religious texts in the Greco-Roman literature of second century as a means of communicating concepts of religious practices and legitimacy in the lives of notable individuals.<sup>169</sup>

Based on that, we can see that the revival of the Augustan ideals in the reign of Trajan was not limited to a programme offered by a single author but a wider phenomenon witnessed to by Trajanic historians and biographers. In this phenomenon, the temple, as the place of communication with the gods, is the locus of legitimacy and piety towards it and the ancestral customs associated with it is the manifestation of this legitimacy.

### Conclusion: Reading *Luke* in Rome

In this article I argued that *Luke*'s allegiance to the Temple reflects an interest in defending the legitimacy of Christianity, as it appears from his characteristic language. In this language, *Luke* addresses the elements of the Roman *Pietas* and shows how Jesus and his movement would not offend the Roman sensibilities. I examined *Luke*'s rhetoric against the Roman text of 1*Clement*, which is more explicit in addressing imperial ideology and Roman values (known as *Romanitas*), and showed the existence of this reading in Rome. Further, I showed that these same Lukan characteristic features, which are not shared with New Testament texts, or even the Septuagint, were at the heart of the revival of Augustan ideology in the Trajanic quest for legitimacy.

The question is whether this context is limited to the Trajanic period. While I believe that the rise of this movement, as it appears in the aforementioned biographies, took place during Trajan's earliest years, we should also see that the heated debate over Christianity's compliance with the characteristics of the *Romanitas* continues through the following decades in the second century. Looking into the Marcionite debate in particular, we can see how dangerous his idea of Christianity as a new religion with a new God is. Andrew Hayes' essay shows the possible impact of Marcion's ideas on the works of his contemporary writer, Justin, which aimed to respond to the intimidating Roman

<sup>167</sup> *Hist.* 176, 365, n. 2 (LCL numbering).

<sup>168</sup> See in particular P.A. Stadter, 'Plutarch and Trajanic ideology', in P.A. Stadter and L. Van der Stockt (eds), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 AD)* (Leuven, 2002), 227-42; T.E. Duff, 'Plutarch and Trajan', *The Classical Review (New Series)* 55 (2005), 462-5; M.M. Catherine, 'Alexander-Imitators in the Age of Trajan: Plutarch's Demetrius and Pyrrhus', *The Classical Journal* 112 (2017), 406-30.

<sup>169</sup> J. Rüpke, 'Narratives as factor and indicator of religious change in the Roman Empire (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries)', in this volume, pp. 35-53.



view of Christianity as a novelty.<sup>170</sup> Looking particularly into the previously mentioned characteristic language of *Luke*, we will observe that it is mainly present in the materials not attested to in Marcion's *Evangelion*; mainly in the birth narrative, the temptations, the final post-resurrection scene of commissioning the disciples to stay in Jerusalem and Acts. This fact raises questions regarding the reason for the addition of these materials. Indeed, this applies equally to the Marcionite controversy and the problem of compliance with the *Romanitas*, which pre-existed Marcion. Interestingly, Tertullian preserves for us remarks made by Marcion in his *Antithesis* regarding the Temple. According to Tertullian, Marcion apparently mocked his opponents' belief in the same God of Israel who let Jerusalem and its Temple be destroyed as the same one who will restore them in the eschaton.<sup>171</sup> This reflects his opponents' allegiance to Jerusalem and its Temple.

It is worth mentioning that by the time of Marcion's controversy (mid-second century) the Church of Rome's reputation had already become defined by these particular values. This is evidenced in bishop Dionysius' letter to the Roman bishop Soter. Noting 1*Clement*, he expresses his appreciation for the tradition of the Roman church in resolving financial and administrative problems of the Corinthian church in a style that fits *Romanitas*: 'You Romans keep up the Romans' ancestral customs (πατροπαράδοτον ἔθος Ῥωμαίων Ῥωμαῖοι φυλάττοντες)',<sup>172</sup> which is extended, from the time of Clement's letter to his time. These words could be found in the stock of the Lukan language regarding *pietas* as we saw earlier.

In conclusion, reading *Luke* (and *Acts*) in second century Rome brings the double work into the power and legitimacy dynamics of that milieu, which explains the characteristic language of *pietas*. As it stands, and without presuming a source hypothesis, that language stands in stark contrast to Marcion's theology on the problem of Christianity and *Romanitas*. While it is beyond its scope to suggest a literary relationship between the *Evangelion* and *Luke*, this article suggests that a wider historical investigation of this milieu that accommodates the two texts, and 1*Clement* would be an instructive addition to the discussion rather than exhausting the scholarship's current debate on literary comparisons.

<sup>170</sup> A. Hayes, 'Who are the "Christians"?', in this volume, pp. 87-95.

<sup>171</sup> Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.24-5.

<sup>172</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.10-1.