‘THE MOST HIGH GOD DOES LIVE IN HOUSES, BUT NOT HOUSES BUILT BY MEN ...’: THE RELATIVITY OF THE METAPHOR ‘TEMPLE’ IN LUKE-ACTS
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ABSTRACT
Since the Kantian revolution, metaphysical knowledge has been articulated by influential theologians in the language of analogy. In accordance with this tradition, the metaphor found in Luke-Acts, that God does live in houses, but not houses built by men, is explored by studying it as a root metaphor. A root metaphor in the theological sense can be defined as the most basic assumption we can make about man’s existence and experience. In this article John H Elliott’s proposal that ‘temple’ and ‘household’ in Luke-Acts articulate a contrast in social institutions is debated. I wish to argue that this ‘contrast’ does not really articulate a shift in social institutions, but rather a broadening of an existing social institution as the result of a changed symbolic universe. This shift in symbolic universe is studied against the backdrop of a tendency to broaden the temple as a theological symbol which had already started and which intensified during the Second temple period. It is shown that the temple, its sacrificial offerings and purifying rituals, were closely associated with the household, its meals and purifying ceremonies. Jesus also advocated the broadening of the concept temple/household. His view is reportedly conveyed by Stephen, Peter, James, and Paul.

1 PREMISE
In his contribution to the significant work on social-scientific studies covering the field of Luke-Acts (1991a) John H Elliott argues that the difference between the exclusiveness of the Pharisees’ and the inclusiveness of Jesus’ convictions regarding the manner in which God is present
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among men resulted in the temple as institution being replaced by the Jesus movement with the household as institution. Elliott named his contribution 'Temple versus household in Luke-Acts: A contrast in social institutions.' The hypothesis he finds substantiated in this excellent work is to be found in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (Lk 18:9-14). This metaphorical narrative begins with Jesus' words: 'Once there were two men who went up to the temple to pray: one was a Pharisee, the other a tax collector' (Lk 18:10), and ends with these words: 'I tell you, said Jesus, the tax collector, and not the Pharisee, was in the right with God when he went home' (Lk 18:14). Elliott interprets the references to εἰς τὸν ἱερὸν (Lk 18:10) and εἰς τὸν οἶκον (Lk 18:14) as being of a contrasting and replacing nature. He concurs with Mottu (1974:202): 'The opposition between the Pharisee and the tax collector is only the secondary aspect of the dominant contradiction which is the spatial contradiction between temple and house....' According to Elliott, this contrast is embedded in social relations on a political, economic and kinship level. Furthermore, this contrast determines the interpretation of Luke-Acts as a macro text, and applies to structure as well as theme. In the first section of Luke-Acts as a 'narrative unity' (cf also Tannehill 1986) the temple comes to the fore whilst the household is the place of importance in the second section. This movement from the temple towards the household is the chart upon which Luke traces the historical and geographical movements of the gospel, from its origins in the Holy Land, the Holy City, and the Holy Place, to the households of the diaspora.

The Household thus serves in Luke-Acts as both a historical and a metaphorical reality. The church which grows through household conversions becomes at the same time a worldwide household of faith. The contrast to the Temple as historical institution and erstwhile sacred symbol is clear: political institution versus kinship institution; centralisation of power and coercion versus diffusion of the powerless households and familial commitment; economic exploitation versus material sharing; stratification by purity versus integration via kinship bonds; exclusion and alienation based on purity lines versus inclusion based on mercy and faith. The former, for Luke, is the object of critique and the arena of rejection, Santan-inspired conflict and death. The latter is [the] object of praise and the sphere of repentance, concord, and divinely conferred life.

We agree with most of — and, in my view, the most important details of — Elliott's social-scientific interpretation of Luke-Acts. We do not, however, accept his proposition that the 'temple' in Luke-Acts was replaced by the 'household'. If Elliott were to be correct in this regard, the results of at least two other recent works about the vision of the temple in Luke-Acts would have to be labelled as incorrect, namely those of F D Weinert (1979, 1981, 1982) and J B Chance (1988).

A case in point would be the reported words of Stephen in Acts 7:48, namely that 'The Most High God does live in houses, but not houses built by men', from which it is clear that both Weinert and Chance are not of the opinion that the writer of Luke-Acts contended that the early church,
in following Jesus, turned its back on the temple as an institution and symbol.

Weinert (1979:186) states that with Stephen's observation regarding the Solomonic temple, the writer was not presenting a new vision of the temple. The positive reference made by Stephen about Solomon's person may be attributed to the fact that Solomon was not, in fact, disobeying God's will when he built the temple; his obedience led him to fulfill David's command (cf also Bauernfeind 1980:118). According to Weinert, the positive observation in Acts 7:48 correlates with Solomon's positive act of consecrating the temple (1 Ki 8:27). Luke's aim, therefore, is not to create any controversy around the temple as such. On the one hand he emphasises the fact that Solomon was obeying God's will, and on the other that building the temple did not imply that 'God's authority over or presence to the world' (Weinert 1979:188) was being restricted in any manner.

According to Chance (1988:40), it is 'correct to conclude that the primary thrust of the critique of [Acts] 7:47-50 is not to attack the temple cult itself, but to warn against trying to limit God's presence.' Unlike Weinert (and Bauernfeind), Chance holds the opinion that the reference to the tabernacle in Stephen's speech should not merely be seen as a concept which is interchangeable with the Solomonic temple. Tabernacle and temple are not synonymous. The tabernacle symbolises a concept of God 'who is on the move in the world; the 'house' [the Solomonic temple - A G v A] points to a view of God who is confined and stationary. They are not the same image of God, and hence, the tabernacle does not equate with the temple' (Chance 1988:40-41).

Elliott (1991a:94), on the other hand, interprets Stephen's speech and stoning as indicating 'a turning point between the earliest phase of the church's life and its connection with the temple (chs 1-8:1a) and its full-scale mission to the households of the diaspora (8:1b-28:31). In the remainder of Luke's account, the temple plays no positive role as a place of Christian assembly or symbol of Christian identity. Along with the synagogue which represents the extension of temple authority and values, the temple reckons only negatively as a locale of Jewish-Christian conflict over purity and its implications for the course of universal salvation.'

Therefore, all three scholars, Weinert, Chance and Elliott, are in agreement that the theological perspective on the temple in Luke-Acts is symbolic in some way or other — that is, it is metaphorical. And this symbolism is connected with an exclusive versus an inclusive concept of God. Elliott regards 'temple' and 'household' as the two distinguishing metaphors of this contrasting concept of God. Chance contrasts the metaphor 'temple as house' with the metaphor 'tabernacle' as the distinguishing symbols of the different concepts of God. He does not, however, take the concept metaphorically, and the social realities it resulted from, or produced, seriously at all. According to Weinert, 'tabernacle' and 'temple' are synonymous. Elliott (1991a:102) regards Weinert's point of view as being 'wide of the mark' since it separates the temple from the temple officials (cf also Weinert 1981, 1982); in other words, the function of the social institution is not interpreted in terms of the actors who are playing out social roles in accordance with the social institutions they are representing.
Of the three scholars, Elliott can be regarded as the most pragmatical since he makes a study of the Lucan reflection on the concept of God in terms of social structures and institutions (cf also Esler 1987:122-125, 244). Although Elliott should receive the most credit for a new and more relevant approach to an old exegetic issue in Luke-Acts (cf also Baltzer 1965; Reitze 1979; Brodie 1979), I have a problem in that his (and Weinert's) contentions also do not as such treat the nature of a metaphor's relativity seriously. I furthermore disagree with Elliott especially in respect of his direct transference of Jesus' controversy with the Pharisees in Galilee to that with the (Sadducean) temple authorities, as if exactly the same political, economic and cultural issues were at stake. His interpretation that the contrast between 'temple' and 'household' in Acts is continued in a contrast between the 'synagogue' and the 'household' in the Diaspora also appears to be somewhat problematic (cf e.g Kee 1990:17-19). This study, however, does not concern itself with these two issues, or the role that Jesus' cleansing of the temple (cf e.g Eppstein 1964:42-58; Hamilton 1964; Dawsey 1984; Sanders 1985:61-76; Neusner 1989; Evans 1989) and the destruction of the temple in A.D 70 (cf e.g Gaston 1970; Franklin 1975:90-91; Chance 1988:57) played in the theology of Luke-Acts. We are particularly interested in arguing that conflicting reflections on aspects of the symbolic universe, such as the concept of God, do not necessarily result in one symbol being replaced by another. In the words of O'Connor & Jimenez (1977:134-135), the relative nature of symbols makes it possible to 'accept them while changing them....'

In this article Elliott's proposal that 'temple' and 'household' in Luke-Acts articulate a contrast in social institutions is therefore debated. We wish to argue that this 'contrast' does not really articulate a shift in social institutions, but rather a broadening of an existing social institution as the result of a changed symbolic universe. The relative nature of a metaphor enables one to preserve the same symbol while other dimensions of its referential meaning are emphasised.

The concept 'symbolic universe' has its origins in the sociology of knowledge. This study makes it theologically applicable. Since the Kantian revolution (cf Allen 1985:217), metaphysical knowledge has been articulated by influential theologians, such as Schleiermacher and Bultmann, in the language of analogy. In accordance with this tradition, the metaphor found in Stephen's speech, that God does live in houses, but not houses built by men, is social-scientifically explored by studying it as a root metaphor. A root metaphor is defined by systematic theologians as the basic assumption we can make about man's existence and experience. Relative articulation of the metaphor mentioned in Stephen's speech is connected with a change in the concept of God. This shift in the symbolic universe is studied against the backdrop of a tendency to broaden the temple as a theological symbol which had already started and was intensified during the Second temple period. It is shown that the temple, its sacrificial offerings and purifying rituals were closely related to the 'household', its meals and purifying ceremonies. As opposed to Elliott, the hypothesis we find substantiated by our results is to be found in the phrase 'εν τῷ ιερῷ καὶ ὁλικων (Ac 5:42); 'And every day in the temple and in people's homes they [Peter and the other apostles — Ac 5:29] continued to teach and preach the Good News about Jesus the Messiah.'
The research results mentioned in this article would suggest a closer investigation into Jesus' advocacy of the broadening of the concept 'temple'/‘household' in the Gospel of Luke and the fact that his view is reported in Acts to be conveyed by Stephen, Peter, James and Paul.

2 METAPHORICITY

A metaphor exists when one thing is seen as another, when one pretends that this is that because one does not know how to talk about this, and consequently uses that to talk about this. Metaphorical use of language is when one pretends that a similarity exists between two different objects, issues, events and the like, where one knows more about one than the other and then uses the one one knows more about to, in a manner of speaking, say more about the one one knows less about (cf McFague 1983:15; Soskice 1985:150).

Metaphoricity clearly has important implications in scientific theory. This is applicable to the sociology of knowledge in particular and therefore also to theological theorising. Without metaphors, theology cannot exist. What do we know of God other than what we come to know through analogues?

Scientific knowledge has a bearing on reason and observation. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), however, argues convincingly that man (as subject) does not know reality (as object) as such (cf Hopper 1987:46-47). Kant also learnt about a 'rational cosmology' from his predecessors. According to this, God is the Supreme Being who circumscribes all reality, spatial and temporal. Kant's position in this regard was neither rational nor empirical, but contained basic elements of both views (cf Hopper 1987:46). Reality is known from the manner in which it appears to the knowing spirit. Therefore, knowledge is always the result of the assimilation of empirical data by the mind. In the period before Kant, it was reasoned that the metaphysical reality (the symbolic universe, in terms of the sociology of knowledge) as such is discernible and knowable. Kant's own interpretation of human experience is that the transcendental reality is not known, except through analogy or symbols (cf Hopper 1987:54). It is precisely because we know very little about something (the Ding an sich, the Noumenon in Kantian terms) that we can discuss it meaningfully in terms of something we know a little more about (the Erscheinung, the Phenomenon). In the sense that ideas and myths are language in terms of ideology and mythology respectively, religious metaphors are images of words (symbols) relating to God. According to Paul Ricoeur, we create these images in order to contain and describe true observations. Those things that are discernible and recognisable (the vehicle, the picture part) within the familiar culture (social universe, in terms of the sociology of knowledge), are creatively and tensely linked in language to something we experience indirectly or intuitively (the tenor, the reality part).

A metaphor questions normal linguistic categorisation and, at the same time it represents a new form of categorisation. This is what Ricoeur (1975:122-128) regards as the working pattern of parables: they orientate in order to disorientate with a view to reorientation. Elsewhere Ricoeur (1978:34) states that a metaphor always comes as a surprise. One may also say that a good metaphor works by means of shock effect (cf Hopkins 1989:215). For this reason, Ricoeur considers that a metaphor creates
sense, but at the same time gives rise to nonsense. Harald Weinrich (in Sellin 1982:384) refers to the creative workings (the *demiurgische Leistung*) of metaphors. Metaphorical phrases are therefore never absolute phrases. They are always open and relative (McFague 1983:13; Brümmer 1989:215; Hopkins 1989:215), and thus provisional.

3 LANGUAGE OF ANALOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE

The amount of literature pertaining to the role played by metaphoricity in theological theorising has increase dramatically during the past decade. One could almost say that it has become overwhelming in this short period (cf the literature references in Brümmer 1989:213 n 1). For our immediate purpose, there is one particular issue which strikes one in the works consulted, namely the correlation between metaphorical language relating to God, and man’s existence. Should we, for example, call God a rock, we are, in fact, implying that we can put our trust in God.


Schleiermacher referred to the above-mentioned concept as *reflective language* at a much earlier stage than Bultmann and used the expression *responding experience* to explain what is meant by his well-known concept ‘das schlechthin Abhängigkeitsgefühl’ (cf Klemm 1986:90). Bultmann’s (1948: 24, 28; 1952:183) concept of *Existenzverständnis* corresponds with this idea. According to him, myths are not meaningful in the sense that they are objective portrayals, but because of the *Existenzverständnis* which is expressed through these portrayals (cf Pelser 1987:171). In fact, man’s *Existenzverständnis*, which is expressed by means of objective ‘mythischen Denken’, is concealed as a result of the nature of his portrayals (cf Pelser 1987:174). To Bultmann, ‘Entmythologisierung’ as ‘existentiale Interpretation’ is the theologian’s hermeneutic-scientific programme to clarify the ‘Intention des Mythos’: ‘Negativ ist die Entmythologisierung daher Kritik am Weltbild des Mythos, sofern dieses die eigentliche Intention des Mythos verbirgt. Positiv ist die Entmythologisierung existentiale Interpretation, indem sie die Intention des Mythos deutlich machen will, eben seine Absicht, von der Existenz des Menschen zu reden’ (Bultmann 1952:184).

Today we find that the distinction Bultmann makes between ‘mythischen Denken’ and ‘wissenschaftlichen Denken’, is being used in the sociology of knowledge in a manner very suitable for interpreting, on an existential level, the type of formulation found regarding the temple as God’s dwelling place in Luke–Acts, against the background of contemporary social-scientific perceptions (cf inter alia Elliott 1986, 1989, 1991a, 1991b).

Berger & Luckmann (1967:1, 2, 15) observe that man and social reality
reciprocally define each other (cf also Van Staden 1988:342) and this leads Petersen (1985) to interpret the social realities in the New Testament in terms of the categories 'social arrangements' and 'symbolic form'. Social arrangements refer to the everyday social institutions: 'Social arrangements have to do with the social structures underlying the social relations comprised by the actions of the actors....Symbolic forms, on the other hand, have to do with the overarching cognitive systems, the systems of knowledge, belief, and value, that define these actors' identities and motivate their actions' (Petersen 1985:x; cf also Van Staden 1990:59). Petersen (1985:29-30) defines theology as 'a kind of knowledge that is the product of systematic reflection upon a symbolic universe, and indeed of reflection that serves to maintain that universe when it is in some kind of jeopardy, as for example from the threats of doubt, or disagreement, or competing symbolic universes.'

At least four basic social institutions or structures can be distinguished within any given social universe (cf Malina 1986a:152-153): economics, politics, kinship, and religion. Any one of these could be the umbrella structure, with the other structures integrated in a subservient manner. In certain modern societies the economy acts as the motivating force behind social relations. Politicians can also control economic and religious institutions. We do, however, also find societies in which families and heads of families exercise control. The first-century Mediterranean world is an example (cf Hollenbach 1987:58). In these societies the economy, politics, and religion were all embedded in an institutional order which was primarily determined through birth and nationality. This particular institutional order is of special significance when one realised that the temple, as the dominant religious (and political — cf Malina 1986b:93) institution, was metaphorically referred to as the 'house of God' in the time of the New Testament.

Because God cannot be conceived of in human terms, metaphorical language relating to God (as well as to anything else), always contains the whispered intonation 'it is, yet it is not'. In this regard, one should pay attention to the relativity of the metaphor which is to be found in Luke-Acts, namely that God lives in houses, but not houses built by men (cf Ac 7:48; 17:24).

4 TEMPLE AND HOUSEHOLD

Not only do both the Hebrew and Greek words for 'house' (־תפּוֹת/oîkoç) refer to a physical building, they also refer to the 'household'. The 'household' represented the most fundamental social entity in the Israelite society (cf Neusner 1987:332; Van Tilborg 1988:207). This 'household' was a self-supporting economic unit, such as that of an artisan. The pater familias was the head of the 'extended family' (cf Pilch 1988:33-34), which included his wife, the eldest son and his family, his younger brothers, their wives and families, the unmarried sisters, the slaves and dependent craftsmen who were in the service of the 'household'. These households reached out to one another, with the result that one could talk about extended families who lived in the same village. Although the elite households (the Judean Sadducees and Galilean Herodians) for all practical purposes had no contact with the non-elites during the first century (cf Hollenbach 1987:58; Malina 1988:14), 'Israel' may, according to Neusner
In Biblical times the temple was often called the 'house of God' (cf Lk 6:4). Very often the single term 'house' (οἶκος) was used when referring to 'temple' ( ναός) (cf Lk 11:51; Ac 7:47,49). In the Old Testament the word 'house' was used more often than the word 'temple' when referring to the place where God lived (Laffey 1988:213). It is clear that the presence of God among believers in a believing community was often metaphorically referred to in both the Old and New Testament as a result of the analogy of 'temple' as 'house of God'. This metaphor may also be called a root metaphor.

McFague (1983:20In27) discovers this concept in the work of Stephen Pepper. Pepper defined a root metaphor as 'the most basic assumption about the nature of the world or experience that we can make when we try to give a description of it' (cf McFague 1983:28). Furthermore, root metaphors do thus have lasting and explanatory power (cf Soskice 1985:101-102; Van Huyssteen 1988:857; Hopkins 1989:215). In the metaphor 'temple' the basic assumption is that God lives in a house, just as people do.

Such analogous language, in particular, is the vehicle for expressing theological core values. In terms of the sociology of knowledge, we have found that these values serve as legitimation of the institutional order (cf Van Staden 1988:342-345; Kee 1989:11-12). In this regard the Shema prayer may be regarded as a 'core or primary law' (Neyrey 1988:82). It is particularly evident in the Markan usage of the shema prayer by Jesus (Mk 12:29) and the teacher of Law (Mk 12:32), which served as an introduction to the call to love God and one's neighbour in the Great Commandment: 'Listen Israel! The Lord our God is the only Lord' (NEB). This prayer is the expression of 'God's creation-as-ordering' (Neyrey 1988:79). It contains the declaration that the God of Israel is the only God and implies, therefore, that God also differentiated between his chosen people, Israel and all other nations. This implies that God's 'holiness' is replicated in man's world. Consequently, all of creation should portray the divine order relating to classification as well as discrimination (cf Neyrey 1988:68).

This 'divine order' is expressed notably by the Greek word ἡλικίας (cf Van Staden 1990:1): ἡ ἔλευσις ἴση, ὡς ἡ ἰδιότητα ἴδιος ἵμαν (LXX Lv 19:21; cf also 1 Pt 1:16). In this analogous formula, the word ἡλικίας may be replaced by the word τέλειος: ἡ ἔλευσις ὀνομαζόμενη τέλειος ἴδιος ὡς ὁ θεός ἵμαν ὁ οὐρανός τέλειος ἔστιν (Mt 5:48) - 'You must be whole just as your Father in heaven is whole!'

Mary Douglas (1966:54) states: '...to be holy is to be whole, to be one; holiness is integrity, perfection of the individual and of the kind.' This 'wholeness' thus applied, for example, to both the sacrificer and the sacrificial animal. To be 'holy' in the sense that God is 'holy' therefore implied that one had to fit in with God, in other words, be pure and faultless (ἁγία καὶ ἁμαρτωλόν - Eph 5:27; cf Van Aarde 1990), 'without spot or wrinkle or any other imperfection' (NEB). According to this, cripples (κοιλιάς καὶ ἀποκοκυμένος - Dt 23:1), the handicapped and gentiles were not acceptable before God and were therefore not allowed to enter the cultic space where God dwelled, namely the temple (Neyrey 1988:67) or the ἄγγελον ἔκκλησία (cf Dt 23:1-8) - the community of 'saints'.

What this amounts to is that the Jews regulated God's presence. In
their concept of God He is seen as being present on a restricted scale. The regulations which determined whether God was present or absent, consisted of the multitude of regulations on purification. This particularly applied to the temple, the temple accessories, the temple staff and the temple worshipers (cf Neusner 1973).

In this respect Neusner (1973:75) indicates in detail how the ideology of especially the pre-70 Pharisees in particular was directed 'to extend into the day-to-day living of ordinary Jews the concerns of ritual purity usually associated only with the priests and Temple.' Elliott (1991b; cf also Neusner 1979:47) formulates this as follows: 'Particularly in Pharisaic ideology, food and meals formed a mediating link between the Temple with its altar and the private home and its table. For the Pharisees, the rigorous purity regulations pertaining to the Temple, its priesthood and sacrifices, were extended to the bed and board of every observant Jew.' In support of this, they harnessed not only the Old Testament, but also the 'traditions of the elders' (cf Mk 7:3; Malina 1988:17). They drew up a comprehensive classification system, according to which almost everything in daily life was arranged in terms of acceptability — that is, 'holiness'. Following on Mary Douglas (1966), Neyrey (1988:76) refers to this as 'boundaries' and speaks of maps of time, maps of persons, maps of things and 'perhaps it is fair to say that their primary map was a map of meals' (cf also Smith 1987). Meals were an important sociological mechanism which exerted control with regard to purity or the lack of it (Douglas 1966:126-127; Elliott 1991b). This also had direct relevance to the maintenance of 'boundaries' in reference to the avoidance of intermarriage between Jew and non-Jew, so that the integrity of the familial community could be protected (cf Bossman 1979; Pilch 1988:36). 'Accordingly, codes defining social, sexual, and food purity and pollution will form one unified complex of concerns' (Elliott 1991b).

In Jesus' time an important bone of contention between the Sadducees and the Pharisees was whether the temple rules should be applied to everyday life. Saldarini (1988:234) describes these opposing views:

The application of purity laws to the people at large was a new mode of understanding Jewish life, law and Scripture and it is reasonable and even inevitable that the Sadducees or someone else should oppose them. The Sadducees had their own (probably more traditional) understanding of Judaism and promoted it against the new Pharisaic view. If many of the Sadducees were priests or supporters of the traditional priesthood, they would have had another motive to oppose the Pharisees. The priests would not want the purity practices characteristic of the Temple and priesthood to be diluted by adaptation to the multitude.

The Pharisaic replication of the temple community in everyday life had the religious implication that social ostracism was legitimated with divine alienation. Like the Pharisees, Jesus also considered that the temple community should be extended to everyday life. Jesus, however, opposed social-religious ostracism. Unlike his Pharisaic opponents, He associated himself with a specific trend which is evident in the Old Testament (and intertestament literature) and which was adopted by the writer of Luke-Acts, and used metaphorically. This is the fact that the initial exclusivity
with regard to access to the temple structure had become more relaxed, so that one could speak of the broadening of the temple. This broadening effect was often created using new metaphors which still had meaning within the referential framework of the root metaphor 'temple'. The first indication of the trend to broaden the temple can be seen in the Second temple period.

5 THE BROADENING OF THE TEMPLE

We have seen that, although the temple was a physical structure, it also functioned as a theological symbol. This applied not only to the temple of Solomon, but also to the temple of Zerubbabel and the temple rebuilt by Herod the Great in the time of Jesus. The temple motifs on the Bar-Kochba coins (cf Meshorer 1967:91-101) are further indications of the lasting power of temple symbolism, even after the destruction of the temple in AD 70, the rebuilding of which, according to Smallwood (1976:445) had already begun in the early years of the Bar-Kochba revolt.

After the destruction of the temple of Solomon, Ezekiel the prophet (chs 40-48) envisaged a new temple (cf Levenson 1976). Ezekiel foresaw that the Zadokites would act as priests (Ezk 44:15-15) and as judges (Ezk 44:24) of a new cultic community. They would teach the community the difference between 'what is holy and what is not, and between what is ritually clean and what is not' (Ezk 44:23- NEB). The city itself would be called 'The-Lord-is-here' (Ezk 48:35 - NEB). But Ezekiel also had his reservations about the right of admission: '...the sovereign LORD, declare[s] that no uncircumcised foreigner...will enter my temple, not even a foreigner who lives among the people of Israel' (Ezk 44:9). In Second Isaiah it is however anticipated that this restriction may be lifted (Is 56:3,7) and that God's presence cannot be restricted to residence in the temple (Is 66:1).

From this it is evident that in the period of the Second temple a process of spiritual building, which we call the theological broadening of the temple. At the beginning, in Nehemiah's time, the temple staff was ordered among other things, to also dedicate the rebuilt walls of Jerusalem, as though the Sanctuary had been broadened. As a result, the city was called 'holy' — after the analogy of the presence of the holy God (Lv 11:44). This broadening has reference to other parts of the book Nehemiah, but also to other sections of the Chronistic writings, in which a start had been made towards abandoning exclusivity with regard to the constitution of the national assembly (cf Rost 1938:31). Women and children were now included in the national assembly (Es 10:1; Neh 8:2-17; cf also Jr 44:15). In intertestamental literature (cf Breytenbach 1989:199-201) there are also many remarks on how man can be reconciled with God outside the temple cult. The literature of the Qumran community, in particular, is a striking example (cf Gärtnert 1965:18-21; Klingzling 1971:50-93). Here the temple is seen as entirely corrupt (cf lQpHab 8:8-13; 12:9) and the community is presented as the true temple of the current time. The Qumran community also used the term מָשָׂא to refer to itself (cf lQS 5:6; 8:5, 9; 9:6). This 'house' is also called 'holy' (IQS 8:5; 9:6). It allows for reconciliation, but only for them (IQS 5:5-7; 8:4-10; 9:3-5; lQSa 1:3).

In particular, the reference to the 'erection of the fallen Tent of David' (4QFlor 1:11; cf also Chance 1988:15) by a messianic figure is echoed

6 CONCLUSION

The use of the symbols 'Tent of God’s presence' (ἡ σκήνη τοῦ ματυρίου; Ac 7:44-NEB), 'dwelling place for the God of Jacob' (σκήνωμα τῷ οἶκῳ ᾿Ιακώβ; Ac 7:46-NEB) and the 'Tent of David' (ἡ σκήνη Δαυίδ; Ac 15:16) as references to the 'mobile tabernacle which moved with the people of God' (Chance 1988:40; cf also Via 1979: 190-206) emphasises the relativity of the 'temple' as root metaphor, as reflected in the theology of Luke-Acts. In Luke-Acts it reportedly had a strong shock effect. This existential experience is understandable, since it should be seen as the product of conflicting beliefs in respect of the manner in which God lives with man.

According to the reports in Luke-Acts, the Jesus movement did not, like the Essenes, turn its back on the temple in Jerusalem as God’s residence. Jesus is reportedly depicted in Luke-Acts as someone who reckoned the temple as his ‘Father’s house’ (Lk 2:49). For him, however, God is not restricted to the Most Holy Place, the court which was built in the rear of the temple; the curtain hanging in the temple was torn in two and God is believed to be among those with whom He is pleased. Subsequently, the Jesus movement extended this notion of an unlimited God to everyday life.
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