

TYLER HALLSTROM

A Den of Thieves?

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

672

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber/Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · Ruben Bühner (Siegen)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala) · Christina M. Kreinecker (Leuven)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

672



Tyler Hallstrom

A Den of Thieves?

Jesus's Action in the Temple and the Question of
Economic Exploitation

Mohr Siebeck

Tyler Hallstrom, born 1991; 2024 PhD in Biblical Studies at Asbury Theological Seminary; Assistant Professor of New Testament at Central Bible University.
orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-5644

ISBN 978-3-16-164262-3 / eISBN 978-3-16-164263-0

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-164263-0

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484

(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <https://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2026 Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems. The right to use the content of this volume for the purpose of text and data mining within the meaning of Section 44b UrhG (Urheberrechtsgesetz) is expressly reserved.

Printed on non-aging paper.

Mohr Siebeck GmbH Co. KG, Wilhelmstraße 18, 72074 Tübingen, Deutschland
www.mohrsiebeck.com, info@mohrsiebeck.com

*Dedicated to my parents, Dave and Cindy
who first taught me how to read God's Word*

Preface

This monograph constitutes a lightly revised version of my PhD dissertation which was completed in spring 2024 at Asbury Theological Seminary. My interest in Jesus's temple action grew out of my coursework with Dr. Craig S. Keener, to whom I owe an immense debt of gratitude and for whose mentorship I am eternally grateful. Dr. Keener exemplifies all the qualities of a model scholar, and while his academic acumen and exegetical expertise are known worldwide, I have treasured even more the opportunity to learn firsthand from his graciousness, selflessness, and Christlikeness. My profound appreciation also extends to Dr. Ben Witherington III and Dr. Craig A. Evans who likewise served on my dissertation committee and helped strengthen the present work with their incisive insights and constructive critiques.

The completion of my doctoral studies would not have been possible without the gracious benevolence of Asbury Theological Seminary and the SOMA Foundation. I also express my gratitude to the Christian Scholarship Foundation for entrusting me with the Carl R. Holladay Scholarship which enabled me to focus more fully on the completion of this project. Although doctoral journeys can be arduous, I count myself blessed that the friendship and fellowship of my professors and peers at Asbury lightened the burden so as to be unnoticeable in view of the profound privilege of being able to devote oneself fully to Scripture in a community of passionate and faithful scholars.

My most heartfelt and sincere appreciation is due to my family whose constant support and unwavering encouragement I have considered priceless. I express my gratitude to my parents, Dave and Cindy, my brothers, Eric, Brian, and Timmy, along with my wonderful sisters-in-law, Leanna, Joey, and Maria. I especially want to thank the most passionate supporters of my work, my nephews and nieces, Danny, Sammy, Alex, Harris, Holly, and Isabella whose honorifics for me are entirely undeserved yet greatly cherished.

I express my deep appreciation to Dr. Jörg Frey for accepting my manuscript for publication, and to Tobias Stäbler and the editors at Mohr Siebeck for their skillful and diligent work in transforming the manuscript into its present form.

Finally, I thank God for his grace and his faithfulness and for blessing me more richly than I could ever deserve.

Soli Deo gloria.

June 2026

Tyler Hallstrom

Table of Contents

Preface	vii
 Chapter 1: Introduction	 1
<i>1.1 State of the Problem</i>	1
<i>1.2 Rationale for the Study</i>	11
<i>1.3 Procedure of the Study</i>	18
 Chapter 2: Historicity and History of Interpretation	 20
<i>2.1 Introduction</i>	20
<i>2.2 Historicity</i>	20
2.2.1 The Historicity of the Temple Act	20
2.2.2 The Historicity of Jesus's "Den of Thieves" Quotation (Mark 11:17 // parr.)	24
<i>2.3 History of Interpretation of the Temple Act</i>	29
2.3.1 Against Economic Exploitation	31
2.3.2 Against the Temple Tax	34
2.3.3 Against Pagan Imagery on Coins	35
2.3.4 Against Polluted Money	37
2.3.5 Against Herod's Monumentalization of the Jerusalem Temple...	38
2.3.6 Against Trade in the Temple	39
2.3.7 An Attempt at Political Revolution	44
2.3.8 An Attempt at Social Revolution	45
2.3.9 Against Inappropriate Sacrifices	47
2.3.10 A Prophetic Act Symbolizing Destruction	48
2.3.10.1 Destruction and Rebuilding	48

2.3.10.2 Destruction with Judgment for Nationalistic Zeal	51
2.3.10.3 Destruction with Judgment for Nonegalitarianism	52
2.3.10.4 Destruction with Judgment for Economic Exploitation	53
2.3.11 Against Animal Sacrifices	55
2.3.12 Against Israel's Holiness Ideology	57
2.3.13 A Messianic Act	59
2.3.14 Other Recent Interpretations	60
2.4 Conclusion	62
 Chapter 3: Economic Exploitation and the Textual Evidence	64
3.1 Introduction	64
3.2 <i>The Sellers, Buyers, and Animals (Mark 11:15a // Matt 21:12a // Luke 19:45 // John 2:14–16)</i>	70
3.2.1 The Sellers and Buyers (Mark 11:15a // Matt 21:12a // Luke 19:45 // John 2:14–16)	70
3.2.2 The Oxen, Sheep, and Doves (Mark 11:15b // Matt 21:12b // John 2:14–16)	73
3.3 <i>The Moneychangers (Mark 11:15b // Matt 21:12b // John 2:14–15)</i> ..	74
3.4 <i>The Vessels (Mark 11:16)</i>	76
3.4.1 A Cultic Vessel	77
3.4.2 A Profane Vessel	78
3.4.3 A Container for Money	79
3.4.4 Assessment	80
3.5 <i>“A House of Prayer” – Isa 56:7 (Mark 11:17a // Matt 21:13a // Luke 19:46a)</i> ..	83
3.5.1 Against Sacrifices	84
3.5.2 Gentile Exclusion	86
3.5.3 Economic Exploitation	87
3.6 <i>“A Den of Thieves” – Jer 7:11 (Mark 11:17b // Matt 21:13b // Luke 19:46b)</i> ..	89
3.6.1 The Meaning of the Word σπήλαιον	91
3.6.2 The Meaning of the Word ληστής	97
3.6.3 Den of Thieves in Jeremiah 7:11	106

3.6.4 Conclusion	110
3.7 “A Place of Business” (John 2:16).....	111
3.8 Conclusion.....	114
 Chapter 4: Economic Exploitation and the Historical Evidence.	115
4.1 Introduction	115
4.2 Context for Exploitation	115
4.2.1 The Financial Operations of the Jerusalem Temple	116
4.2.1.1 Sources of Income	116
4.2.1.2 The Temple as a Bank	119
4.2.1.3 The Wealth of the Temple	121
4.2.2 Alleged Corruption of the Priesthood.....	122
4.2.2.1 Craig Evans and Alleged Corruption.....	122
4.2.2.2 Evaluation of Evans’s Methodology.....	134
4.2.3 Conclusion	140
4.3 Mechanisms of Exploitation.....	141
4.3.1 The Surcharge Rates of Moneychangers	141
4.3.1.1 The Role of Moneychangers.....	142
4.3.1.2 The Reputation of Moneychangers.....	145
4.3.1.3 The Rates of Moneychangers	149
4.3.1.4 Conclusion.....	156
4.3.2 The Elevated Prices of Animal Vendors	157
4.3.2.1 Sellers of Sheep and Oxen.....	158
4.3.2.2 Sellers of Doves	160
4.3.2.3 Conclusion.....	166
4.3.3 The Mandatory Payment of Tithes and Taxes.....	167
4.3.3.1 Tithes and Offerings.....	167
4.3.3.2 The Temple Tax	170
4.3.3.3 Conclusion.....	175
4.3.4 Predatory Loans to Pilgrims	176
4.3.5 Accumulation of Wealth	180
4.4 Conclusion.....	182

Chapter 5: Economic Exploitation and the Socio-Economic Evidence 183

 5.1 Introduction 183

 5.2 Taxation 185

 5.3 Poverty 188

 5.4 Debt 194

 5.5 Tenancy 198

 5.6 Conclusion 203

Chapter 6: Conclusion 204

Bibliography 206

Index of Ancient Sources 231

Index of Modern Authors 241

Index of Subjects 244

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 State of the Problem

The study of Jesus's dramatic action in the temple engenders profound polarity. On one hand, there is widespread consensus on the historicity of the account, that it constituted one of the most pivotal events in the life of Jesus, that it precipitated his death, and that it was clearly initiated by Jesus with a definite purpose in mind. On the other hand, however, this definite purpose remains lamentably enigmatic and endlessly disputed. Not only does the account itself represent its own exegetical Gordian knot with narrative details seemingly impossible to untie, but even the attempt to catalog the numerous proposed meanings of the event has been regarded as "dizzying"¹ and "bewildering."² Among the most significant recent treatments of the account is the work of Jostein Ådna who rightfully laments, "There are numerous interpretations of Jesus' temple act, and it is in no way self-evident how the differing understandings relate to each other, or how they might be systematized."³ For some such as A. J. M. Wedderburn, the proliferation of interpretations precludes one's ability to use the account as a "key" for unlocking the ministry of Jesus, and it is instead a "puzzle" which must be unlocked by the ministry of Jesus.⁴ In stark

¹ Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 91.

² A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: A Key or a Puzzle?," *ZNW* 97.1 (2006): 5, n. 5.

³ Jostein Ådna, "Jesus and the Temple," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2654. See especially his monograph, Jostein Ådna, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel: Die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung*, WUNT 119 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). Cf. Jostein Ådna, "Temple Act," *DJG*, 947–52.

⁴ Wedderburn, "Jesus' Action in the Temple." Cf. "The many differing interpretations of this event have shown how hard it is to use it with any confidence as a key, let alone *the* key, to Jesus' ministry. Rather, it is that ministry which may offer us the most reliable key to unlock the puzzle of Jesus' action in the temple and which may enable us at last to fit this enigmatic event into a more or less coherent picture of his life and teaching" (p. 22). Emphasis original. In disagreement, however, see Ådna, "Jesus and the Temple," 2675, n. 123.

contrast, however, E. P. Sanders finds the temple incident to be “the surest starting point” in his own reconstruction of Jesus’s life and ministry.⁵

Perplexity at Jesus’s intention is, of course, neither novel nor unexpected. John Chrysostom in the fourth century AD in his homily on John 2:11–22 anticipates his audience’s confusion about Jesus’s actions, remarking,

And why, you will say, did Christ do this very thing and show indignation against these men such as He did not seem to show anywhere – not even when men insulted and taunted Him and called Him a Samaritan and a demoniac? He was not satisfied with mere words, but also took up a little whip and drove them out with it.⁶

Correspondingly, in more recent years Jesus’s intention is still regarded as “murky at best,”⁷ and N. T. Wright finds that the temple incident “is clearly underdetermined.”⁸ For Paula Fredriksen, perplexity dovetails with impossibility. She argues against the historicity of both Jesus’s temple prophecy and temple action, and posits that even if they were authentic, “this still would not help us to discern and establish the meaning of Jesus’s action” since it was “so obscure” that even the evangelists, “its most ancient publicists, completely

⁵ E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61, cf. 11–12. Sanders nevertheless “hasten[s] to say that the question of Jesus and the temple brings with it the amount of uncertainty which is usual in the study of the Gospels” (p. 61). Sanders also cites R. Pesch as in favor of the temple incident as a starting point. See R. Pesch, “Der Anspruch Jesu,” *Orientierung* 35 (1971): 53–56.

⁶ John Chrysostom, *Hom. Jo. 23*. Translation from John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist. Homilies 1–47*, trans. Thomas A. Goggin, FC 33 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1957), 225. Chrysostom himself, however, was not in doubt concerning the target of Jesus’s indignation. He clearly sees the temple action as directed at economic exploitation, writing that the Synoptic use of “‘den of thieves’ ... was to show that the wares sold were the products of theft and of rapacity and of greed and they were growing rich from the misfortunes of others,” whereas the Johannine “‘house of business’ ... was to show that their business was impious” (pp. 225–26).

⁷ Klyne Snodgrass, “The Temple Incident,” in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence*, ed. Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb, WUNT 247 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 462.

⁸ N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 2 (London: SPCK, 1996), 414.

misunderstood his meaning.”⁹ Put simply, the meaning of the event is “hermeneutically inaccessible.”¹⁰

Few would go as far as Fredriksen in claiming the hermeneutical inaccessibility of the event, however, and scholars have regularly recognized the central importance of ascertaining the meaning of Jesus’s temple action. In part, the importance of the temple action flows from the importance of the temple itself. As Sanders has rightly opined, “It is almost impossible to make too much of the Temple in first-century Jewish Palestine.”¹¹ Accordingly, Jesus’s relationship to the temple continues to capture the attention of scholars.¹² Wright not

⁹ Paula Fredriksen, “The Historical Jesus, the Scene in the Temple, and the Gospel of John,” in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, *John, Jesus, and History* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007), 265. For a response to Fredriksen’s essay, see Mark Allan Powell, “On Deal-Breakers and Disturbances,” in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, *John, Jesus, and History* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007), 277–82. Assessing Fredriksen’s views on the temple act is complicated by the fact that her views have changed over the years, a detail she narrates in part in the introduction to the second edition of her *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), xx–xxiv. Whereas in her 1988 edition she held that Jesus “enacted a prophecy of the Temple’s coming destruction” (p. xxi), she now sees the account “as a post-70 tradition that harnessed the shock of the Temple’s destruction in such a way that it reinforced Christian belief” (p. xxiv). Fredriksen’s changed views have not always been adequately appreciated in recent surveys of literature, such as the 2019 volume by Eyal Regev who cites only her pre-2000 volumes to locate her alongside Sanders as an advocate of the “symbolic demonstration of destruction” view (*The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred*, AYBRL [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019], 24–25). See also Jacob Chanikuzhy whose 2012 study lists Fredriksen and her 1998 volume to indicate her as an advocate of the historical probability of the incident, and omits her in his list of those who reject its historicity (*Jesus, the Eschatological Temple: An Exegetical Study of Jn 2,13–22 in the Light of the Pre-70 C.E. Eschatological Temple Hopes and the Synoptic Temple Action*, CBET 58 [Leuven: Peeters, 2012], 149–50, nn. 225–226). Cf. Ådna, “Jesus and the Temple,” 2660, cf. n. 84.

¹⁰ Fredriksen, “Scene in the Temple,” 267. Fredriksen posits that “Jesus’ gesture would have been visually inaccessible as well” given the size of the temple and the density of the crowds (pp. 266–67).

¹¹ E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 262. As Wright comments, “The Temple was the focal point of every aspect of Jewish national life.... Its importance at every level can hardly be over-estimated” (*New Testament and the People of God*, *Christian Origins and the Question of God* 1 [London: SPCK, 1992], 224). On the significance of the temple, cf. Ådna, “Jesus and the Temple,” 2635, n. 1. See also the chapter “The Centrality of the Jerusalem Temple and High Priesthood in Second Temple Judaism” in Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*, WUNT 291 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 13–45.

¹² Among the most recent examples is Michael Patrick Barber, *The Historical Jesus and the Temple: Memory, Methodology, and the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge

only considers one of the “chief gains” of the Third Quest to be that the subject of Jesus and the temple has been placed “where it belongs, at the centre of the agenda,”¹³ but he has also more recently opined that the study of the Gospels “positively cries out for exploration of big, new subjects: Jesus and the temple, Jesus and priesthood, Jesus and economics.”¹⁴ Notably, all three topics come together in the temple act. One is unsurprised, therefore, at the abundance of scholarly attention dedicated to reconstructing and interpreting Jesus’s temple act since it has been seen as Jesus’s most ambiguous, yet self-defining, gesture, and that “to grasp the cleansing of the temple is virtually tantamount to grasping the historical Jesus himself.”¹⁵ Similarly, Ådna has recently affirmed “the centrality of the temple act and sayings to research on the historical Jesus.”¹⁶

One thus encounters a text which scholars regularly recognize as central to comprehend Jesus, yet which is itself perplexingly difficult to comprehend. Exacerbating the task of grasping the significance of the temple action is the plethora of interrelated issues that must be solved, both on the macro- and micro-level. At a macro-level, scholars rightly insist that Jesus’s action cannot be interpreted in isolation, but must be closely integrated into one’s overall portrait of Jesus. Ådna, for example, emphasizes that “any viable interpretation of the temple act must cohere with other materials in the Gospels on Jesus’

University Press, 2023). Cf. James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and Temple: Textual and Archaeological Explorations* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014); Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in Its Jewish Context*, SNTSMS 165 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Ådna, “Jesus and the Temple”; Paul M. Hoskins, “Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John” (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002); Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*; Timothy C. Gray, “Jesus and the Temple: The Narrative Role of the Temple in the Gospel of Mark” (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 2006); David Darnell Edwards, “Jesus and the Temple: A Historico-Theological Study of Temple Motifs in the Ministry of Jesus” (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1992). On attempts to separate the two, Charlesworth writes that “one of the most influential effects of the Jesus Seminar has been to drive a wedge between Jesus and the Temple,” and notes that his own work is an attempt to ameliorate the divide (“Jesus and the Temple,” 151).

¹³ Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 405. Cf. Ben Meyer who, writing in 1992, opined that the temple act “has been underplayed ... by recent historical-Jesus research” (*Christus Faber: The Master Builder and the House of God*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 29 [Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1992], 66).

¹⁴ N. T. Wright, “Whence and Whither Historical Jesus Studies in the Life of the Church?,” in *Jesus, Paul and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, ed. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 150.

¹⁵ Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 81. Cf. “The cleansing of the temple was the most charged symbolic act of the public life of Jesus” (Meyer, *Christus Faber*, 115). Although disputing its historicity, Fredriksen nevertheless acknowledges that “in modern reconstructions as in Mark’s narrative, the scene at the Temple is the key to the rest of the story” (*From Jesus to Christ*, 225).

¹⁶ Ådna, “Jesus and the Temple,” 2675, n. 123.

relationship to the temple.”¹⁷ This involves, in part, a determination of where Jesus is to be located on the spectrum of pro-temple to anti-temple,¹⁸ and especially the critical question of how one should relate the temple act to Jesus’s temple sayings.¹⁹ Corresponding to this is the question of how much of the pro-temple or anti-temple material is attributable to the historical Jesus or the evangelists. For Burton Mack, for example, “the anti-temple theme is clearly Markan” and “the temple act is a Markan fabrication.”²⁰ For others, however, the material authentically reflects the words and deeds of the historical Jesus, and James H. Charlesworth investigates the work of Walter Bauer, John Dominic Crossan, E. P. Sanders, and Nicholas Perrin to investigate “the supposition, or claim, that Jesus led a movement that was, in principle, opposed to the Temple or its worship.”²¹ And just as Ådna posits that the temple act cannot be read in isolation of Jesus’s larger attitude toward the temple, so too Charlesworth stresses that this attitude “cannot be reduced to one action or sayings related to it.”²² In contrast to the scholars he examines, he points to Gospel traditions highlighting Jesus’s positive relationship with the temple and posits that “we are entering a new era in understanding Jesus and his reverence for the Temple.”²³

¹⁷ Ådna, “Temple Act,” 948.

¹⁸ Among the more forthright assessments is James D. G. Dunn’s acknowledgement: “Jesus’ attitude to the Temple is not entirely clear” (*Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?: The New Testament Evidence* [London: SPCK, 2010], 44). For discussion, see James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, Christianity in the Making 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 636–40, 785–90, 795–6.

¹⁹ See, e.g. Sanders who argues that “the action and the saying form a unity. Jesus predicted (or threatened) the destruction of the temple and carried out an action symbolic of its destruction by demonstrating against the performance of the sacrifices” (*Jesus and Judaism*, 75). On this topic, see also Ådna, “Jesus and the Temple,” 2665–72.

²⁰ Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 292. Mack appeals to “the lack of any evidence for an anti-temple attitude in the Jesus and Christ tradition prior to Mark” (p. 292). He continues: “Mark’s fiction of an anti-temple messiahship (a contradiction in terms) could have worked only after the temple had already been destroyed. The gospel theme must therefore be a post 70 C.E. fabrication. Before that time the scenario would have appeared ridiculous” (p. 282). A forceful critique of Mack’s work is found in Craig A. Evans, “Jesus and the ‘Cave of Robbers’: Toward a Jewish Context for the Temple Action,” *BBR* 3 (1993): 93–110, esp. 94–100. Evans writes, “Mack’s book is fraught with problems, not the least of which are his assertions that Mark invented much of the tradition.... Mack’s imaginative analysis hardly constitutes scholarly progress in the study of Mark and Christian origins” (p. 94, n. 5).

²¹ Charlesworth, “Jesus and the Temple,” 150. Cf. Joseph, *Jesus and the Temple*, 12–14.

²² Charlesworth, “Jesus and the Temple,” 178.

²³ Charlesworth, “Jesus and the Temple,” 179. Charlesworth adds that “all attempts to comprehend Jesus’ attitude to the Temple should acknowledge that Jesus was in Jerusalem during his last week, not to predict the destruction of the Temple, but to obey the *halakah* that faithful Jews must be in Jerusalem to celebrate Passover and to worship in the Temple, the House of God” (p. 179).

Beyond the particular question of Jesus's view of the temple and the historicity of his sayings and deeds is the related question of how the theme of the temple functions in each individual Gospel and how each evangelist shapes the narrative differently.²⁴ Jacob Chanikuzhy draws attention to how Mark and Matthew differ in their narrative shaping of the temple act and the attendant interpretive implications, positing, "While in Mark the fig tree story is to be understood as an interpretive tool for the temple action, in Matthew the interpretive story seems not to be the fig tree story but the entry story."²⁵ For some

²⁴ Perhaps the most notable recent example is Gray, "Jesus and the Temple." As he writes, "The tension between Jesus and the temple dominates the landscape of Mark 11–15 and propels the narrative to its climax" (p. 6). Further, the temple demonstration is the "watershed event in Mark's narrative" (p. 46). Beyond Mark 11–15, the importance of the temple in Mark 1–10 has been emphasized in Morten Hørning Jensen, "The Temple 'Before the Temple' in the Gospel of Mark: How the Temple Is a Focus in Mark 1–10," *Early Christianity* 12.3 (2021): 388–420. Additionally, Margareta Gruber has investigated the Johannine account of the temple act in order "to explore the literary strategy of John's Easter hermeneutics" ("...But He Was Acting in the Temple of His Body': Symbolic Performance of Death and Resurrection in the Cleansing of the Temple (John 2:13–23)," in *History and Theology in the Gospels: Seventh International East-West Symposium of New Testament Scholars, Moscow, September 26 to October 1, 2016*, ed. Tobias Nicklas, Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, and Mikhail Seleznev, WUNT 447 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020], 170). Emphasis added. On the role of the temple in the Gospels, see also Emilio G. Chávez, *The Theological Significance of Jesus' Temple Action in Mark's Gospel*, Toronto Studies in Theology 87 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2002); Mark A. Matson, "The Contribution to the Temple Cleansing by the Fourth Gospel," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr., SBLSP 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 489–506; Mark A. Matson, "The Temple Incident: An Integral Element in the Fourth Gospel's Narrative," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001); Sunik Hwang, "Matthew's View of the Temple" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002); Francis D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Gospel of Luke" (PhD diss., Fordham University, 1979); Francis D. Weinert, "The Meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts," *BTB* 11.3 (1981): 85–89; Lynn Allan Losie, "The Cleansing of the Temple: A History of a Gospel Tradition in Light of Its Background in the Old Testament and in Early Judaism" (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1984); Robert Ellis Dowda, "The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptic Gospels" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1972); Hoskins, "Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple in the Gospel of John"; Alan Richard Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 220 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002); Peter Head, "The Temple in Luke's Gospel," in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004); Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001); Stephen T. Um, *The Theme of Temple Christology in John's Gospel*, LNTS 312 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006).

²⁵ Chanikuzhy, *Jesus, the Eschatological Temple*, 149. Cf. William Rodgers Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*, JSNTSup (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).

such as Simon J. Joseph, these differences indicate disagreement, asserting, “The Gospels are not in agreement as to the *meaning* of the incident.”²⁶ Further, there is the question of how Jesus relates not only to the temple broadly, but also the priesthood more specifically, a topic which scholars have decried as widely neglected, and a “pariah of biblical scholarship.”²⁷ Especially important has been how this “awkwardly shaped stone” of the temple act fits within the larger construction of Jesus’s context, aims, and death, a focus especially stressed in the Third Quest for the Historical Jesus.²⁸ For those who see Jesus in politically revolutionary terms, for example, this stone accordingly becomes a politically revolutionary act,²⁹ whereas for those who understand Jesus as an eschatological prophet, this stone accordingly becomes an eschatologically

²⁶ Simon J. Joseph, “Jesus and the Temple Incident: A New Proposal,” *JSHJ* 14.1 (2016): 72. Emphasis original.

²⁷ For discussion, see Wardle’s examination of “Jesus’ View of the Temple and Jerusalem Priesthood” in *Temple*, 169–91. Similar to Ådna who emphasizes the need to relate Jesus’s temple action and his overall relationship to the temple, so too Brant Pitre writes that “any attempt to understand Jesus’s relationship to the ancient Jewish Temple must eventually raise the question of his relationship to the ancient Jewish priesthood.” Yet, he laments that “when we turn to recent studies of Jesus and Judaism, we find a strange situation: If there is any single subject which modern historical scholarship on Jesus has almost completely neglected, it is the subject of Jesus and the Jewish priesthood” (“Jesus, the New Temple, and the New Priesthood,” *L&S* 4 [2008]: 71). Pitre cites as recent exceptions to this the pair of articles by Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, who calls the priesthood “a pariah of biblical scholarship” (“Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1,” *JSHJ* 4.2 [2006]: 156); cf. “Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2,” *JSHJ* 5.1 (2007): 57–79.

²⁸ Wright describes the goal of his own investigation as seeing “where this awkwardly shaped stone will fit within the building under construction,” noting that “there is some reason to suppose that it will turn out to be the head corner-stone” (*Jesus and the Victory of God*, 414–15). Wright explains that the five key questions of the Third Quest are 1) How does Jesus fit into Judaism?, (2) What were Jesus’s aims?, (3) Why did Jesus die?, (4) How and why did the early church begin?, and (5) Why are the Gospels what they are? (pp. 89–121). The temple act relates especially to these first three questions.

²⁹ S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967). The view that Jesus was a political revolutionary is regularly traced back to Hermann Reimarus, who, as Brandon summarizes, “interpreted Jesus’ preaching of the coming of the Kingdom of God as incitement to revolt against the government of Rome” (p. 22). Like Brandon, Reimarus interprets the temple act in accordance with his overall conception of Jesus. For discussion, see James P. Sweeney, “Jesus’ Temple Action (Mark 11:15–18) in Recent Discussion: An Examination of Its Character, Meaning, and Role in Jesus’ Death” (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2000), 74–78. Cf. Ernst Bammel, “The Revolution Theory from Reimarus to Brandon,” in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*, ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 12. Fredriksen also discusses how various portraits of Jesus, such as a “Jewish peasant Cynic,” an “ethical, egalitarian Spirit-Person,” or “the antinationalist Jesus,” each offer their own explanation of the temple action (*Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* [New York: Knopf, 2000], 210–12).

oriented prophetic demonstration.³⁰ Further, while scholars have posited a variety of reasons for Jesus's death, it has more recently been frequently connected to the temple action, owing in large part to the influence of Sanders.³¹ Lastly, insofar as many have seen an economic motivation behind Jesus's action, the question is also raised concerning Jesus's overall relationship to economic issues.³² Richard Bauckham's suggestion that Jesus opposed the temple

³⁰ For this view see especially Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*. The impact this larger portrait has on the temple action is evident in how Sanders argues against the "cleansing" interpretation, writing: "Thus there is *no* context for understanding the symbolic action as 'cleansing'. Contemporary Judaism would not expect 'cleansing' from an eschatological prophet or teacher" (p. 90). Emphasis original.

³¹ See Sanders's review and critique of scholarship on Jesus's death in *Jesus and Judaism*, 22–58. Sanders summarizes his own view: "Many factors – Jesus' extraordinary self-claim; the gathering he attracted; the nervousness on the part of Jewish leaders not to give the Romans occasion for punishment of the people generally; the Romans' own anxiety about prophets and about crowds at feasts – doubtless help account for the fact that Jesus was crucified. *But he was not crucified until after he had time to make a demonstration against the temple*, and that appears to have been the last thing which he *did* (except for his last meal with the disciples) before he was executed. The gun may already have been cocked, but it was the temple demonstration which pulled the trigger" (*Jesus and Judaism*, 305). Emphasis original. For Joseph, "The Temple incident was the primary causal factor that led to Jesus' death" ("Jesus and the Temple Incident," 93). In contrast, Jürgen Becker concludes "that Jesus did not engage in the action in the temple and that it cannot have been the cause of his final fate" (*Jesus of Nazareth*, trans. James E. Crouch [New York: de Gruyter, 1998], 333). For a helpful treatment of the views and issues, see Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005). McKnight writes, "If there is a new trend, it is to connect the death of Jesus with his temple action" (p. 93). See also Sweeney's section on "the role of Jesus' temple action in his death" ("Jesus' Temple Action," 275–338). Cf. Adele Reinhartz, "The Temple Cleansing and the Death of Jesus," in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, ed. Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen M. Schuller, WUNT 305 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 100–111.

³² For some recent treatments on economics and Scripture, see Edith Rasell, *The Way of Abundance: Economic Justice in Scripture and Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2022); Peter Oakes, *Empire, Economics, and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020); Jonathan Cornillon, *Tout En Commun? La Vie Économique de Jésus et Des Premières Générations Chrétiennes* (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 2020); Thomas R. Blanton and Raymond Pickett, eds., *Paul and Economics: A Handbook* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017); Douglas E. Oakman, *Jesus, Debt, and the Lord's Prayer: First-Century Debt and Jesus' Intentions* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014); Gyorgy Benyik, "Jesus and Money," in *The Gospels: History and Christology: The Search of Joseph Ratzinger-Benedict XVI*, ed. Bernardo Estrada, Ermenegildo Manicardi, and Armand Puig i Tàrrach (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2013); Albino Barrera, *Biblical Economic Ethics: Sacred Scripture's Teachings on Economic Life* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013); Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood, eds., *Engaging Economics: New Testament*

tax as economically exploitative, for example, necessarily involves the question of Jesus's relationship not only to poverty and wealth, but also to taxation.³³

In addition to these macro-level issues are a host of micro-level issues which relate to the details of the pericope itself as it appears across the four Gospels. As Tom Holmén has observed, "It seems that it is not the lack of clues in understanding the passage that causes difficulties, but rather that they are so many."³⁴ These difficulties include determining the historical reliability of Jesus's temple action overall, but especially of Mark 11:17 which occupies a critical function in the interpretation of the event.³⁵ Should these be taken as historical, then the question remains concerning how to interpret the significance of the intertextual connection with OT texts like Isa 56:7, Jer 7:11, Ps 69:9, and Zech 14:21.³⁶ Further, disagreement exists on the lexical range and

Scenarios and Early Christian Reception (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Richard A. Horsley, *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009); Rau Eckhard, "Arm und Reich im Spiegel des Wirkens Jesu," in *Eschatologie und Ethik im frühen Christentum: Festschrift für Günter Haufe zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Christfried Böttrich, Greifswalder Theologische Forschungen 11 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2006), 249–68; Annette Merz, "Mammon als schärfster Konkurrent Gottes – Jesu Vision vom Reich Gottes und das Geld," in *Gott oder Mammon: Christliche Ethik und die Religion des Geldes*, ed. Severin J. Lederhilger, Linzer Philosophisch-Theologische Beiträge 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001), 34–90. See also the recent discussion on Jesus's attitude toward possessions and wealth, including a summary of scholarship on sociological interpretations in Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, "Possessions and Wealth," in *The Jesus Handbook*, ed. Jens Schröter and Christine Jacobi, trans. Robert L. Brawley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2022), 437–44.

³³ Richard Bauckham, "Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple," in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity*, ed. Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge: Clarke, 1988), 72–89. For Bauckham, Jesus's objection "was a radical objection to the [temple] tax itself" (p. 75).

³⁴ Tom Holmén, *Jesus and Jewish Covenant Thinking* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 305.

³⁵ For an affirmation of the historicity of the account, see, e.g., Snodgrass, "Temple Incident"; Evans, "Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers.'" For a denial of its historicity, see, e.g., R. J. Miller, "The (A)Historicity of Jesus' Temple Demonstration: A Test Case in Methodology," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr., SBLSP 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 235–52; David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act," *CBQ* 55.2 (1993): 263–83; David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act Revisited: A Response to P. M. Casey," *CBQ* 62.1 (2000): 55–63; Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 292. Cf. the bibliography for both positions provided in Chanikuzhy, *Jesus, the Eschatological Temple*, 149–50, nn. 225 and 226.

³⁶ See, e.g. Henk Jan de Jonge, "The Cleansing of the Temple in Mark 11:15 and Zechariah 14:21," in *The Book of Zechariah and Its Influence*, ed. C. M. Tuckett (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003); Cecil Roth, "Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah 14:21," *NovT* 4.3 (1960): 174–81; Joel Marcus, "No More Zealots in the House of the Lord: A Note on the History of Interpretation of Zechariah 14:21," *NovT* 55.1 (2013): 22–30; Evans, "Jesus and

intended sense of key terms such as *σκεῦος, ληστής, and σπήλαιον*.³⁷ For example, the phrase *σπήλαιον ληστῶν* (“den of thieves”) has frequently been taken as confirmation that Jesus’s anger was directed at economic exploitation.³⁸ However, scholars have argued that it is inappropriate to understand *ληστής* as a financial swindler, but instead refers to a violent robber, or a “brigand.”³⁹ Additionally, the term *σπήλαιον* has also been found by some to be at odds with the traditional interpretation, since “a ‘den’ (be it of thieves or of brigands) is not a place where robberies are committed,” but a place of refuge for the subjects in question.⁴⁰ Questions also surround the historical and narrative function of the characters mentioned in the account, such as the buyers and sellers, the

the ‘Cave of Robbers’”; Steven M. Bryan, “Consumed by Zeal: John’s Use of Psalm 69:9 and the Action in the Temple,” *BBR* 21.4 (2011): 479–94; J. R. Daniel Kirk, “Time for Figs, Temple Destruction, and Houses of Prayer in Mark 11:12–25,” *CBQ* 74.3 (2012): 509–27; Holly J. Carey, “Teachings and Tirades: Jesus’ Temple Act and His Teachings in Mark 11:15–19,” *SCJ* 10.1 (2007): 93–105; Mieczysław Celestyn Paczkowski, “Isaiah 56:7 in the Patristic Interpretation,” *Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia* 12.4 (2019): 469–95; George H. Guthrie, “The Tree and the Temple: Echoes of a New Ingathering and Renewed Exile (Mark 11.12–21),” *NTS* 68.1 (2022): 26–37; Matthew J. Klem, “Flipping Tables and Building Temples: An Intertextual Reading of Psalm 68:10 LXX in John 2:17,” *HBT* 43.1 (2021): 70–98.

³⁷ See, e.g. Josephine Massyngbaerde Ford, “Money ‘Bags’ in the Temple (Mk 11:16),” *Bib* 57.2 (1976): 249–53; George Wesley Buchanan, “Mark 11:15–19: Brigands in the Temple,” *HUCA* 30 (1959): 169–77; George Wesley Buchanan, “An Additional Note to ‘Mark 11.15–19, Brigands in the Temple,’” *HUCA* 31 (1960): 103–5; George Wesley Buchanan, “Symbolic Money-Changers in the Temple?,” *NTS* 37.2 (1991): 288.

³⁸ E.g. “The use of Jer 7:11 shows him protesting exorbitant rates of exchange for foreign currency and high prices for sacrifices” (Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 413). See also the discussion in Craig Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 68–69.

³⁹ Thus, Buchanan concludes, “There is no linguistic evidence to support the translation ‘den of thieves,’” but instead argues for “cave of brigands,” or even, “a zealot stronghold” (“Mark 11:15–19,” 177). Marcus J. Borg also insists that “contrary to the most common interpretation, ‘robbers’ almost certainly cannot refer to economic dishonesty on the part of the merchants, or to the inappropriateness of commercial activity in the Temple precincts” (*Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*, new ed. [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998], 185). For discussion, see Gray, “Jesus and the Temple,” 36–38. Cf. “The reference to the ‘den of robbers’ from Jer 7:11 has nothing to do with dishonest trade in the temple” (David E. Garland, *A Theology of Mark’s Gospel: Good News About Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God*, Biblical Theology of the New Testament [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015], 149–50).

⁴⁰ Kirk, “Time for Figs, Temple Destruction, and Houses of Prayer,” 518. Kirk emphasizes that “in Jeremiah the phrase *σπήλαιον ληστῶν* is aptly chosen to represent the practice of a people who see the temple as a place of safety to which they can flee after committing various forms of injustice in other spheres” (p. 519). In agreement, see Marcus J. Borg and John Dominic Crossan, *The Last Week: The Day-by-Day Account of Jesus’s Final Week in Jerusalem* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2006), 49.

Index of Ancient Sources

A. Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Numbers</i>	
19:30 LXX	93	15:1–10	81
42:25	79		
42:29 LXX	79, 92	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
		14:22–26	118
<i>Exodus</i>		15:4	188
22:25	145, 178	15:8	189
23:11	26	15:11	188
23:17	118	16:16–17a	118
30:11–16	144, 170, 171	23:19	32, 145
30:13–16	144	28:29	102
30:16	55	31–34	125
38:26	34		
		<i>1 Kings</i>	
<i>Leviticus</i>		8:4 LXX	50
4:3	159	11:29	50
4:13	159	18:4 LXX	93
4:23	159		
5:7–11	166, 170, 172	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
5:7	74, 161	2	130
5:11	161, 165	2:17–32	130
6:2	102	2:27	130
6:4	102		
8:11	77	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
8:11 LXX	77	5:8	67
12:6–8	161	7:12–13	55
12:6	74	23:21	102
14:22	161	24:24	170
15:14	74		
15:29	74	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
16:3	133	36:22–23	55
19:13	101–102		
19:35–36	113	<i>Ezra</i>	
25:35–37	178	10:8	177
25:36–37	145		
25:37	32	<i>Nehemiah</i>	
27:30–31	118	5:3–12	120
		10:32–33	144

<i>Job</i>		19:1–13	49
20:19	102	19:10–11	49
24:9	102	21:12	102
		22:13–19	88
<i>Psalms</i>		32:14	79
17:4	105		
62:10	102	<i>Lamentations</i>	
119:36	88	4:13	123
<i>Proverbs</i>			
11:1	113	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
11:26	181	4:1–15	49
20:10	113	4:12–13	49
		5:11	123
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		7:22	105
5:8	102	18:10–18	105, 106
		18:18	102
<i>Isaiah</i>		22:9	98
20:1	50	22:12	108
20:2–4	49	22:12–14	88
28:1–13	131	22:29	102, 108
28:7	123	33:31	88
44:28–45	55		
45:8	105	<i>Daniel</i>	
56	53, 88–89	11:14	105
56:7	9, 24–27, 40,		
58, 83–89, 111		<i>Hosea</i>	
56:7 LXX	26–27, 84	2:12	49
56:9–12	88	6:7	56
56:11	88	6:9	123
		12:7	108, 113
<i>Jeremiah</i>			
6:13	88, 123	<i>Amos</i>	
7	53, 89, 106–	2:8	120
107, 111, 115, 168		8:4–6	113
7:1–11	35–36		
7:5–7	107	<i>Obadiah</i>	
7:6	53, 108	5	99
7:9	36		
7:11	9–10, 15, 20,	<i>Micah</i>	
	24–25, 27, 36,	2:2	102
	43, 48, 52, 58,	3:2	102
	69, 87–111,	6:10–12	105
	123		
7:11 LXX	96, 107	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
7:34	106	3:1–4	123
8:10	88, 123		
12:9	94, 95	<i>Zechariah</i>	
12:9 LXX	94, 96	9:9	66
13:1–11	49	14:21	9, 25, 29, 40,
17:11	181	112	

B. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>			50, 52, 63, 74,
6:12	194		76, 83, 86, 88–
9:13	56		91, 93, 101,
12:7	56		105, 106, 109,
17:24–27	170, 172–175,		115, 164, 182,
185			199
17:24	117	11:17b	90, 164
17:27	156	11:20–25	65
18:22–35	194, 195	12:1–12	199
18:28	195	12:13–17	174
21:5	66	12:33	56
21:9	66	12:40	104, 108
21:12–17	23, 64	12:42–43	189
21:12–16	22	13:1–2	23, 50
21:12a	70–73	14:10–11	137
21:12b	73–76	14:48	98
21:13	90	14:58	23
21:13a	83–89	15:27	98
21:13b	89–91		
21:14	67	<i>Luke</i>	
21:15–17	67	2:22–24	164
21:18–22	67	2:24	74, 161
23:23–24	134	7:40–43	194–95
24:1–2	23	10:30	98
25:27	75	11:46	202
26:55	98	12:13–20	180
27:6	37	12:18	181
27:16	98	16:1–13	194
27:38	98	19:28–44	67
		19:39–44	68
<i>Mark</i>		19:41–44	68
7:9–13	47	19:45–47	164
10:45	174	19:45	70–73
11	168	19:45b	164
11:1–10	67	19:46	25, 90
11:11	42	19:46a	83–89
11:12–14	65	19:46b	89–91
11:15	42	19:47–48	68
11:15–19	65, 101	21:5–6	23
11:15–18	22, 64	23:19	98
11:15–17	50, 185		
11:15–16	27	<i>John</i>	
11:15a	70–73	2:1–12	68
11:15b	73–76, 164,	2:11–22	2
205		2:13–22	22, 64
11:16	40, 76–83	2:14–16	70–76, 159
11:16b	164, 166	2:14	158, 159
11:17	9, 13, 14, 18,	2:16	25, 29, 40, 42,
	20, 24–29, 32,	111–114	

2:16b	59	3:14	98
2:19	23	6:14	25
10:1–10	100		
10:8	100	<i>Romans</i>	
10:10	100	13:1–7	169
11:38	92		
12	69	<i>2 Corinthians</i>	
18:13	128	11:26	98
19:29	81		
		<i>Hebrews</i>	
<i>Acts</i>		9:21	77
2	169	11:38	93
2:44–45	168		

C. Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Literature

<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>		<i>1 Maccabees</i>	
27:7	126	1:20–24	121
<i>Baruch</i>		<i>2 Maccabees</i>	
6:14	98	3:1–7	121
		3:4–40	119
<i>2 Baruch</i>		3:6–14	120
1:4	126		
10:18	126, 136	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	
32:2–4	126	4:1–14	119
		4:3	120
<i>4 Baruch</i>			
1:1	126	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	
1:8	126	1	126
4:4–5	126	1:4–8	124
		2:3	124
<i>1 Enoch</i>		8:11	125
53:6	55	17–18	126
89–90	126	17:21–23a	55
90:29	55	17:30	55
97:8–10	181		
		<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	
<i>Jubilees</i>		4:115–18	55
23:17	123	5:414–27	55
23:21	123–24, 126	5:432–33	55
32:10–14	118		
		<i>Sirach</i>	
<i>LAB</i>		26:26–27:1	113
19:6–7	126	27:2	113
		37:11	113
<i>Ladder of Jacob</i>		50:1–2	55
5:8–9	126	50:5–6	55

<i>Testament of Dan</i>		<i>Testament of Moses</i>	
5:7	124	2–9	125
5:10–12	55	5–6	125
		5–7	138
<i>Testament of Issachar</i>		5:3–6:1	125
7:8	92	6	137
		7	137
<i>Testament of Judah</i>		7:4–6	138
21:7–22:1	124		
<i>Testament of Levi</i>		<i>Testament of Reuben</i>	
10	124	7:2	92
14–16	124		
14:1–6	124, 126	<i>Tobit</i>	
17:1–2	124	1:7	118
17:11	126		

D. Rabbinic Literature

Targums	51:53	132
<i>Fragmentary Targum Deuteronomy</i>		
16:19	131	
<i>Fragmentary Targum Ezekiel</i>		
22:26	131	
<i>Fragmentary Targum Genesis</i>		
49:12	131	
<i>Targum 1 Samuel</i>		
2:27	130	
10:27	130	
<i>Targum Isaiah</i>		
5:1–7	130	
22:20–24	130	
28:1–13	130, 131	
28:1	131	
28:8	131	
32:6–7	131	
53:5	55	
<i>Targum Jeremiah</i>		
7	137	
7:8–9	131	
8:10	131	
18:18	132	
23:11	131	
		<i>Targum Lamentations</i>
		4:22
		131
		<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Deuteronomy</i>
		30:4
		131
		<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Exodus</i>
		40:10
		131
		<i>Targum Zechariah</i>
		4:7
		55
		6:12
		55
		Mishnah
		<i>‘Abot</i>
		3:18
		162
		<i>‘Arakin</i>
		6–8
		177
		6:2–3
		178
		8:2–3
		178
		9:3
		145
		9:4
		119
		<i>Baba Qamma</i>
		3:9
		160
		10:4
		160

<i>Berakot</i>		4:3	72
9:5	40, 79, 80, 82	4:3B–D	81
		4:4	72
<i>Bikkurim</i>		4:9	81, 165
3:5	82	5:1–4	162
		5:1	164
<i>Horayot</i>		5:4–5	166
2:7	165	5:4	81
		5:6	72
<i>Hullin</i>		6:5	82, 162
1:5	162, 163, 164	7:7	162
<i>Kelim</i>		<i>Tosefta</i>	
2:6	80	<i>Hagigah</i>	
12:5	79	2:2–3	159
12:7	128		
17:16	80	<i>Menaḥot</i>	
18:2	80	13:18–19	132
26:2	80	13:21	105, 132, 133,
27:6	80	134, 139	
27:7	80	13:22	133
29:1	80		
		<i>Šeqalim</i>	
<i>Keritot</i>		1:6D	5
1:7	13, 81, 133,	3:1	82
	136, 137, 150,	3:2–4	162
	151, 162, 163,	3:9	162
	164		
5:2	160	<i>Zebaḥim</i>	
		11:16	132
<i>Menaḥot</i>			
8:2	166	Babylonian Talmud	
8:7	166	<i>Baba Meši'a</i>	
13:8	160	44	162
<i>Me'ilah</i>		<i>Berakot</i>	
3:4	162, 163, 164	62b	80
<i>Middot</i>		<i>Beṣah</i>	
2:5	81	20a–b	159
<i>Šabbat</i>		<i>Giṭṭin</i>	
6:5	128	56a	128, 132, 201
<i>Šeqalim</i>		<i>Ketubbot</i>	
1:3–5	144	65a	128
1:3	172	66b	128
1:4	171	67b	189
1:6–7	151–53, 154–		
56		<i>Megillah</i>	
1:6	5, 145, 150	18a	55
1:7	151		
4:3–4	165		

<i>Menahot</i>		<i>Ḥagigah</i>	
21b	162	2:3	159
<i>Pesaḥim</i>		<i>Šeqalim</i>	
2:3a	139	1:4	155
57a	132, 133, 134,	Other Rabbinic Works	
139		<i>Amidah</i>	
<i>Sanhedrin</i>		14	55
26B	103	<i>Mekilta Bahodesh</i>	
<i>Sukkah</i>		1:1	34
30a	168	<i>Pesiḡta Rabbati</i>	
<i>Yebamot</i>		47:6	133
61a	132, 201	<i>Rabbah Lamentations</i>	
<i>Yoma</i>		1:50–51	128
35b	132, 201	<i>Rabbah Leviticus</i>	
39b	128	3:5	168
Jerusalem Talmud		9:6	55
<i>Beṣah</i>		21:9	133
2:4	159		

E. Dead Sea Scrolls

<i>IQpHab (Pesher Habakkuk)</i>		<i>4Q159</i>	
1:3	126	1.6–7	35, 171
7:1–2	127	<i>4QMMT</i>	
8–12	127	82–83	127
8:7–17	126	<i>4QpNah (Pesher Nahum)</i>	
8:8–13	132	1:11	127
8:9	126	<i>4QPS 37</i>	
9:4–5	127	2:14	127
9:4–7	132	3:6	127
9:9	126	3:12	127
9:9–12	127	<i>CD/Damascus Document</i>	
11:4	126	6:13–17	37
12:7–10	127	6:14–17	127, 178
12:8–10	124		

F. Philo and Josephus

Philo		18.3	128
<i>Embassy</i>		18.312–313	144
121–122	99	18.312	34, 117
		20	139
<i>Against Flaccus</i>		20.179–181	138
5	98	20.180–181	132
		20.181	105, 129
<i>On Sobriety</i>		20.206	129
20	145	20.206–207	105, 129, 132,
		138	
<i>On the Special Laws</i>		20.213–214	138
1.68	118	20.213	129
1.74	159	184.111–113	119
1.76–78	117		
1.76	117, 178	<i>Jewish War</i>	
1.166–67	158	1.152	121
3.158	195	1.179	121
3.159	195	1.402	201
4.77	145	2.228	98
		2.254	98
Josephus		2.293	128
<i>Against Apion</i>		2.422–48	139
2.105–106	78, 82	2.422	201
2.106	40, 41	2.426–27	128, 134
2.108	128	2.426	128, 201
2.109	41, 78, 82	2.428	201
2.185–188	128	2.434	128
		2.441	128
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		2.590–594	166
3.193–196	144	5.210–11	128
3.233–234	81	5.222–24	128
8.330	93	6.115	201
12.421	93	6.282	119, 120
13.56	178	6.300–309	106
14	186	6.424	118, 158
14.72	121	7.187–89	92
14.105	121, 128	7.218	117, 144
14.110	116	7.257–58	135
14.111–113	120	7.260	197
14.203	186	20.206	139
14.415	93		
14.417	93	<i>Life</i>	
14.421	93	70–76	166
15.425–430	93	190–196	129
17.164	128	422	201
17.317	121		

G. Greek and Latin Literature

Ammianus Marcellinus		<i>Philosophies for Sale</i>	
<i>Res gestae</i>		11	147
9.3	147		
Aristophanes		Plato	
<i>The Rich Man</i>		<i>Republic</i>	
550–554	189	514a	92
Cassius Dio		Plutarch	
<i>Roman History</i>		<i>Lucullus</i>	
64.15.3	79	20.1–4	196
Chariton		Procopius	
<i>Chaereas and Callirhoe</i>		<i>Secret History</i>	
1.7	148	22.3–5	148
		25.12	148
Cicero		Seneca the Elder	
<i>Epistulae ad Quintum fratrum</i>		<i>Controversiae</i>	
1.1.33	188	9.12	146
<i>Letter to Octavian</i>		Suetonius	
8.31	147	<i>Divus Augustus</i>	
<i>Pro Flacco</i>		2.1–3	147
28.67–69	121	3.1–2	147
		4.1–2	147
		28.3	38
Dionysius of Halicarnassus			
<i>Antiquitates Romanae/Roman Antiquities</i>		<i>Galba</i>	
1.32.4	92	9.1	147
1.39.2	93, 99		
1.39.4	93	Tacitus	
Herodotus		<i>Annals</i>	
<i>Persian Wars</i>		2.42	187
1.94	142	3.40–46	187
Lucian		<i>History</i>	
<i>How to Write History</i>		5.8.1	116, 119, 175
10	146	Theocritus	
		<i>Idylls</i>	
		12.35	145

H. Patristic Literature

Augustine		2.51	146
<i>On Flight in Persecution</i>		3.50	146
13.3	142	18.20	146
<i>Sermons</i>		<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>	
36.9	181	21:12–13	32, 145
Basil		<i>Epistulae</i>	
<i>Letters</i>		99.11.2	146
188	99	John Chrysostom	
Clement of Alexandria		<i>Homilies on John</i>	
<i>Salvation of the Rich (Quis dives salvetur)</i>		23	2, 32, 91
42	97	Origen	
Cyril of Alexandria		<i>Commentary on Job</i>	
<i>Commentary on John</i>		19.7	146
2.18	150	<i>Commentary on John</i>	
Eusbeius		10.145–149	21
<i>Against Hierocles</i>		Tertullian	
33.2	147	<i>On Flight in Persecution</i>	
Jerome		13.3	142
<i>Clementine Homilies</i>			

Index of Modern Authors

- Abrahams, Israel, 151–153, 155, 172
 Adams, Samuel L., 201
 Adna, Jostein, 1, 3, 4–5, 7, 12, 14, 21–23, 29–31, 42, 56–57, 59, 65, 70, 82–83, 143, 161, 173–74
 Andreau, Jean, 143, 148, 152
 Applebaum, Shimon, 54, 185, 197
- Balentine, Samuel E., 102–103
 Bammel, Ernst, 7, 34, 44
 Barclay, John M. G., 169, 191
 Barrett, C. K., 24, 69, 83, 97, 101, 112, 149
 Bauckham, Richard, 8–9, 13, 16, 24–26, 28–29, 34–35, 41, 48, 51–52, 70–72, 74, 80–81, 86, 156, 160–163, 166, 170, 172–75, 185, 187, 193, 203, 206
 Beasley-Murray, G. R., 64, 100
 Beavis, Mary Ann, 21
 Becker, Jürgen, 8, 21
 Betlyon, John W., 142, 145
 Betz, Hans Dieter, 27, 29, 38–39
 Bickerman, E. J., 171
 Bilkes, Gerald M., 143
 Bird, Michael F., 101, 103–104, 169
 Blenkinsopp, Joseph, 177
 Block, Daniel Isaac, 99–100
 Blomberg, Craig, 10, 12–13, 15, 34, 142, 157
 Bock, Darrell L., 2, 12, 41, 70, 90–91, 165, 181
 Bockmuehl, Markus, 13, 29, 33, 40–41, 73, 81, 122, 161–162, 170
 Bogaert, Raymond, 152–153
 Borchert, Gerald L., 22, 64, 68
 Borg, Marcus J., 10, 15–16, 24, 35, 53, 57–59, 97, 100, 183–184, 186, 199–201
 Boring, M. Eugene, 78, 83
 Bovon, François, 41, 155, 181
 Bracke, John M., 108
 Brandon, S. G. F., 7, 44–45, 192
 Broshi, Magen Israel, 117, 202
 Brown, Michael L., 110
 Brown, Raymond E., 23, 69, 140
- Bryan, Steven M., 10, 13, 15
 Buchanan, George Wesley, 10–11, 100–101
 Bultmann, Rudolf, 24
 Burke, Simeon R., 174
 Buth, Randall, 178
- Carson, D. A., 22, 42, 89, 112, 142
 Carter, Warren, 105, 108
 Casey, Maurice, 24, 29, 78, 82
 Chancey, Mark A., 117, 171, 198–199
 Chanikuzhy, Jacob, 3, 6, 8, 12–14, 21, 31, 42, 66, 67, 69, 73, 79, 86, 112, 165
 Charlesworth, James H., 4–5, 11, 36, 92, 103
 Chilton, Bruce, 39, 41, 47–48, 131, 133, 162, 194
 Cho, Bernardo, 137, 163–164
 Cohen, Akiva, 144
 Cohen, Edward E., 152–153
 Cohick, Lynn H., 59–60
 Collins, Adele Yarbro, 25–27, 31, 35, 39, 78, 101, 104
 Collins, John J., 125, 127, 155
 Crossan, John Dominic, 5, 10, 12, 15, 24, 52–53, 55, 142, 157, 184
 Crossley, James G., 28, 33, 104, 122, 171
 Culpepper, R. Alan, 40, 49, 104, 152, 159, 161, 172
- Davenport, Gene L., 124
 Domeris, William, 31, 105, 122, 141
 Dowda, Robert Ellis, 6, 12, 154
 Dunn, James D. G., 5, 14, 23, 30, 42, 49, 50, 119, 120, 129, 172, 194
- Edersheim, Alfred, 42–43, 151–153, 155
 Eppstein, Victor, 41–43, 150–151, 164
 Evans, Craig A., 5, 9, 13, 24, 26, 28–29, 33–34, 39, 42–44, 48, 50, 52, 54, 66, 103, 104–106, 122–23, 126–38, 140, 146, 159, 168, 175, 198–99, 201–202, 205
- Ferguson, Everett, 119

- Fiensy, David A., 16, 132, 183–184, 198, 200–201
 Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 22, 68, 104, 181
 Ford, Josephine Massyngbaerde, 10, 79–80
 France, R. T., 30, 39–41, 65, 71, 83, 86–87, 91, 97, 142
 Fredriksen, Paula, 2–4, 7, 36, 184
 Freyne, Sean, 166, 185
 Friesen, Steven J., 189–191

 Garland, David E., 10–11, 56–57, 71, 74, 77, 83–84, 86–87, 91, 110, 160, 170–171
 Garnsey, Peter, 191
 Goldingay, John, 84–85, 107–108
 Goodman, Martin, 17, 54, 57, 116, 118, 129, 134, 149, 179, 196–197
 Gordon, Benjamin D., 178–179
 Graeber, David, 197
 Gray, Elmer L., 144
 Gray, Timothy, 4, 6, 10, 12, 61, 71–72, 77–78, 84–85
 Gruber, Margareta, 6, 61
 Gundry, Robert H., 10, 66, 90, 91, 101, 105–106, 142
 Guthrie, George H., 10, 29, 61

 Haenchen, Ernst, 20–21, 42, 78, 87, 112, 143, 149, 152
 Hagner, Donald, 42, 71, 143
 Hamel, Gildas, 198, 201
 Hamilton, Neill Q., 82, 116, 119–120
 Han, Kyu Sam, 126
 Harl, Kenneth W., 154
 Harland, Philip A., 185–187
 Hartley, John E., 102, 165
 Harvey, A. E., 26–27
 Hayward, Robert, 103, 108, 131–132
 Heichelheim, F. M., 192
 Herzog, William R., 56–57, 96, 149, 179–180
 Holmén, Tom, 9, 23, 41, 56–57, 60, 64, 71–72, 91, 95, 107, 109, 111
 Horbury, William, 34, 117, 144, 171
 Horsley, Richard A., 45–47, 109, 116, 128–129, 167–169, 174–175, 179, 185–186, 202, 206
 Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement, 112
 Hutt, Curis, 11, 17, 142, 146

 Instone-Brewer, David, 36, 41, 79, 81–82, 150–152, 154–156, 165–166, 171, 192

 Jeremias, Joachim, 78, 82, 123, 133, 140, 146, 148
 Johnson, Luke Timothy, 18, 68
 Joseph, Simon J., 4–5, 7–8, 12, 15, 31, 47, 56–57, 73, 76–77, 122, 174–175, 203

 Keener, Craig S., 22, 43, 68, 71, 87, 118, 127, 155, 158–159, 177, 180, 187
 Kelber, Werner H., 77
 Kirk, J. R. Daniel, 10, 28, 30, 91–92, 95–96, 107, 109
 Klawans, Jonathan, 74, 161, 167–170, 175, 181
 Kloppenborg, John S., 199–201
 Kvasnica, Brian, 178

 Lane, William, 40–41, 66, 86, 90, 154
 Laynesmith, Mark, 60
 Longenecker, Bruce W., 8, 183, 190–191, 194

 Mack, Burton L., 5, 9, 21
 Maier, Gerhard, 67, 86, 90, 98
 Maier, Paul L., 17, 119–120, 142, 145, 149–150, 153
 Malina, Bruce J., 109–110, 149
 Marcus, Joel, 9, 25, 28, 30, 40, 66, 77, 104, 108, 112, 144, 155, 183
 Marius, Reiser, 159–160, 162, 192
 Mason, Steve, 139
 Mathew, Sam P., 12, 33, 70, 161
 McConville, J. G., 85, 88
 McLaren, James, 137–141
 Merz, Annette, 9, 56, 57
 Metzendorf, Christina, 12, 21, 30, 31, 59
 Moloney, Francis J., 68, 77
 Morris, Leon, 71–73, 86, 90, 98, 112, 142, 146, 151
 Moule, C. F. D., 7, 34, 44, 49, 208
 Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, 11, 36–37

 Neusner, Jacob, 11, 41, 55–57, 75, 79, 80–82, 132, 150, 155–156, 162–165

 Oakes, Peter, 8, 188, 190
 Oakman, Douglas E., 8, 117, 180, 184–185, 188, 192–196
 Odell, Margaret S., 106
 Osborne, Grant R., 144
 Oswalt, John N., 84, 88
 Owen-Ball, David T., 174

- Pastor, Jack, 195
- Perrin, Nicholas, 1, 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 29, 30, 41, 52–55, 57, 59, 60, 89, 96, 108, 109, 120, 122, 125, 131, 137, 150, 175–177, 179, 184, 196, 202–203, 206
- Pitre, Brant, 7, 61–62
- Quarles, Charles L., 34, 72–73, 88–89, 157
- Raabe, Paul R., 100
- Ramos, Alex, 118, 192–194
- Regev, Eyal, 3, 31, 37–38, 53, 75, 83, 136, 173, 203
- Richardson, Peter, 31, 35–38, 57, 75, 164
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L., 109–110, 149
- Rowlandson, Jane, 200–201
- Ruiz, Gilbert A., 12, 117–120, 143, 150, 153
- Safrai, S., 118, 177
- Sanders, E. P., 2–3, 5, 8, 14, 23–24, 26–28, 33, 46, 48, 49–53, 55, 57, 76, 81, 117–118, 121–123, 135, 150, 153, 158–165, 172, 186–187, 194, 205
- Schein, Andrew, 188–189
- Schnabel, Eckhard J., 29, 66, 117, 135–137, 149, 155, 173, 202
- Schürer, Emil, 118, 158
- Scott, James C., 169
- Seeley, David, 9, 13, 21, 134–136, 157
- Shafrai, Ze'ev, 177–178
- Shaner, Katherine A., 61, 149–150
- Smith, Steve, 136–137
- Snodgrass, Klyne, 2, 9, 11, 15, 18, 21–23, 31, 59–60, 83, 95, 97, 101, 106, 122–123, 125–127, 132, 140–141, 170, 192
- Staalduine-Sulman, Eveline van, 130
- Stegemann, Ekkehard, 189, 192–193, 197, 202
- Stegemann, Wolfgang, 189, 192–193, 197, 202
- Stein, Robert H., 40, 66, 86, 142–150, 158, 170
- Tan, Kim Huat, 14, 24, 29, 31, 33, 80–81, 101, 110, 122–123, 142, 157, 159
- Taylor, Vincent, 12, 32, 157, 166
- Telford, William Rodgers, 6, 77–78
- Tenney, Merrill C., 98, 112
- Theissen, Gerd, 56–57
- Thompson, J. A., 94
- Tiwald, Markus, 124
- Tromp, Johannes, 125–126, 138
- Udoh, Fabian, 187–188, 199–200
- Wardle, Timothy, 3, 7, 28–30, 33, 73, 116, 118, 120, 122
- Wassén, Cecilia, 27, 31, 60
- Wedderburn, A. J. M., 1, 29–31, 62
- Wengst, Klaus, 41
- Wenham, Gordon J., 102, 169
- Wi, MiJa, 195
- Williams, Joel, 98
- Witherington III, Ben, 13, 22–23, 40–41, 43, 59–60, 66, 69, 90, 155
- Worthington, Bruce, 60–61
- Wright, N. T., 2–4, 7, 23, 29–30, 44–45, 49–53, 55, 57, 59, 89, 97, 122, 127, 129

Index of Subjects

- agraphon*, 17, 146
 Animal Sacrifices, 55–57, 78, 84–86, 109, 157–166
 Augustus, 38, 146–147

 Baal, 35–36, 106, 108
 Banking, 75, 80, 117–120, 143, 145, 147–148, 151
 Bribery, 54, 108, 123, 125, 129, 132–134, 147
 Buyers and Sellers, 10–12, 15, 19, 21, 43, 60–61, 63, 69–74, 113–114, 142, 157–167

 Caiaphas, 41–43, 48, 127, 164
 Cleansing, 8, 14, 30, 38, 49, 52–53, 56, 59
 Commercialization, 28, 96, 112
 Court of the Gentiles, 40, 70, 86–87

 Debt, 117, 128–129, 128–129, 168, 177–180, 186, 194–198, 194–202, 201–202
 Den of Thieves, 10, 15, 24–29, 32, 39, 48, 87–111, 164
 Doves, 13, 15, 35, 70, 72–74, 81–82, 105, 118, 133, 151, 158–167

 Eschatological Act, 14–15, 25, 46, 49–50, 54–56

 Fig Tree, 6, 49, 52, 65–68, 199
 First Jewish Revolt, 28, 128

 Hanuth, 41–43
 Herod the Great, 38–39, 93, 121–122, 125, 137–138, 176, 199–200
 High Priesthood, 13, 41–45, 57, 96, 104–105, 109, 123–140, 167–168, 201–202
 Historicity
 – of Mark 11:17, 24–29
 – of the Temple Act, 1–4, 9, 20–24
 Holiness, 37–38, 57–58, 78, 120
 House of Prayer, 26, 40, 83–89

 Idolatry, 54, 123, 131, 133, 137
 Intercalation, 65–66
 Interest, 13, 16, 32, 46, 96, 103–106, 120, 143–145, 168, 176–179, 184–186, 194–201

 Jerusalem Temple
 – Corruption of, 34–35, 51–54, 60, 104, 111, 122–141
 – Destruction of, 5, 23, 27, 33, 46, 48–55, 67, 90, 117, 131, 133, 136, 173
 – Rebuilding of, 48–51
 – as shortcut, 41, 78–80, 82
 – Treasury, 36–37, 70, 80–81
 – Wealth of, 37, 116–122

 Melkart, 35–36
 Messiah, 5, 50, 59–60, 67
 Metaphor, 39, 48, 57, 91, 94–97, 100–111
 Moneychangers, 11–13, 17–19, 21, 27, 32, 34, 55, 58, 74–76, 82, 141–157
 Monopoly, 15, 35, 70, 81, 148, 161–166
 Mount of Olives, 41

 Oxen, 70–74, 158–162

 Pagan Imagery, 35, 49, 70–71, 75, 182
 Passover, 5, 68, 118, 144, 158
 Pilgrimage, 14, 118–119
 Poverty Scale, 189–190, 203
 Predatory Loans, 54, 109, 141, 176–180, 202
 Priesthood, 7, 103–106, 115–116, 122–141, 158, 161, 163, 167–168, 176, 201, 205, 211
 Prophetic Demonstration, 8, 14–15, 23, 28, 46, 48–51, 58–66, 88
prosbul, 179, 197

 Qumran, 60, 117, 127–128, 131, 171

 Sanhedrin, 41, 43
 Sheep, 70–74, 118, 158–162

- Simeon b. Gamaliel, 162–163
 Subsistence Level, 16, 160, 172, 178, 184–194, 198
 Surcharge Rates, 17–19, 43, 141–142, 144, 149–157, 193
 Taxation, 16, 34, 141, 173–175, 184–188, 194, 199–203
 Temple Tax, 34–37, 55, 81, 117, 119, 121, 144, 151, 155–157, 167, 170–175, 180, 182, 184–188, 193, 203
 Tenancy, 179, 194, 198–202
 Tithes, 46, 105, 109, 129, 133, 139, 141, 167–175, 181–182, 186–187, 194
 Tyrian Shekel, 13, 34–37, 71, 144, 151–156, 164, 170–171, 179
 Vessel, 41, 76–83, 166, 175
 Violence, 44–46, 52, 97–106, 111, 123, 127, 129, 132, 134, 139, 195, 201
 Zeal, 51–52
 Zealot, 10, 28, 44–45, 101
 ληστής, 10, 27, 52, 93–111
 σπήλαιον, 10, 15, 27–28, 91–96, 101, 109–110