

RBL0 08/2009



**Barker, Margaret**

***Temple Themes in Christian Worship***

London: T&T Clark, 2007. Pp. xi + 286. Paper.  
\$29.95. ISBN 0567032760.

Albert L. A. Hogeterp  
Faculty of Catholic Theology  
Utrecht, The Netherlands

This book comprises nine chapters with elaborate literary attention for elaboration on temple themes in the interest of Christian worship, ranging from New Testament texts to late antique patristic literature, with comparative attention to the Old Testament, the Pseudepigrapha, Hellenistic Jewish literature, Dead Sea Scrolls, and early rabbinic literature. The book takes the writings of Basil the Great (330–379 C.E.) on unwritten mysteries as a literary starting point (1–6) for the exploration of the temple tradition in early Christianity.

Chapter 1, “The Temple Tradition” (1–18), provides an overview of late antique patristic, early apostolic, and New Testament evidence of the use of temple imagery symbolizing unwritten, secret teachings. Barker’s negative evaluation of Flavius Josephus as “traitor of his people, as “the false prophet mentioned in Revelation 16.13,” as self-proclaimed “new Jeremiah” who interpreted scriptural prophecies “as favorable to the Romans” in his *Jewish War* 3.351–354 (11) is perhaps too much of a value judgment. This does not take into account Josephus’s own concern against “false prophets” who misled the Jewish people (e.g., *J.W.* 2.261; 6.285) and his elaborate defense of Jewish religion against calumny by Apion (*Against Apion*).

At the outset of chapter 2, “Temple and Synagogue” (19–44). Barker rightly points out the limitations in reconstructions of synagogal worship and temple worship and criticizes a tendency to focus on synagogal culture to the exclusion of attention for temple tradition (19–20). Barker discusses the subjects of the Day of Atonement, Passover, sanctity and alleged communal expulsion of apostasy, and the symbolism of the church as priestly community and temple in early Christian tradition. The discussion of the subject “Expulsion?” (32–38) appears problematic, in that Barker’s comparative literary analysis does not distinguish clearly between passages with explicit evidence of separation with its arguable contexts and uncertain hints that could also be interpreted in various other ways. This is illustrated by her problematic argument that “hints” in Paul’s letters, in Rom 9:3 and 1 Cor 12:3, could be taken to imply that a synagogal curse against Christians existed in Paul’s time (38). Romans 9:3, as interpreted by, for example, J. D. G. Dunn (*Romans 9–16*, 532), expresses an “eventuality deemed impossible” and provides a literary figure of speech compared with Exod 32:32. As Barker already comments herself, 1 Cor 12:3 could perhaps be paralleled by a test in Roman cross-examination as written down by Pliny (38), but the commentary on 1 Corinthians (2000, 918–24) by A. C. Thiselton noted twelve differing interpretations of the juxtaposition between curse and confession in 1 Cor 12:3. A further juxtaposition of curse and confession occurs in 1 Cor 16:22.

In chapter 3, “Sons and Heirs” (45–72), Barker surveys descriptions of the building of late antique churches inspired by temple imagery, relates literary evidence of ancient Jewish hopes that the Jerusalem temple would be rebuilt, and refers to Christian texts by Ephrem and Cyril about the attempted rebuilding project in 363 C.E. that was allegedly thwarted by natural disasters and surrounded by Christian procession around the city of Jerusalem. On pages 58–59, Barker cites a fourth-century passage from Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.23 on a belief that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple was a “requital for the death of James the Righteous.” Barker uncritically reads this “quotation” by Eusebius as evidence of a perception of Josephus “even by Jews,” while considering the fact that “the present text of Josephus does not have this section, but Origen knew it” as an aside, as a matter of a footnote (59 n. 16). A sound methodical way of proceeding would rather be to take a critical text edition of Josephus’s works as the point of departure for Josephus’s writings and to treat the patristic literature of Origen and Eusebius as late antique evidence of secondary reference.

In chapter 4, “Lord and Christ” (73–98), Barker focuses on early Christian doxologies and their arguable relation to and elaboration on temple tradition. In some cases, the survey produces problematic readings, such as those of Mal 2:7; Philo, *On Dreams* 2.189, 231; and Sir 50:17 as representations of priests, in particular high priests, as angels (76–77). The Greek term *angelos* could denote messenger rather than an exclusive sense of angel, but this very Greek term does not appear in the Greek text of Sir 50:17.

In chapter 5, “Baptism and Resurrection” (99–134), Barker argues that early Christian baptism should be traced back to the initiation rite of the “ancient royal high priests” (105), while relating resurrection to a typology of Melchizedek’s priestly ascent (112). With regard to the latter argument, Barker further refers to Heb 7:3, 16, 23–24, but Heb 7 does not comprise explicit notions of resurrection apart from an emphasis on eternal priesthood. It should further be noted that Barker’s discussion of baptism does not sufficiently consider a broader setting of Baptist movements in both early Judaism and Christianity not restricted to the issue of anointing of high priests (see, e.g., K. Rudolph, “The Baptist Sects,” *CHJ* 3: 471–500).

In chapter 6, “Transformation and Transfiguration” (135–165), surveys ancient Jewish perceptions of divine appearance in settings of temple liturgy and interprets early Christian revelations and visions of the kingdom, including that in Luke 17:21, as being “in the midst” (164), as coterminous with ancient temple liturgy. Barker concludes this chapter with an interpretation of Maranatha (1 Cor 16:22) as a “prayer for the Lord to appear” rooted in “ancient high priestly blessing” in Num 6:24–26 (164–65) but does not provide further argument why and in which ways the two texts could be related.

In chapter 7, “Cup and Covenant” (167–99), Barker explores early Christian literature that surrounded the Eucharist with temple imagery, observing that “memories of the original Day of Atonement in the temple shaped the Eucharistic liturgies” (197). In this respect, Barker further includes an outlook on memory about the origin of the Eucharist in medieval Rome (199).

In chapter 8, “Bread and Wisdom” (201–19), Barker turns to one element of the Eucharist, the element of bread, and situates Basil’s notion of unwritten tradition on Eucharist prayer in line with biblical tradition about the “Bread of the Presence” in the temple accompanied by invocation of the Presence (212–13). Barker further discusses early Jewish evidence that relates the Bread of the Presence to divine wisdom (214–19). It is not made clear by Barker’s survey why a temple origin should be considered as the exclusive background to and origin of elements of the Eucharist. Barker’s point of view cannot be taken for granted. A recent article by M. Hengel argues that, contrary to sacrificial cult and temple, the Eucharist conveyed a “new revolutionary specifically early Christian view” and constituted a “development *sui generis*” (“Das Mahl in der Nacht, ‘in der Jesus ausgeliefert wurde’ [1 Kor 11,23],” in *Le Repas de Dieu: Das Mahl Gottes* [ed. C. Grappe; WUNT 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 115–60, at 127–28 and 141).

Chapter 9, “Music and Unity” (221–38), discusses literary evidence of biblical and early Jewish texts for music in temple worship and surveys various forms of a “Sanctus” (Rev 4:8; 3 En. 1; 36; 39:12, 40; 1 En. 39.12; Isa 6:3; LXX Isa 6:1 and Targum; John

Chrysostom, *Homily on Isaiah 6*; Hekhalot Rabbati; 227–230). Barker observes that the early literary evidence of the Sanctus presupposes links with atonement and with “renewal and restoration of creation,” thereby further referring to passages from Isaiah and the Apocalypse (230).