

## The High Priest's New Clothes: Adam as Priest in Genesis 2–3

By Jacob Rennaker

In his 2009 Enoch Seminar paper, John Levison treated the subject of “Adam as a Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Literature.”<sup>i</sup> The subject of the seminar was “Enoch, Adam, [and] Melchizedek: [as] Mediatorial Figures,” and Levison felt that Adam was out of place. He argued that, while Enoch and Melchizedek were almost entirely conceived in Second Temple literature as positive figures who communicated heavenly knowledge upon others, Adam was rather “an *unmediator* or an *anti-mediator*” who “mediates loss.”<sup>ii</sup> He stated this most strongly in the following: “Adam was a loser. In the writings of Second Temple Judaism, the unequivocal assumption is that he lost much more than he mediated.”<sup>iii</sup> Given these findings, it is both surprising and significant that Adam could have been depicted not only as a positive figure, but as the archetypal priestly mediator between God and creation. This paper hopes to outline the positive, priestly view of Adam in Second Temple literature, and to demonstrate how these authors may have discerned such ideas from the first chapters of Genesis.

The temple held a unique place in the minds and hearts of the Jewish people during the Second Temple period; having been recently and forcefully estranged from this sacred focal point of their religion, these people possessed a heightened sensitivity to the temple and its related imagery.<sup>iv</sup> Such sensitivity is already evident in the writings of Ezekiel, a prophetic figure who bridged the gap between those who had lived in the shadow of the Jerusalem temple their entire lives, and those who knew nothing but the ruins of this sacred structure upon their return. In describing his vision of the temple,<sup>v</sup> Ezekiel uses language evocative of Eden. For instance, this is evident in the regular appearance of specific heavenly beings—cherubim—in Ezekiel’s narrative. While the six gates of the temple’s courtyards were all decorated with palm trees

(Ezek. 40:16, 22, 26, 31, 34, 37), indicating a garden-like setting, the walls and doors of the sanctuary proper were decorated with both palm trees *and* cherubim (Ezek. 41:20, 23, 25a). This, of course, is suggestive of Adam's eastward expulsion from Eden. Cherubim are placed מַקְדָּם לַגֶּן "at the east of the Garden of Eden" to prevent a westward return to the garden. Similarly, the cherubim on the doors that Ezekiel describes in temple vision are stationed at the eastern entrances of the temple's most sacred inner chambers. The identical positioning of these protective figures in these two texts suggests a conceptual connection between the idea of the temple and Eden. In fact, Marvin Sweeney suggests that this correlation between Eden and the temple "may explain the appellation *ben-'ādām*, 'son of Adam' or 'mortal,' that is consistently applied by YHWH to Ezekiel throughout the book. The fact that only the high priest may enter the Holy of Holies, where the Ark of the Covenant is guarded by cherubim much like the Garden of Eden, reinforces this image."<sup>vi</sup>

Earlier in Ezekiel, the author made the connection between Adam and priesthood more explicit. Chapter 28 describes Eden as being at the top of a mountain, and uses language evocative of the Israelite tabernacle and temple. The text also refers to an inhabitant of this sacred space as wearing precious stones (Ezek. 28:13) similar to those that were worn by Aaron as he officiated in the tabernacle (Exod. 28:15-20). While the Masoretic Text of Ezekiel only mentions this figure wearing nine stones (as opposed to the twelve stones mentioned for the priestly breastplate in Exodus), the Septuagint mentions all twelve stones.<sup>vii</sup> In the verses that follow, God explains that because of this individual's "sin" (אָשָׁם), "I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God," or Eden (Ezek. 28:16). Thus, the text of Ezekiel 28 strongly suggests that the being banished from Eden was wearing priestly attire before being expelled, which also seems to imply that this individual was performing priestly duties within the garden.<sup>viii</sup> Terje

(Ter-yah) Stordalen notes that “the reference to Eden, the Garden of God, in Ezek 28:13 is best apprehended as a metaphor for the Temple in Jerusalem, part of an explicit stratum in the oracle hinting to the Judahite high priest in office in Jerusalem,”<sup>ix</sup> and goes on to argue that this passage “demands that the reader be aware of the metaphor ‘Temple-is-Eden.’”<sup>x</sup>

Several authors during the Second Temple period made similar, yet more expansive conceptual connections with Eden and creation as they wrote about the restored temple in Jerusalem. Contained within these texts are intimations of a complex understanding of what the temple, its rituals, and its attendants symbolized. For some of these authors, the temple was symbolic of the cosmos as a whole—as was the temple’s high priest—and worship performed in the Israelite temple affected the entirety of creation. Related to this view was the understanding that the temple was symbolic of Eden, and that the high priest was a representative of Adam. From this perspective, the Israelite high priest effectively reversed humanity’s expulsion from the presence of God. Both views are significant for our understanding of how Second Temple period authors and audiences may have understood the creation narrative in Genesis 1-3.

Among those who saw the temple and cosmos as symbolically interchangeable, Philo (20 BCE–50 CE) and Josephus (3–100 CE) were perhaps the most explicit.<sup>xi</sup> For instance, Philo wrote, “The whole universe must be regarded as the highest and, in truth, the holy temple of God. As a sanctuary it has the heaven, the most holy part of the substance of existing things; as votive offerings it has stars; as priests it has angels.”<sup>xii</sup> Here, Philo sees the universe in terms of the temple, which was a representation of a larger reality. In commenting on the Israelite tabernacle (the structural and symbolic precursor to the temple),<sup>xiii</sup> Josephus wrote that each area was “designed as a copy and configuration of the universe, if [one] is willing readily and with

intelligence to make enquiry,” and provides several examples.<sup>xiv</sup> Philo gives us a rather concise example of this approach in the following statement:

Now in front of [the Holy of Holies] was a veil...of Babylonian woven cloth embroidered in blue and linen as well as scarlet and purple, worked in marvelous fashion. The combination of material it possessed did not lack theoretical significance, but was like an image of the universe. For it appeared that fire was hinted at in the scarlet, the earth in the fine linen, the air in the blue, and the sea in the purple...And the woven cloth was embroidered with the spectacle of the whole heaven, except for the signs of the Zodiac.<sup>xv</sup>

The veil here appears as a microcosm of the universe itself, as well as the elements of creation. Thus, according to both Philo and Josephus, the temple’s cosmic symbolism permeated the entire sacred structure.<sup>xvi</sup>

This same sort of cosmic symbolism that was so clearly displayed on the veil before the Holy of Holies also appears in Philo’s explanation of the clothing that the high priest wore as he offered sacrifice and entered the Israelite temple’s Holy of Holies:

In this way the high priest is adorned (*diakosmêtheis*) and sent forth for his holy task, so that whenever he enters (the sanctuary) offering the ancestral prayer and sacrifices, the whole universe (*kosmos*) may enter with him by means of those copies which he bears upon himself...Perhaps, again, he is teaching the worshipper of God in advance that, even if he is not worthy of the Maker of the universe, he should at any rate try without ceasing to be worthy of the universe, a copy of which he wears: he is thus obliged to carry as an image the pattern in his heart, and so in some manner be changed from man into the nature of the universe and...himself be a little universe.<sup>xvii</sup>

According to Philo's interpretive framework, both the veil through which the high priest passed *and* the ritual clothing of the high priest himself represented the cosmos as a whole. Philo also transferred the symbolic value of these items to the nature of the ritual act that the high priest was performing within the temple. He writes elsewhere that

the high priest for the Jews offers both prayers and thanksgiving not only for the whole race of men, but also for the parts of nature, earth, water, air, and fire, considering that the universe (which is in fact the truth) is his native land, on whose behalf he is accustomed to propitiate the ruler with supplications and entreaties, beseeching him to make what he has created a partaker of his own fair and merciful nature.<sup>xviii</sup>

Because the temple here signifies the cosmos, the high priest's offerings could be viewed as having a redemptive effect on all of creation. Robert Hayward explains this in the following:

“Most important is [Philo's] conviction that the Temple in some manner represents the universe, the high priest a figure mediating between earth and heaven, and the public sacrifices of the Temple representing in a fashion the homage not only of Jews, but of the whole human race to God.”<sup>xix</sup>

Conceptually, this same sort of symbolism was expressed when authors made connections between Eden, Adam, and the temple. The author of *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* states that the tabernacle (and later temple) ritual somehow restored what was lost through Adam and Eve's disobedience in Eden. According to this account, God showed Moses “the measurements of the sanctuary, and the number of the offerings, and the signs by which they shall begin to examine the heavens. And [God] said: These are the things which were forbidden to the race of men after they had sinned [in Eden].”<sup>xx</sup> In his commentary on this passage, Hayward states that this reference to Adam and Eve suggest these first parents were

responsible for losing privileges which human beings should properly have retained. Among these are the ways to Paradise: these and other gifts are, it would seem, partly restored to Israel with the building of the tabernacle and the conduct of its Service. The due celebration of the annual festivals, in particular, give Israel some part in the divinely appointed order of things which themselves directly affect the whole human race.<sup>xxi</sup>

From this perspective, the creation of the tabernacle and temple were functional replacements for the Eden's primal sacred space.

The book of *Jubilees* also makes conceptual ties between Eden, Adam, and the temple. In its account of creation, Adam and Eve are created outside the garden; God brings Adam into the garden after forty days, and then brings Eve into the garden after eighty days (*Jubilees* 3:9-13).<sup>xxii</sup> The author makes clear that these procedures reflect the priestly laws governing entrance to the temple in Lev. 12:2-8, and suggest that the Garden of Eden had a similar level of sanctity as did the temple. This particular idea is made explicit in *Jubilees* 8:19, where the narrator describes Noah as knowing “that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies, and the dwelling of the Lord.”<sup>xxiii</sup> Hayward explains the significance of viewing the Garden of Eden in light of the temple in these words:

It would appear, then, that Adam and Eve were brought into the Holy of Holies prior to their disobedience: their expulsion from Eden thus signifies their removal from the place where God's Presence on the earth is most immediate for Israel. The high priest's entry in the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur might, then, in some manner typologically correspond to the first man's return to Eden, for a season, to be reconciled with his Maker face to face.<sup>xxiv</sup>

In understanding Eden as a sort of primeval temple, Adam's role is equated with the priestly roles later performed by Levites. This is seen clearly in the description of Adam's actions in *Jubilees* immediately following his expulsion from Eden: "And [God] made for them coats of skin, and clothed them, and sent them forth from the Garden of Eden. And on that day which Adam went forth from the Garden, he offered as a sweet savour an offering, frankincense, galbanum, and stacte, and spices in the morning with the rising of the sun from the day when he covered his shame."<sup>xxv</sup> While Adam's offering here appears to be fulfilling the priestly requirements for daily offerings in the tabernacle (and later, the temple) given in Ex. 30:1-8, interpretations of Adam's apparel suggest an additional priestly connection.

In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (in Hebrew), the author "implies that Adam's [clothing] is analogous to Sim[e]on's high priestly robes: if so, he may suggest here what later writers state openly, that the high priest's vestments are the garments of the first man."<sup>xxvi</sup> This text solidifies such a connection in its detailed description of Simeon—the high priest at the time—functioning within the Jerusalem temple. It begins, "Greatest of his brothers and the beauty of his people was Simeon the son of Johanan the priest; In whose generation the house was visited and in whose days the Temple was strengthened" (50:1). In the verse immediately preceding this introduction of the high priest, we read, "And Shem and Seth and Enosh were visited, and above every living thing is the beauty of Adam" (49:16). The juxtaposing of Adam and Simeon was not haphazard. Hayward notes that "The description of Sim[e]on as the 'beauty,' *tip'eret*, of his people establishes more than a formal link with the preceding chapter (49:16), where the 'beauty,' *tip'eret*, of Adam is named."<sup>xxvii</sup> Thus, for the author of *Ben Sira*, the figure of Adam and the figure of the high priest were inextricably connected.

Hayward articulates this relationship in the following: “[Ben Sira’s] juxtaposing of the high priest with Adam...strongly suggests that [he] took the high priest as a latter-day representative of Adam; and that the [temple] Service, therefore, was offered for the whole world<sup>xxviii</sup>...Ben Sira seems to imply that the privileges granted to the first man, and thus to all mankind, are also peculiarly summed up in Israel whose representative is Sim[e]on in his function as sacrificing high priest.”<sup>xxix</sup> According to this interpretation, the high priest represented the first man, Adam, before God in the temple.

Taken together, these several Second Temple texts display a complex understanding of how the temple and its priests were conceptually related to Eden and Adam, suggesting that the temple itself was in some way a recreation of Eden and that the rituals performed by the temple’s priests made restitution not only for Adam and Eve’s disobedience, but also made offerings on behalf the entire human race.

A similarly relation between Eden, Adam, and the temple appears in several Qumran texts. In the Community Rule, we read: “For God has chosen them [the community] for an everlasting covenant, and all the glory of Adam is theirs” (1QS 4:22-23). The curious phrase כול אדם also appears in one of the *Hodayot*: “And you [God] are causing [the community] to inherit all the glory of Adam and an abundance of days” (1QH 4:15). This association between the Qumran community and Adam is further demonstrated throughout the *Hodayot*. For example, one passage reads, “I will recount your glory in the midst of the sons of Adam; and in the abundance of your goodness my soul delights” (1QH 19:6-7).<sup>xxx</sup> In fact, Fletcher-Louis observes that much of this collection “is a sustained and extended meditation on the anthropology of Genesis 2:7,”<sup>xxxi</sup> which describes the creation of Adam from the dust of the



earth.<sup>xxxii</sup> These examples suggest that the Qumran community considered the character of Adam as glorious, and believed that they could somehow participate in that glory.

Given the evidence that both *Ben Sira* and *Jubilees* were preserved at Qumran,<sup>xxxiii</sup> it is not surprising that additional texts there may contain imagery that associates high priestly figures with the concept of Adam and a return to the presence of God. While the Qumran community saw themselves as inheritors of “all the glory of Adam,” they also saw themselves as priests. These two views are joined in 4Q Florilegium (4Q174 1 i:6-7): “And he has commanded that a sanctuary of Adam<sup>xxxiv</sup> be built for him; that there they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the law.<sup>xxxv</sup>” Michael Wise and Carla Sulzbach agree that מקדש אדם here is best translated as “sanctuary / Temple of Adam” in view of the Edenic overtones they see in this text.<sup>xxxvi</sup> It is possible that the community saw themselves as a conceptual sanctuary consisting of priestly individuals who had each received the “glory of Adam,” thus becoming a “Temple of Adam.” It is also possible to combine this idea with the importance of a physical location to perform priestly duties at Qumran. Sulzbach suggests that, “in light of other historical precedents, it may be assumed that *Miqdash Adam* refers to a certain place, the designated *maqom*, where worship and divine service takes place (for the moment, until better times). Perhaps even the synchronized angelic-human [priestly] service as described in the [*Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice*] could thus have taken place in the *Miqdash Adam*.”<sup>xxxvii</sup>

If the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* in particular were used in a liturgical setting, then its 2<sup>nd</sup> Song may support the view that the community saw themselves individually as representatives of Adam. Referring to those in the heavens, the Instructor asks: “[What] is the offering of our tongues of dust (לשון עפרנו) (compared) with the knowledge of the g[ods?] (4Q400 2 6-7)” This is a possible allusion to Gen. 3:19, where God says to Adam, “For you are dust (עפר), and unto dust

you will return.” This passage from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Song is the only instance where humanity comes close to being viewed negatively in the *Songs*; elsewhere, the emphasis is always on glorious figures (often portrayed using priestly language). It should be remembered that by reading *Ben Sira* and *Jubilees* together, the high priest entering the Holy of Holies most likely represented Adam returning to Eden, and therefore signified a return to the presence of God.<sup>xxxviii</sup> If the Qumran community embraced this imagery in *Ben Sira* and *Jubilees*, then perhaps the community also understood these *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* as somehow functioning to reverse the sentence pronounced upon Adam in Gen. 3:19; instead of returning to the dust, community members would ritually receive the glory originally intended for Adam. Such a liturgical experience would have held a special significance for those at Qumran, who were unable to participate in the various priestly rituals at the temple in Jerusalem.<sup>xxxix</sup> In fact, by laying claim to the “glory of Adam,” it is possible to see the Qumran community as appealing to a tradition even older than the Jerusalem temple in order to justify their community’s performance of priestly functions.<sup>xl</sup>

Given this possibility that Eden could have been viewed as a temple by Second Temple authors, then the humans who inhabited this sacred space and met with God face to face could have been interpreted as functioning in some sort of temple-related or priestly capacity.<sup>xli</sup> Earlier, I presented evidence from the book of Ezekiel and subsequent Second Temple texts that explored the ways in which this literature conceptualized Adam as a sort of priest. The following will demonstrate why this interpretation was plausible (and perhaps preferable) by focusing on language and imagery used in the Eden narrative, explaining how the idea of a priestly Adam was a real interpretive possibility in Gen. 2-3.

The first verbal cues that alert us to Adam's priestly possibilities occur in Gen. 2:15. Here, God takes the man and וינחהו "places him" (literally "causes him to rest") in the Garden of Eden. Similarly, Solomon was described as having installed sacred furniture in the temple using a similar form of the same verb: וינה (2 Chron. 4:8).<sup>xlii</sup> This temple association becomes much clearer as the text describes the purpose for Adam's relocation: he is placed in the garden לעבדה ולשמרה (NRSV "to till it and keep it"). These verbs are elsewhere translated as "serve" (עבד) and "keep / guard" (שמר), and are most often used together to describe the priestly actions of "serving" God and "keeping / guarding" God's word.<sup>xliii</sup> After commenting upon this particular association, Gordon Wenham even went so far as to state that "if Eden is seen then as an ideal sanctuary, then perhaps Adam should be described as an archetypal Levite."<sup>xliv</sup>

Other elements within Genesis 2-3 point to an understanding of Eden's inhabitants as functioning within tabernacle- and temple-related sacred space. The prohibition against eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil stated that if this was violated, Adam would "surely die" (Gen. 2:17).<sup>xlv</sup> Wenham argues that "according to later cultic ritual the sanctuary was the centre of life, because there God was present. To be excluded from the camp of Israel...was to enter the realm of death."<sup>xlvi</sup> From this perspective, then, the prohibition was less about the length of Adam and Eve's lives, as it was about their ability to remain ritually pure within a particular sacred space.

This idea relates to the previous discussion regarding the language used to describe Adam's responsibilities in the Garden of Eden: his responsibility to "till" (עבד) and "keep" (שמר) the garden is verbally identical to the priestly actions of "serving" (עבד) God and "keeping / guarding" (שמר) God's word. For Israelite priests, one noticeable aspect of "guarding" meant protecting the tabernacle and temple from ritually impure individuals or creatures entering its

precincts.<sup>xlvii</sup> Gregory Beale notes that this priestly responsibility to guard sacred space “appears to be relevant for Adam, especially in view of the unclean creature lurking on the perimeter of the Garden who then enters.”<sup>xlviii</sup> He goes on to explain:

When Adam failed to guard the temple by sinning and letting in a foul serpent to defile the sanctuary, he lost his priestly role, and the cherubim took over the responsibility of “guarding” the Garden temple: God “stationed the cherubim...*to guard* the way to the tree of life” (so Gen. 3:24; see also Ezek. 28:14, 16). The guarding function of the cherubim probably did not involve gardening but keeping out the sinful and unclean, which suggests that Adam’s original role stated in Genesis 2:15 likely entailed much more than cultivating the soil, but also “guarding” the sacred space.<sup>xlix</sup>

Indeed, the duties of the cherubim in protecting the entrance to Eden are very similar to the duties of the Israelite priests in protecting the entrance to the tabernacle and temple. As these duties are described using the same verb that outlines Adam’s responsibility to “guard” (שמר) the garden, it may be inferred that Adam’s duty was priestly in nature.

A couple of final elements suggest a priestly context for understanding the roles of Adam and Eve within the garden; these appear in the description of their actions—as well as the actions of God—after Adam and Eve have tasted the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 3:6). Upon hearing the voice of God in the garden, they hid themselves “from the presence of the LORD God” (מפני יהוה אלהים). Menahem Haran has suggested that “in general, any cultic activity to which the biblical text applies the formula ‘before the Lord’ can be considered an indication of the existence of a temple at the site, since this expression stems from the basic conception of the temple as a divine dwelling-place and actually belongs to the temple’s technical terminology.”<sup>1</sup> If this is the case, then Adam and Eve’s previous actions within the

garden could have been viewed as paralleling the actions of the priests in the Israelite tabernacle and temple. This suggestion is strengthened by the temple-related actions of God that follow: God clothes Adam and Eve (וילבשם) with “garments” (כתנות) of skin. The same verbal form of “clothe” (לבש) appears several times in passages that describe Moses clothing the priests of the tabernacle with “garments” (כתנות), suggesting that God’s clothing of Adam and Eve could be seen to have had priestly overtones.<sup>li</sup>

The inclusion of Eve in these temple-oriented passages certainly complicates the categories of an all-male priesthood in ancient Israel. Nevertheless, from the aforementioned Second Temple writings it is clear that there was a common perception of Adam in the Genesis narratives as a sort of priestly figure; an idea so potent that it was seen by some as radiating into the present from primeval times, and by others as an interpretive lens through which to illuminate the stories of humanity’s beginnings. In both cases, Adam was seen positively by several Second Temple authors as a priestly, mediatorial figure who served as the archetype for perhaps the most significant contemporary mediatorial figures: the Jewish temple priesthood.

Thank you.

---

<sup>i</sup> John R. Levison, “Adam as a Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Literature” in Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski, eds., *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 247-272.

<sup>ii</sup> Levison, “Adam as Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Literature,” p. 247.

<sup>iii</sup> Levison, “Adam as Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Literature,” p. 248.

<sup>iv</sup> Concerning both temple and Eden imagery, Michael Fishbane writes, “It was not until the woe and dislocation of the exile, and with it the destruction of the land and Temple, that the symbolism of Eden emerges with singular emphasis. In the mouths of the post-exilic prophets, this imagery serves as the organizing prism for striking visions of spatial renewal.” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 369-370.

Regarding the perception of temple imagery during this period, Carla Sulzbach noted that “The assorted strands of references to sacred places that were still clearly discernible in the earlier strata of the Hebrew Bible were mined by

---

the various Second Temple period texts and these were then fused into one grand, intricately contrived temple image.” Carla Sulzbach, “Of Temples on Earth, in Heaven, and In-Between,” in Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, eds., *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity: Presented to James H. Charlesworth on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), p. 173.

<sup>v</sup> See Ezekiel 40-48.

<sup>vi</sup> Sweeney, “Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile”, in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pp. 141-142.

<sup>vii</sup> For a detailed comparison and analysis of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Ezekiel 28:11-19, see Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, pp. 332-356.

<sup>viii</sup> Fletcher-Louis agrees with this reading: “The office of high priest was thought to recapitulate the identity of the pre-lapsarian Adam. This goes back at least as far as Ezekiel 28:12ff. where the prince of Tyre wears precious stones which are simultaneously those worn by the *Urmensch* in the garden of Eden and those of the Aaronic ephod according to Exodus 28.” See Crispin Fletcher-Louis, “The Worship of Divine Humanity as God’s Image and the Worship of Jesus,” in Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 126.

<sup>ix</sup> Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, p. 394.

<sup>x</sup> Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, p. 408.

<sup>xi</sup> G.K. Beale notes that “While it is true that Philo and Josephus had varying interpretations of the temple symbolism, their views intersect at significant points” (G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* [Downers Grove, IL: Apollos, 2004], p. 49). In what follows, I will be focusing on these intersections, as they “both testify to a general cosmological understanding of the temple held by mainstream contemporary Jewish thought” (Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission*, p. 49). Translations from these and subsequent authors in this section are taken from Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*.

<sup>xii</sup> *De Spec. Leg.* I. 66.

<sup>xiii</sup> See Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), pp. 189-204, and R. J. Clifford, “The Temple and the Holy Mountain,” in Truman Madsen, ed., *The Temple in Antiquity* (Salt Lake City, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1984), pp. 112-115.

<sup>xiv</sup> *Ant.* III. 180-182.

<sup>xv</sup> *War* V. 212-214.

<sup>xvi</sup> See Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>xvii</sup> *De Vit. Mos.* II. 133-135.

<sup>xviii</sup> *De Spec. Leg.* I. 97. In commenting upon this passage, Hayward states that “the cosmos itself may be viewed as a Temple, and the earthly Temple in Jerusalem, presided over by the high priest, as a material representation of the universe constantly presenting to God thanksgiving due to Him though the prescribed Service of the high priest and his deputies” (*The Jewish Temple*, pp. 110-111).

---

<sup>xix</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 109. Moshe Weinfeld similarly summarized his survey of this literature: “According to these sources not only do the different parts of the Temple and its objects represent the heavenly abode, but even the priests of the Temple represent the divine retinue, i.e. the angels. Thus we hear Philo stating that the Temple of God represents the whole Universe: the inner shrine represents heaven, the votive objects are the stars and the priests are the angels, the servants of his power (*Spec. Leg.* I. 66). The high priest, who in his view has been consecrated to the Father of the world, wears a vesture which represents the world (*Vita Mos.* II. 133f.; cp. *Wisd. Sol.* 18:24) and when he enters before the Lord, the whole universe enters with him (*ibid.* compare Josephus, *Antiq.* III. 184f.)” See Weinfeld, “Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord—The Problem of the *Sitz im Leben* of Genesis 1:1-2:3,” in Andre Caquot and Mathias Delcor, eds, *Melanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), p. 506.

<sup>xx</sup> *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* XIX. 10-11.

<sup>xxi</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 167.

<sup>xxii</sup> See also Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*, p. 89.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Translation of Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*, p. 89.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*, p. 89.

<sup>xxv</sup> Jubilees 3:26-27

<sup>xxvi</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 45.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 44.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 14.

<sup>xxix</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, p. 45.

<sup>xxx</sup> I have chosen to render בני אדם here as “sons of Adam” instead of “sons of men.” The first lines of this hymn, “I thank you, my God, for you have dealt wonderfully with dust (עפר), and in forming (וביצר) clay you have made very mighty” (1QH 19:3), allude to the imagery employed in the creation of man as recorded in Gen. 2:6-7. By analogy, the particular phraseology בן אדם translated as “son of Adam” appears to be more appropriate than “son of man” or “human” in late Second Temple texts. Marvin Sweeney argues: “Later texts of the Second Temple period...note that the priest in the Temple represents Adam in the Garden of Eden, which may explain the appellation *ben-’adam*, ‘son of Adam’ or ‘mortal,’ that is consistently applied by YHWH to Ezekiel throughout the book. The fact that only the high priest may enter the Holy of Holies, where the Ark of the Covenant is guarded by cherubim much like the Garden of Eden, reinforces this image” (Marvin Sweeney, “Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile” in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], pp.141-142).

<sup>xxxi</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, p. 108.

<sup>xxxii</sup> An excellent example of such a meditation from this collection is the following: “(God) lifts up the poor from the dust to the [eternal height,] and to the clouds he magnifies him in stature, and (he is) with the heavenly beings in the assembly of the community.”<sup>4</sup>QHodayot<sup>a</sup> 7 ii, 8-9. Based on the translation in Esther Chazon, et. Al., eds., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIX: Qumran Cave 4 XX, Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 100.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*, pp. 39-40, 85.

---

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Some have translated מקדש אדם as “sanctuary of human beings” (e.g. John Elwolde, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Vol. 1* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], p. 125, s.v. אדם). However, if the author wanted to be explicit about the sanctuary being composed of humans, rather than referring to Adam, he or she could have used the more specific אנוש “human,” which appears frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls (see Elwolde, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Vol. 1*, pp. 334-335, s.v. אנוש). At the very least, this statement is ambiguous enough to be alluding to Adam (see Elwolde, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Vol. 1*, pp. 124, 129, s.v. אדם I, IV).

<sup>xxxv</sup> For this last clause, I follow the translation of Geza Vermes in *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), p. 525.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> See Michael Wise, “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991), p. 131; Carla Sulzbach, “Of Temples on Earth, in Heaven, and In-Between,” in Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, eds., *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity: Presented to James H. Charlesworth on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), p. 177.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Sulzbach, “Of Temples on Earth, in Heaven, and In-Between,” p. 178.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> See above.

<sup>xxxix</sup> Newsom writes: “What was specifically needed at Qumran...were not merely arguments couched in visionary form to demonstrate the authenticity of the claims of the group but rather some form of experiential validation of their claims. I would suggest that the cycle of songs in the Sabbath Shiroth was developed precisely to meet this need for experiential validation...To the extent that the worshipper experienced himself as present in the heavenly temple through the recitation of the Sabbath Shiroth, his status as a faithful and legitimate priest would have been convincingly confirmed in spite of the persistent contradiction of his claims in the world” (Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, pp. 71-72).

<sup>xl</sup> The author of the Hebrews makes a similar rhetorical move by claiming Jesus as a priestly heir of the pre-Levitical Melchizedek (e.g. Hebrews 7).

<sup>xli</sup> Desmond Alexander put it this way: “If Genesis portrays the Garden of Eden as a sanctuary or temple-garden...[it follows that] because they met God face to face in a holy place, we may assume that Adam and Eve had a holy or priestly status.” Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem*, p. 25.

<sup>xlii</sup> In other temple-related contexts, this same verb and verbal form are used to describe the placement of divine images in their temples. See 2 Kings 17:29 and Zech. 5:5-11.

<sup>xliii</sup> See Num. 3:7-8; 8:25-26; 18:5-6; 1 Chron. 23:32; Ezek. 44:14. See Cassuto, *Commentary on Genesis, Part I*, pp. 122-123, Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” p. 21, and Parry, “Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary,” p. 144. For a more technical discussion, see Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission*, p. 67 n. 89.

<sup>xliv</sup> Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” p. 21.

<sup>xlv</sup> See also Gen. 3:3-4.

<sup>xlvi</sup> Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” p. 24. Wenham finds evidence for this view in the language of Leviticus. See Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), pp. 177, 201, and Wenham, “Why Does Sexual Intercourse Defile?” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 95:3 (1983), pp. 432-434.

<sup>xlvii</sup> E.g. Num. 3:6-7, 32, 38; 18:1-7; Neh. 11:19; Ezek. 40:45; 44:14; 1 Chron. 9:17-27; 2 Chron. 23:19.



---

<sup>xlviii</sup> Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, p. 69.

<sup>xlix</sup> Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, p. 70.

<sup>1</sup> Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, p. 26.

<sup>li</sup> E.g. Ex. 28:41; 29:8; 40:14; Lev. 8:13. See also Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," pp. 21-22, and Parry, "Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary," p. 145. For a discussion of early Jewish and Christian traditions that make a similar association between Adam's garment and priestly clothing, see John Tvednes, "Priestly Clothing in Bible Times," in Donald Parry, ed., *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism* (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book, 1994), pp. 649-662, and Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection*, pp. 122-124.