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The Christian interpretation that the Church replaced the Jerusalem Temple in theological supersession is re-examined in light of the literary motif of Temple desecration and restoration, especially in the eschatological context. This context is that of the eschatological Jerusalem tradition in which history of development the expressions of desecration and restoration were adapted to the political and religious realities of the First and Second Temple's destruction. The theological development and continuity of this motif was studied through a literary, exegetical, and comparative analysis of selected texts in the Tanach, Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the New Testament.

The investigation of the significance and use of the motif revealed that the divine ideal, that of YHWH dwelling in the midst of His people, was expressed through the cultic dimensions of purity and impurity, which corresponded to the polar covenantal expressions of cursing and blessing and the eschatological events of desecration and restoration. This divine ideal was communicated through the concept of sanctuary, which was viewed in its earthly construction as modeled according to a heavenly archetype (הקדש). In the Tanach, this sanctuary concept was viewed in a seminal form in Genesis where its literary structure was paralleled by Exodus, in the establishment of a central Sanctuary, and in the prophetic visions of the eschatological Temple which would accompany the
realization of the ultimate Restoration of national Israel. Special attention was also given to the typological development of Temple desecrators within the desecration motif. The progressive development of these figures carried the continuity of the desecration motif and projected it into the eschatological realm. The investigation of the apocalyptic literature revealed further development of the motif based on the attempt to interpret the prophetic scheme of the Tanach, and to orient the religious communities to the eschatological timetable supposedly revealed by the prophet Daniel. The question of continuity in the New Testament with previous historical and theological usage of the motif was addressed first by an inquiry into of the attitudes of Jesus, Stephen, and Paul toward the Temple, which resulted in a positive affirmation of its sanctity and eschatological role with national Israel. In particular, an examination of the Pauline use of ναὸς for both the individual Christian and the collective Church, revealed a metaphorical relationship in sanctification contexts that did not imply the concept of replacement. Special emphasis was given to the use of Daniel’s “Seventieth Week” (Daniel 9:27) as a paradigm for the structure of both the Olivet Discourse and the Apocalypse. The central feature that emerged in this usage was that of the “Abomination of Desolation” which served as a pivotal eschatological indicator and carried forward the desecration motif with its typological imagery of the eschatological desecrator. This desecrator was further seen to influence the concept of the “man of sin” in II Thessalonians 2 and the Johannine “Antichrist” in Revelation 13. The Apocalypse was seen to climax the motif in its various expressions of the Temple (Revelation 21-22), but primarily as an eschatological recapitulation of protology in which the divine ideal is realized for Israel and the Christian Church. The conclusion thus argued positively for a progressive continuity in the eschatological future of national Israel common to both early Judaism and Christianity, and negatively against the concept of theological supersessionism of Israel by the Church.
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<td>תודדיה (&quot;Thanksgiving [Hymns]&quot;&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpIs&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pesher on Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Messianic Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q15</td>
<td>Copper Scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q243-245</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>The Son of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q385-389</td>
<td>Second Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q390</td>
<td>The Angels of Mastemah and the Rule of Belial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q397-399</td>
<td>Second Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q547</td>
<td>The Vision of the Four Kingdoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q554</td>
<td>The New Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QMelec</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QT</td>
<td>Temple Scroll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1958, when John Townsend wrote his dissertation at Harvard University on "The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought," he could correctly state in his opening remarks that:

The various writers who have made a study of the attitudes in the New Testament toward the Jerusalem Temple appear never to have seriously considered the possibility that Jesus and the early Christians truly accepted the Jewish temple as part of their own religion. These writers have aimed to determine not whether Jesus and the early Christians accepted or rejected the Jerusalem cult, but rather how they replaced it."

At that time it was the consensus among New Testament scholars that the significance of the Jerusalem Temple was its service as a proleptic paradigm for the 'ἐκκλησία (i.e., the Christian community, the Church). The Church, as the


2The term "Church" (capitalized to distinguish the collective or universal sense in contrast to the individual or local) is usually expressed in the Greek New Testament by the word 'ἐκκλησία, which is the equivalent of the Hebrew מִשְׁרָפ (as used by the LXX) and also of πολιτεία (the LXX uses συναγωγή to render both terms, but the NT only in James 2:2) meaning "an assembly." Among the Greek-speaking peoples of that time, 'ἐκκλησία was used to denote the "assembly" in which citizens of Hellenistic towns exerted their political rights and fulfilled their public responsibility, cf. K. L. Schmidt, s.v. "ἐκκλησία," TDNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1965) 3: 517. In this sense it was like the Israelite מִשְׁרָפ (e.g., Joshua 24:1, 25-27; cf. Deuteronomy 23:2-3; Micah 2:5; Nehemiah 13:1), which was religious, cultural, legal, and political in character. It is the special use of in the LXX'ἐκκλησία refers to the congregation regarded collectively as a people and as a whole, rather than
"New Temple," was said to have replaced the Jewish Temple as God's final institution in redemptive history.3

In Jewish thought a spiritualized interpretation of the Temple has also developed, partly from the allegorical methodology of Hellenistic interpreters like Philo,4 and partly from the theological necessity of Judaism to adapt to life without its central institution. However, among Orthodox Jews the loss of the

to the actual assembly or meeting of the people, cf. James Barr, "QAHAL - ἐκκλησία," in The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: University Press, 1961), p. 119. In the NT, therefore, ἐκκλησία is used in the New Testament to denote groups of Christians, or the whole of Christianity, as uniquely members of Christ's "Body" (Colossians 1:18, 24; cf. Romans 12:5; Ephesians 5:30), citizens of heaven (Philippians 3:20; Ephesians 2:19; Hebrews 12:23), and the ἄγω θεοῦ ("the household of God"). I Timothy 3:15, although Paul's language of description concerning the is colored by terminology familiar to the congregation of Israel. However, the term λαός ("people") is also employed, especially when the Tanach is quoted (2 Corinthians 6:16; 1 Peter 2:9-10), allusions to ethnic/national Israel are made (cf. Roman 9:25-26; Hebrews 4:9), to refer to the community of believers called from both Jews and Gentiles (cf. Titus 2:14). This word comes by way of the LXX, which used it to translate Ἰσραήλ, the honorific title used to designate Israel (ישראל, "My People"), as God's "Elect." It is especially this use of λαός, implying identity by dependence, and equating Gentile Christians with "the people of God" (cf. Acts 15:14), that has some led scholars to view the Church as Israel's successor to this title. Cf. P. Minar, Images of the Church in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 66-104.


Temple could not be envisioned as final, and belief continued that the Temple will be rebuilt, either by a faithful generation,\(^5\) the Messiah\(^6\) or as an eschatological phenomena - the fully constructed heavenly Temple transferred to earth.\(^7\) But by

---

\(^5\)E.g. the statement in Jerusalem Talmud, Yoma 1:38b: "Any generation that fails to rebuild the Temple, it is as though that generation itself had destroyed the Temple."

\(^6\)Cf. Leviticus Rabbah 9:6; Numbers Rabbah 13:2; Midrash on Song of Songs 4:16; 4QFlorilegium (midrash on II Samuel 7:10-14). This belief was based on Zechariah 6:12-14, a well-attested messianic passage which declares that the "Branch" will build the ideal Restoration Temple (cf. comments in chapter 4).

\(^7\)This revised restoration hope is first reflected in the apocryphal literature and the New Testament (e.g. Revelation 21:2, 10), but also later in the Sages, cf. Baruch 4:3; II Esdras 7:26; 8:52; Hagiga 12b; Menahot 110a. Recently, orthodox (and ultra orthodox) rabbis and Yeshiva students (most part of the newly-formed Yeshivat Har Habayit) in Jerusalem have argued that this the expectation of a Temple that will descend from heaven to earth is not a biblical or rabbinic concept. Rabbi Yisrael Ariel, Founder and Director of the Jerusalem-based Temple Institute, has contended that the only source for this theology is apocryphal and Christian (based on Revelation 21-22), cf. Jerusalem Post (International edition), August 28, 1993, p. 3. The perspective of the Temple Institute, Yeshivat Har Habayit, and several related organizations (e.g. Atara Leyoshna, Atara Cohanim, The Faithful of the Temple Mount, The Sanhedrin Institute, and some of the Lubavitcher Hassidic organization - Habad) is that the Third Temple is to be constructed with human hands, and that this is the mandate for the present generation since the liberation of Jerusalem in June of 1967, cf."The Issue of the Temple Mount," a "Position Paper" published by the Yeshiva of the Temple Mount, July, 1993, pp. 1-7; cf. for general topic Roger Friedland and Richard D. Hecht, "The Politics of Sacred Place: Jerusalem’s Temple Mount/ al-haram al-sharif," in Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Eds. Jamie Scott & Paul Simpson-Housley. Contributions to the Study of Religion 30. Ed. Henry Warner Bowden (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), pp. 21-61. However, the concept in rabbinic thought was developed from the idea of an original heavenly prototype to which the earthly Temple and the city of Jerusalem was oriented both spatially and theologically. In addition, the supposed impossibility of any generation of Jews rebuilding the Temple after having lived outside the Land and having become ceremonially unclean, made the proposition of an undesecrated Temple, untouched by human hands, more theologically acceptable. The eschatological hope for the Third Temple was also recently codified in the signing of the תואם ירושלים ("Covenant of Jerusalem") on May 19, 1993, which the preamble reminds is 1,922 years after the destruction of the Second Temple.
whatever means the Temple returns, it remains at the center of the eschatological hope of the restoration of Israel. As one modern Israeli rabbi has put it: "All of Jewish history is one large parenthesis without the Temple."9

Since the time of Townsend, many Christian scholars have affirmed that the New Testament milieu was essentially Jewish and apocalyptic in character.10 In addition, Jewish scholars such as David Flusser,11 Samuel Sandmel,12 Michael

---

8This centrality is reflected in various ways: (1) that reference to the future hope was earmarked by an expression of longing for the Temple: "It became a matter of course, when adverting to the restoration, to resort to some such phrase as: 'may it be rebuilt in our lifetime and in our day'" (Tosefta Menahot 13:23; Avot 5:20); (2) the existence of the Mishnaic tractate Middot, which was devoted to the preservation of the Temple's dimensions and architectural details, is itself "eloquent evidence that the Rabbis held themselves in constant readiness for the restoration," cf. Theodore S. Rose, "The Attitude of the Rabbis Toward the Destruction of the Second Temple" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, 1943), p. 91; (3) the belief that the Shekinah could not return without a Temple: "There is no Zebuh (Divine residence) except the Temple" (cf. Genesis Rabbah 3:4; Baba Batra 3a); (4) Rabbinic legislation was said to be temporary, conditioned by the rebuilding of the Temple, e.g., Rabbi Jose [concerning modifications in the regulations concerning the redemption of the fourth-year produce of vineyards] said: "when the Temple will be rebuilt, the matter will revert to former procedure" (Mishnah, Ma'aser Sheni 5:2), and Rabbi Judah [two generations after Jose, discussing the announcement of the new moon] said: "These things were inaugurated by Rabbi Johanan ben Zakai upon the destruction of the Temple and when the Temple will be rebuilt they shall return it their ancient mode" (Tosefta Rosh Hashana 4:8); (5) the Temple was viewed as the primary means of delivering Israel from calamity (Berakot 62b); and (6) necessary for the ultimate purification of Israel, thus, it was often signified as "Lebanon" to remind of its function "to make white" Israel's sins (TB, Yoma 39b).

9Rabbi Nachman Kahane, head of the Young Israel Synagogue and The Institute for Talmudic Commentary, Jewish Quarter, Jerusalem. Interview conducted June 18, 1991.


Stone, Geza Vermes, and Jacob Neusner have entered the field of New Testament studies, and have renewed the question of continuity and discontinuity between Jewish and early Christian interpretation of the Temple and of Israel's eschatological fulfillment. The interpretation of the Temple in the New Testament and in Palestinian Judaism has also been assisted by recent symposia on the larger question of messianism in Judaism and Christianity and resultant publications edited by James Charlesworth.

Nevertheless, an assumption of hierarchical replacement or supersessionism, continues to be a dominant interpretive position among Christian scholars in all divisions of Christendom. The assumption for this viewpoint is


derived from an interpretation of the Temple according to a "typological," rather than a literal, grammatical, historical hermeneutic. The literal hermeneutic, while recognizing that the term "temple" in the New Testament is used to refer to Christ, Christians, and the Church, nevertheless sees behind these references the literal Jerusalem Temple, understanding this usage as figurative or metaphorical, rather than typological, since this would require fulfillment, not simply illustration. Waltke exemplifies the interpretive results obtained when the typological method is employed in relation to prophetic fulfillment for the Temple when he writes:

With the transformation of Christ's body from an earthly physical body to a heavenly spiritual body, and his ascension from earthly realism to the heavenly Jerusalem with its heavenly throne and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the earthly material symbols were done away and the spiritual reality portrayed by the symbols superseded the shadows. Consequently, [Old Testament] prophecies about Israel's future kingdom that pertain to the church age, which began with Pentecost [c. A.D. 33], find a spiritual fulfillment.\footnote{This is not a question of interpreting the Tanach in relation to the New Testament, but of reinterpreting the clear, contextual meanings of the Tanach, reducing their literal realization to spiritual reality, in order to maintain final prophetic fulfillment in messianic and restoration texts. The New Testament cannot be approached by the principle of analogy if this means superimposing upon it a system of interpretation not derived from the Tanach. The analogy of antecedent texts must be employed in a manner where chronologically antecedent theology is first checked to whether it informed the theology under investigation. Interpretation of the Tanach in relation to the New Testament according to a literal, grammatical, historical methodology preserves the integrity of literal contextual interpretation as well as the unity of revelation inherent in the analogical principle. As such, it provides a hermeneutical consistency in definition and application which must necessarily reserve fulfillment of prophetic texts to an eschatological future, cf. Walter Kaiser, Toward an Old Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979).}

Clowney reveals specifically how the restoration of the Temple is understood according to this approach when he concludes:

All that the temple means, then, is fulfilled in Jesus Christ ... It is not so much that Christ fulfills what the temple means; rather Christ is the meaning for which the temple existed ... Heaven offers no other Christ, and no temple beyond Christ ... 19

This method, strictly interpreting the legal and cultic institutions, and the prophetic restoration texts, in light of the new revelation in Christ, without regard to the interpretive context of the Tanach, concludes that a continuity exists between the "Old" and "New" testaments only on the basis of "spiritual" fulfillment.20 Thus, the function of the "Old Covenant Temple," as in the Tanach, is relegated to a symbolic role, which finds its ultimate end in the "New Covenant Temple," the true Temple of God, which is Christ, and his Body, the Christian Church. Again, Clowney states:

Christ is the true temple ... The coming of the true supersedes the figurative. The veil of the temple made with hands is destroyed, for its symbolism is fulfilled ... Those who are joined to Christ are ... therefore made with him the New Temple of God.21

With this hermeneutic in place, New Testament Temple studies have commonly been focused on the negative statements in the Gospels concerning the Temple's destruction, or upon portions of the epistolary literature that appears to condemn its cultus (the sacrificial system), e.g., the Epistle to the Hebrews.22 These studies have generally concluded that Jesus and his disciples denounced the


20This is the conclusion of the Temple studies section in the recent work by James Smith, What the Bible Teaches About the Promised Messiah (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1993), pp. 397-422.

21Ibid., pp. 125-126.

Jewish cultus, and pronounced (Jesus), or announced (disciples), divine judgment upon the Temple and the Jewish Nation.\textsuperscript{23} While many of these scholars have acknowledged the similarities in viewpoint concerning the Temple between the New Testament and the Jewish prophets and apocalyptic writers (especially at Qumran), the recognition of theological continuity has largely been eclipsed by the hermeneutical presupposition Israel's eschatological hope was completed in the first-century advent of Christ.\textsuperscript{24}

The purpose of the present research is to submit evidence that challenges the premise of theological replacement of Israel by the Church. The attempt is not to refute the system that has produced this interpretation, but to offer an example of an inter-textual motif that will hope to show that the New Testament's understanding and application of the Temple was consistent and harmonious with that expressed by the Hebrew Prophets, namely of the Jewish eschatological hope of national and spiritual restoration, centering around the rebuilding the Temple and the re-institution of its cultus. This investigation will necessitate not only a thorough examination of the concept of the Temple in the Tanach, but also a re-examination of the New Testament's attitude toward the Temple. The primary focus, however, will be upon demonstrating the continuity of an eschatological Temple motif\textsuperscript{25} that conveyed the Jewish restoration hope through biblical and extra-biblical prophetic, eschatological, and apocalyptic literature.


\textsuperscript{25} Our use of the term "motif" accepts the definition of J. T. Shipley (ed.) \textit{Dictionary of World Literature} (Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and
This motif of Temple desecration and restoration, developed by the writing prophets in Tanach, and continued in apocalypticism, is employed in the New Testament in both the narrative pericopes and eschatological and apocalyptic discourses of Jesus, in the disputation sermons in Acts, in both sanctification and eschatological texts in the Pauline corpus, and in the Johannine Apocalypse, the Book of Revelation. If the use of the use of this motif can be demonstrated to maintain continuity in interpretation with the restoration prophets, it may be argued that the use of the Temple in the New Testament offers no textual support for the theological concept of spiritual replacement of Israel by the Church.

**Orientation to the Topic**

The Temple functioned as the established center for the cultic institution of Israel. Because of the integral spiritual connection between Land, People, and cult, what affected the People of Israel affected the Temple, and what affected the Temple affected the People of Israel. Thus, cultic desecration brought the destruction of the Temple, and effected an exilic condition for the Jewish Nation. A reversal of this condition would result in not only a return of the People to their Land, but would also effect the restoration of the Temple and its cult. This was the eschatological hope of the Prophets that was developed by the Jewish apocalyptic writers and continued in the New Testament. The unifying eschatological motif underlying this hope was that of desecration and restoration, two polar events that together form the spectrum of the eschatological drama.

---

Company, 1968), p. 274; "a word or pattern of thought that recurs in a similar situation … to evoke a similar mood, within a work, or in various works of a genre. In our case the pattern is that of Temple desecration with its attendant response of restoration recurring in situations of social and cultic conflict and controversy. The genres are those of prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology, which were the literary forms generated by these situations. We have selected one of several Temple motifs; for a more general study cf. L. J. Meisner, "The Temple Motif: God's Witness Unto Himself" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1977). For examples of other dominant motifs in the Tanach cf. Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations. Philip W. Loan Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies. Brandeis University Studies and Text III. Edited by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).
The perception of this eschatological motif informed the hope of the early Tan'a'itic Sages after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. We read in Makkot 24a-b that once a group consisting of Rabbi Akiba, Rabban Gamaliel, Rabbi Eleazer ben Azariah, and Rabbi Joshua were coming up to Jerusalem, and rent their garments when they reached Mount Scopus. When they arrived at the Temple Mount they saw a fox emerging from the Holy of Holies, and every man wept but Rabbi Akiba, who laughed. They said to him: "Akiba, you always amaze us. We weep and you are merry!" He replied: "For what reason do you weep?" They replied: "Shall we not weep that from such a place about which it is written: 'and the common man that draweth nigh shall be put to death' (Numbers 1:51) a fox emerges, and concerning it the verse is fulfilled: 'For the Mount of Zion which is desolate, the foxes walk on it?'(Lamentations 5:18)." Akiba retorted: "For that reason I rejoice and am merry." Rabbi Akiba then went on to cite positive biblical prophecies yet unfulfilled,26 finally concluding that if the prophecies of desecration have come to pass, so must also the future promises of restoration. Thus, Akiba linked together the predictions of desecration and restoration as an eschatological assurance for the restoration of the Temple and its cultus.

The theological perspective of Rabbi Akiba was informed by the Tanach, and primarily by the eschatological hope set forth by the Restoration (Post-exilic) Prophets. However, prior to the destruction of the Temple, Christianity had begun as a movement within Judaism. Although Jesus and the apostles were dependent on these same prophetic scriptures, the New Testament records that Jesus

\[26\text{Isaiah 8:2; Micah 3:12; Zechariah 8:4-5. His argument was that Scripture (Isaiah 8:2) set forth these two witnesses: Uriah the Priest, who lived during the time of the First Temple, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, who lived during the time of the Second Temple. Uriah's witness was of desecration and destruction (Micah 3:12), which was precisely fulfilled. Zechariah's witness was of return and restoration (Zechariah 8:4), which was yet unfulfilled. His point was that the prophecies concerned the same object, and if one was fulfilled, so must the other be fulfilled. Thus, if the Temple was destroyed as predicted, it will also be rebuilt as predicted. He has in view the certainty of prophetic fulfillment, but also the eschatological linkage of desecration and restoration, which serve for him as a guarantee of future divine intervention.}\]
predicted the Temple’s destruction, both in direct statement (e.g., the “no stone upon another” and Olivet discourses) and in parabolic demonstrations (e.g., the withered fig tree, the “cleansing” of the Temple). In the early formative period after the death of Jesus, the issue of the Temple becomes one of conflict (e.g., Stephen’s sermon, the riot against Paul), while in the Pauline epistles the Church is spoken of as a temple, and the Apocalypse envisions a New Jerusalem without the presence of a Temple. Does the New Testament, therefore, present a negative attitude toward the Temple, sanctioning its destruction, and replacing the cultic institution with the Church?

With the suppression of Chiliasm in the fourth century C.E., predominant Christian interpretation answered this question in the affirmative. The destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. demonstrated the conclusion of the old Jewish dispensation, which had actually been brought to completion some 40 years earlier by the death of Jesus. Since, it was reckoned, Jesus had been typified by the institution of the Temple, now that he had fulfilled the foreshadowed redemption, the Temple was unnecessary (as was national Israel), both having been replaced by the Church. For example, the German New Testament scholar Schenke, commenting on the “rending of the veil” (of the Temple) in Matthew 27:51/Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45, says that this act symbolized the displacement of the dispensation of the temple by the "new saving community of the crucified." 27

In like manner, the interpretation of Jesus' "cursing of the fig tree," the "cleansing of the Temple" pericopes, and his "I can destroy the temple of God" statements (e.g., Matthew 26:61; 27:40) have been adduced as evidence that Judaism and the Jewish Nation, as represented by its cultic institution, the Temple, were cursed as a replacement for the old physical temple (the Jerusalem Temple) was made by the new spiritual temple (the messianic community or Church). 28 This


28Cf. e.g., William R. 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 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), and J. C. de Young, Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in History and Redemption (Amsterdam:
“replacement theology,” which has been alleged to be a contributing factor to Christian anti-Semitism, draws its support from the assumption that Jesus and the New Testament writers stood in opposition to the Temple, and consequently to any hope of Jewish spiritual restoration outside the Church.

Nature of the Problem

In order to understand the interpretation of the specific New Testament texts that have given rise to replacement theology, one must first consider the general significance of the Temple as reflected in the Tanach, and especially its importance to first-century Judaism - the context for the rise of early Jewish-Christianity. For the purpose of our consideration of the problem here, we may briefly summarize this significance as follows.

The figure of the Temple is an integral part of the history of the Jewish People. It symbolized throughout Israelite history the unique status of sanctity that separated Israel from the nations, for it was built as a sanctuary for the Shekinah - the visible manifestation of God’s Presence. When apostasy from YHWH first affected the Temple cult (II Chron. 33:4-7), and later became entrenched (Ezek. 8:5-16), the departure of the Shekinah from the Temple (Ezek. 9:4, 18-19; 11:23) signaled the impending judgment of God (Ezek. 8:18; 11:9-11).

Following this exilic punishment period, a preliminary restoration was effected that enabled the rebuilding of the Temple and the resumption of a purified Temple service. The restoration community, and especially its leaders, realized the importance of rebuilding, since it served as a visible sign of the


guarantee of YHWH's continued covenant with His People. As Baldwin has pointed out, "While the temple lay in ruins there was no outward sign of the Lord's presence with the restored community."\(^{30}\) However, their rebuilding did not literally fulfill the restoration plan for the Temple as envisioned by Ezekiel (40-48) and announced by prophets such as Haggai (cf. 2:5-9), Zechariah (cf. 6:12-15; 14:16-21), and Malachi (cf. 3:1; 4:6). The degree of restoration did not balance that of desecration, since continued cultic offenses imperiled further desecration and destruction. This threat became reality when foreign desecration and destruction came to the Second Temple, and no restoration followed. The result was a theological crisis for Judaism,\(^{31}\) since the Temple had stood as a symbol of


\(^{31}\)70 C.E. marked the beginning of an adjustment period in Judaism to life without a functioning cultus. While the Temple was eventually replaced in Judaism out of theological necessity, it continued as a symbol of divine restoration and blessing. If Israel was the Chosen People, and Israel was the Promised Land, then a return and a restoration would have to be effected one day. This focus on national election with the rebuilding of the Temple as a sign of the messianic age was later developed in rabbinic literature and Agadic legends. Historical evidence of the preservation of this hope may be seen in K. W. Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70," *NTS* 6(1960): 269-280, who believes that the site of the altar on the Temple Mount was visited after the destruction as a part of continued hopes for rebuilding the Temple. Others, such as Rabbi Liebel Reznick, *The Holy Temple Revisited* (New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1990), p. 156, conjecture that Shimon Bar Kosiba (Bar Kokhba), proclaimed messiah by Rabbi Akiva, might have erected an interim cultic edifice that served as a functioning Temple. This would have been expected of Bar Kokhba as the messianic king, cf. Zechariah 6:12-13. Such a suggestion was made by the nineteenth-century Lithuanian Rabbi Samuel Shtrashun (R'Shash) in his commentary on *Pesachim*. Possibly informed by the preserved records of the Roman historian Dio Cassius, R'Shash stated that a High Priest by the name of Eleazer had been appointed by Bar Kokhba, and that sacrifice had been re-instituted. Perhaps support for this theory may be found on coins minted by Bar Kokhba which bear an image of the facade of the Temple and the name of Eleazer, cf. Michael Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine*, p. 13, although it is more likely that this portrayal was reminiscent of the architecture of the Second Temple, perhaps engraved during Bar Kokhba's reign as a sign of messianic expectation. Although Bar Kokhba proved a disappointment, aspirations for the rebuilding of the Temple continued into the Byzantine period, and were especially excited during the reign of the emperor Julian (363 C.E.), when a construction of the Temple was partially initiated. Rebuilding expectations
Israel's unique status as the Chosen People.\textsuperscript{32} The Christian reaction was to interpret this as a divine rejection of Israel as the election of God, and to see in the removal of the physical Temple a theological replacement by the spiritual Temple, the Church. The polemical disputations that ensued between the synagogue and church over this question produced mutual persecutions, promoted anti-Semitism, and erected a wall of theological separation that has all but obliterated the history and spiritual heritage common to both. It is claimed that the New Testament, especially in the eschatological discourses of Jesus and Paul, which make mention of the Temple as an object of desecration and destruction, have fostered this attitude and have given justification to the interpretation of theological replacement in Christianity.

The studies in recent years which have attempted to investigate this relationship have taken as their starting point the already developed notions of both the sanctity and inviolability, and the desecration and destruction of the Temple, as well as the concept of the eschatological Temple. While studies in Tanach have considered the socio-political status of the Temple, Temple propaganda, the Temple within its Near Eastern religious milieu, and even the Temple of Ezekiel 40-48, relatively little has been done treating the prophetic/apocalyptic Temple desecration and restoration texts. By contrast,

\textsuperscript{32}The Temple had become the nexus of both Jewish worship and political loyalty in the Second Temple period from the time of Antiochus IV, and thus served as an expression of Israel's corporate election. Jews in the Diaspora were united with Jews in Israel by (1) the direction of prayer (eastward), (2) re-burial in the Land, (3) the payment of the Temple tax, and (4) participation in the annual cycle of festivals through pilgrimage. On the question of Israel's election cf. Jakob Jocz, \textit{A Theology of Election: Israel and the Church}, London, 1958, and B. W. Helfgott, \textit{The Doctrine of Election in Tannaitic Literature}, New York, 1954.
New Testament studies have focused on the desecration of the Temple, but have followed the approach of isolating a particular discourse (e.g., the Olivet Discourse), a compositional unit (e.g., Luke-Acts), or a passage (e.g., Mark 13 or 14-15). There have been few comparative studies of the Tanach with the New Testament texts concerning the Temple, and even less that examine a specific Temple motif, within the larger context of the Tanach and the Jewish apocalyptic literature.

Statement of the Problem

Our first problem is to identify the motif of Temple desecration/restoration and confirm its eschatological dimension. Since the New Testament cites the Tanach in its teaching concerning the Temple, the interpretation of the Tanach in its employment of the motif will be essential. Most of the studies in this area have demonstrated that the dependence of the New Testament statements upon passages in the Tanach, which may in many cases have been midrashic interpretations of these texts (most notably Daniel). These studies have offered excellent examples of the exegesis of the relevant texts, but have been restrictive in terms of their focus on the New Testament context. Reading these texts in isolation from the larger structural and theological context of the Tanach may prevent the interpreter from seeing vital literary and conceptual links which have precipitated later expression.33

What is needed is an exploration of the underlying motif in Tanach that gave rise to the more developed concepts of Temple desecration/restoration in the

33An example of this may be seen in the common analysis of the Genesis narrative or Sinai narrative in isolation from one another. The links between the inaugural work of God at creation in Genesis with the work of God in covenant or the arrangement of the collections of laws in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy with their preparatory narrative framework in Genesis can be easily overlooked. By isolating and concentrating on an isolated theme we are able to more accurately discern the narrator's strategy, and to establish what literary relationships exist between the later accounts of ritual and earlier historical narratives. Cf. Meir Sternberg, The Poetics of Biblical Narrative, Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading, Indiana, 1985, and John Sailhamer, The Pentateuch as Narrative, Michigan, 1992.
post-exilic period, especially as expressed in Jewish apocalyptic literature, and in
the New Testament. Can we find cultic imagery in the Pentateuch that provides
continuity with the Temple motif as later employed by the Prophets? Is there a
unilateral development of this motif, or was this motif modified or abandoned in
Second Temple period Judaism? How does this motif inform the interpretation of
the New Testament, which depends upon the prophetic corpus and apocalyptic
composition (Daniel)? Has it applied or re-interpreted the eschatological motif,
i.e., is it in continuity or discontinuity with the Prophets in their expression of a
future restoration for national Israel in terms of their cultic institutions?

The Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this dissertation to isolate a motif of
desecration/restoration in the Tanach and trace its development through to its
expression in the New Testament (c. 45 C. E. - c. 95 C. E.). The motif that has
been selected is that with respect to Israel’s cultic institutions centered in the
Temple, since this represented the realization of the spiritual promises historically
made to national Israel.34 This motif has been further been qualified by its use
eschatologically, since the fulfillment of the restoration hope has not been realized
by Israel, it is either to be interpreted literally with respect to Israel’s future, or re-
interpreted spiritually with a present application to the Church (replacement
theology). Our interest, then, is to see whether the concept as it existed in Jewish
apocalyptic literature and the New Testament is a continuous development of that
expressed originally in the Tanach. If the New Testament’s use of the Tanach is

34 The theological perspective of the Temple in pre-70 C. E. Judaism is
complicated by the competing sects which held the Second Temple in varying
degrees of sanctity. Apocalypticists, such as those at Qumran, envisioned a Third
Temple, while among establishment Judaism it appears that the synagogue was
already replacing the Temple as a center for worship and assembly. However, the
attitude toward the defense of the Temple as evidenced by the priests during the
Jewish Revolt, and actions afterward such as the renewal of the Red Heifer
ceremony and the possibility of ritual sacrifice, would imply the Temple
continued to be regarded as the symbol of national and spiritual restoration. Cf. K.
consistent with the prophetic interpretation of an eschatological restoration for national Israel, then the New Testament cannot be construed as advancing a replacement theology.

While the application of the motif to the Temple does not begin in history until the erection of the First Temple in 967 B.C. (I Kgs. 6), there were previous events in early Israelite historiography that were later extrapolated and used as proleptic paradigms for the eschatological Temple. This may be seen in the way legal and cultic material in Exodus and Leviticus are paralleled with sections of Genesis, and in the use the Prophets, and especially, Ezekiel (and later the Book of Revelation), make of the Garden of Eden narrative in relation to the later motifs of eschatological desecration and restoration (cf. Zechariah 14:8-9; Ezekiel 28:11-19; 47:1-12; Revelation 22:1-5). Additional pre-prophetic Temple imagery in the Pentateuch may be found in divine announcements of a chosen place and in the covenantal stipulations of cursing and blessing. It is also possible that similar imagery of a cultic nature can be discovered between a Garden of Eden "sanctuary" and the Sinai Tabernacle -Sanctuary. The development in this case would follow from an Ideal Sanctuary to a Portable Sanctuary to a Permanent Sanctuary with a continuity in sanctity demonstrable throughout.

One particular expression of the motif of desecration, that of the crystallized apocalyptic expression ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐπιτύρωσις ("the abomination making desolate"), found in various forms in the Book of Daniel (especially 9:27), is especially significant, as it repeatedly serves as a signal in the New Testament (Gospels, 2 Thessalonians, Apocalypse) for eschatological desecration in the context of divine retribution. What the phrase ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐπιτύρωσις meant to New Testament writers certainly depended upon what the phrase ἡ θυσία meant to Daniel, however, Daniel’s understanding and adaptation of the term in his apocalyptic genre depended on how earlier writers in Tanach developed the motif from the concept of ritual desecration. Those who have approached this study previously have neglected to precisely identify or trace such a development. It is our supposition that the background for this phrase needs to be sought in earlier texts introducing an adversarial or polemical
relationship between מִרְמָר and a human protagonist (i.e., a cultic “desecrator”). This dissertation will seek to show the particular analogical relationship that exists between these later texts and the citation/allusion contexts from which they are drawn in the Tanach comparing the contributions of Synoptic, Johannine, and Pauline literature.

Significance of the Study

With respect to the questions concerning the attitude of the New Testament toward the institution of the Temple and its ritual, the conclusions of this research may provide new data for interpreters and may possibly provoke renewed discussion in the area of the Jewish-Christian polemic concerning the question of Jewish restoration. Further, the present selective survey of the motif will offer new insights between relationships in the use of the Tanach in the New Testament, and should assist in the interpretation of related motifs in similar eschatological contexts.

Finally, it is hoped that the development of this biblical motif will make a specific contribution to the general study of biblical theology, adding to the treatment of the concepts of sin and sanctification the paradigm of Israel’s ritual relationships and their demonstration presented through the vehicle of the Temple. Moreover, the application of the results of this research would be especially significant to the fields of apocalyptic and eschatological studies, offering the fruit of literary analysis in this topic as a model for other topical searches for a literary/theological unity of motifs.

A REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF MAJOR RESEARCH ON THE THEOLOGY OF THE TEMPLE

In the Christian realm, the theological treatment of the Temple and its cultus was originally reserved to general socio-religious cultural studies such as
those by J. Pedersen and R. de Vaux, and the basic Old Testament theologies. However, the move toward more technical analysis of the cultus was initiated by Rudolph Otto's, Das Heilige (1917), published in English as The Idea of the Holy, translated John W. Harvey (Oxford, 1928). Otto, however, did not investigate the connection between holiness and purity, especially as obtained by the means of separation. Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London, 1966), corrected this deficiency of Otto by documenting the requirement in Tanach that purity and ritual separation were indeed counterparts of holiness. While contributing to research related to the Temple motif, the study of cultic sanctification and de-sanctification became a specialized area of study.

Among works that have made significant advances in the priestly understanding of holiness are those by E. O. James, The Nature and Function of Priesthood: A Comparative and Anthropological Study (London, 1955), which further defined the separation of the priest from the common Israelite by an act of consecration, and a recent study by John G. Gammie, Holiness in Israel (Minneapolis, 1989), which carefully examines the biblical concept. One unique

---

35Johannes Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture I-IV (Copenhagen, 1926).


contribution of Gammie's work is his survey of the concept of holiness in each
genre of literature in the Tanach, especially among the prophetic and apocalyptic
writers. To this list we may add the conceptual approach to cultic texts presented
by Philip P. Jenson's *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the
World* (Sheffield, 1992). This revision of Jenson's Cambridge dissertation
considers the Holiness Spectrum as a framework for classifying the various
theories of cultic purity. By isolating groups of texts which reflect a distinctive
set of concerns and relatively unified perspective, he was able through a
recognition of gradation to categorize various dimensions of holiness (whether
spatial, personal, temporal, or ritual). While he does not treat apocalyptic with
the same detail as the priestly writings of the Pentateuch, he does demonstrate how
his conceptual approach reveals the characteristic of apocalyptic to idealize and
harmonize the disorder of the present (brought about as a result of cultic impurity)
by an eschatological order (the perfection of the cult).

Recent studies of the theme of the Temple in the Tanach begin with R.
Patai's survey *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (London,
Temple: The Presence of God in Israel's Worship* (Oxford, 1965), which was
originally presented as a thesis at the University of Sheffield in 1961 entitled *The
Divine Dwelling-Place in the Old Testament*. Clements traces the imagery of the
Shekinah localized in the midst of Israel as a unifying theme throughout the
Tanach that colors Jewish eschatology. He argues that Israel's unrealized hope of
God's transcendence and immanence was taken up by Christians and applied to
the indwelling of the Church, the Body of Christ, by the Holy Spirit, thus finding
in the concept of the Trinity a solution to the problem of immanence existent in
the faith of Israel.

The interpretation adopted by Clements was enlarged by J. McKelvey,
concludes from the use of the Temple motif in the New Testament that a
theological replacement of Israel by the Church was intended. McKelvey's
research apparently begin with a theological assumption that is reflected in his
subtitle: *The Church in the New Testament*. Furthermore, since his investigation was restricted to New Testament usage of theological polemical texts, his conclusions were not guided by the eschatological usage of the Temple motif in Tanach, which would informed the theological *Weltanschauung* of Jesus and the early Jewish-Christian writers of the New Testament.

The concept of temple imagery raised in New Testament studies, was explored further with respect to ancient Near Eastern concepts and their influence in the biblical text by R. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* Harvard Semitic Monographs 4 (Harvard University, 1972). Although scholars have questioned Clifford’s idealization of the Temple as a "mountain" to correlate with Ugaritic cosmology and their imagery of the sacred mountain, the parallels he drew between the Tanach and cultic symbolism of “high places” as sites for worship have provided useful background for the development of the temple cult in Israel. A similar comparative study, though limited to temple traditions in the Land of Israel, was that of Hebrew University professor Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978). Haran’s technical analysis primarily deals with an evaluation of the documentary sources that preserve and discourses relating to the pre-biblical origins and explanations of the temple rituals. Haran's work, controlled by higher critical assumptions regarding theories of Pentateuchal development often hinders tracing the unity of a literary theme. Because his primary interest is in how the Priestly Document differs from other Pentateuchal sources, he does not attempt to treat the figure of the Temple as a literary device to advance a theological concept.

In the field of studies that treat the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, major recent studies dealing with the Jerusalem Temple begin with the work by S.C.F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity* (London, 1957). Brandon’s thesis was representative of the old Tübingen hypothesis that Jesus was allied with the Zealots and that there was a theological discord between Paul and the Jerusalem Church. A new direction was set by J. T. Townsend, *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought* (Dissertation: Harvard Divinity
School, 1958). Parts of this research were later published as "The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century," in God and His Temple (ed. L. Frizzel, 1980). In his dissertation Townsend argued that every writing or tradition within a writing that can be shown to stem from before the fall of Jerusalem indicated an acceptance of the sanctity of the Temple and the Temple service as a legitimate worship in which Jewish-Christians as well as Jews took part. Townsend's conclusions parted with the prevailing New Testament interpretation of his day, establishing a more positive evaluation of the early Christian community within the context of Judaism.

Two works which followed Townsend, and which partially shared his viewpoint were: J. C. de Young, Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in History of Redemption and Eschatology (Kampen, 1960), and Lloyd Gaston, No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels (E. J. Brill, 1970). Gaston worked from the assumption that the New Testament was written primarily for Gentile Christians for whom the fall of Jerusalem was not a relevant concern. Nevertheless, he concluded that the fall of Jerusalem in the synoptic tradition did not teach a rejection of Israel, and thus contributed to the positive perspective in New Testament studies of the Christian attitude toward the Temple.

In 1973 Donald Juel presented his dissertation to Princeton University, subsequently published (1977) by the Society of Biblical Literature as Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, SBL Dissertation Series 31 (Scholars Press). In his work, which focuses on the attitude of both Jesus and his accusers at the trial (Mark 14-15) toward the Temple, he places Jesus within the Jewish tradition of the eschatological restoration of the Temple, seeing him identified as the Messiah-King who will rebuild the Temple. However, he interprets this "Temple" as a spiritual replacement for the physical Jerusalem Temple. He concludes: "The temple charge suggests that Jesus' death not only brings about the birth of a new community but the rejection and destruction of another. The 'temple not made with hands' is a replacement for the old 'temple made with hands'" (p. 213). Jesus' death will mark the end of the temple
establishment, and the new temple he will 'build' will succeed the old temple as the real place of worship" (p. 208).

A similar interpretation of replacement was the conclusion of James McCaffrey's 1981 doctoral dissertation presented at the Biblical Institute in Rome, and published in 1988 in the Analecta Biblica series (number 114) under the title: The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14, 2-3. McCaffrey, supporting the Catholic position of replacement, argued that the allusion to the many compartmental Temple complex of the Tanach was used by Jesus in his promise of eternal dwelling to his disciples to teach that the eschatological Temple is not the Jerusalem Temple, but the sacrificial body of the risen Jesus transformed spiritually into the New Temple (cf. pp. 244-245, 254-255). To do this, he must interpret the term οίκου, which indicates a building in the literal (spatial) sense, at a secondary level of deeper spiritual meaning to mean a "family" or "household," designating an "inner spiritual 'space'" (p. 246). Again we see that in order to understand the Temple in a way other than that consistently understood by the Tanach, a non-literal or allegorical hermeneutic must be employed.

As the Dead Sea literature became available, the attitude of the Qumran Community toward the Temple began to be assessed in light of Second Temple Judaism. What naturally emerged from this research was the comparison of texts that detailed this attitude with possible parallels in the New Testament. An early treatment of the Temple within the apocalyptic literature of Qumran was considered by George Wesley Buchanan in his 1959 doctoral dissertation at Drew University, "The Eschatological Expectations of the Qumran Community." The function of the Temple in the idealized future of the Essene community is the subject of the Temple Scroll (1QI), and analysis may be found in works which comment on this document. The first major published study of this type was that of B. Gärtner, The Temple and Community in Qumran and the New Testament.

---

38 The primary work on the Temple Scroll remains that by Yigael Yadin, שמחה הוליל ידין (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1977), however, forthcoming is an extensive commentary on the text of 1QI by Lawrence Schiffman.
(Cambridge, 1965). Gärtnert adequately deals with the apocalyptic texts from Qumran in relation to the Temple, however, his work is now almost 30 years old, and needs much revision due to the expansion of study on this topic published in such journals as Reuave de Qumran. Some of this recent research has been presented in an incidental manner in festschriften and, for example, in two collections of essays: John and the Dead Sea Scrolls, edited by James H. Charlesworth, and Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls, edited by Murphy O’Connor and James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1990).

Various Temple motifs have also received attention by New Testament scholars. A popular motif among researchers has been that of the Shekinah, has generated several original studies. Such studies provide a framework for the comparative theme of the localized manifestation of God in the Temple in Tanach with the metaphorical usage of the Church as a temple to express a similar manifestation of God. Specifically, since in the New Testament, the Church is likened to the Temple, within which dwells the Holy Spirit, there is thought to be a correspondence to the Shekinah, which once occupied the same position above the Ark of the Covenant in relation to the Tabernacle and First Temple. Of this research, the most comprehensive treatment has been the doctoral dissertation by Basque Jesuit Priest J. Luzarraga, Las Tradiciones de la Nube en la Biblia y en el Judaísmo Primitivo published in the series Analecta Biblica (No. 54) in 1973. Luzarraga took his lead from the French publication by J. Potin, La theophanie du Sinai et le don de la Loi dans le carde de la liturgie juive de la fete de la Pentecote (Lyon, 1968), but included beyond the biblical material, an extensive study of the term based on comparative Semitic languages, and early rabbinic literature. This work was complemented by the more complete study of this motif in the rabbinic tradition by Domingo Muñoz León, Gloria de la Shekinah en los Targumim del Pentateuco (Madrid, 1977). León’s work was built upon two earlier studies, that of Joshua Abelson written at the turn of the century, The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature (reprinted 1969), and that of A.M. Goldberg, Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Shekhinah in der frühen Rabinischen Litteratur (Berlin, 1969).
About the same time as the work by Luzarraga was published, Meredith M. Kline, wrote his thesis at the Westminster Theological Seminary entitled *The Holy Spirit as Covenant Witness* (1972). Aspects of this work were enlarged by his father Meredith G. Kline, professor of Old Testament at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, and released as the monograph *Images of the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, 1980). This study, written from a replacement perspective, was one of the first to fully develop the motif between the Tanach and the New Testament. Kline's unique premise sought to connect the Glory-cloud theme in the Tanach, and especially at Creation, with that of (re)creation in the image of the Glory-Spirit in the New Testament.

In 1988 a dissertation dealing with an eschatological motif related to the Temple was submitted to Princeton Theological Seminary by Elizabeth Gaines, *The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period*. While her focus was on the theme of the eschatological Jerusalem, her study serves as a model for a specific focus in tracing the function of the eschatological Temple motif.39 Her particular contribution was the identification and classification of eschatological Jerusalem traditions as employed throughout the literature of the biblical, intertestamental, and New Testament/rabbincic period. While her purpose was to trace the motifs of the eschatological Jerusalem, she demonstrated that the same variety in function that exists for the Jerusalem traditions also exists for the place of the Temple in eschatological Jerusalem.

A work similar in approach to Gaines, but directed to the motif of the Tabernacle, rather than the Temple, was that by Craig Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQ Monograph Series 22, 1989). His research attempts to isolate the Tabernacle motif and trace it independent of its later development in the Temple. His study is useful in that it seeks to explain the separate tradition that seems to appear in the New Testament relating to the Tabernacle.

In dealing with the specific eschatological motif of Temple desecration, several works have explored the concept as embodied by the Danelic phrase נַעֲשֶׂה הַסְּרָה (and equivalent forms), and the LXX and New Testament translation: τὸ βδέλυμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ("the abomination that makes desolate"). The first such work was by the French scholar Beda Rigaux, *L'Antechrist: et l'Opposition au Royaume Messianique dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1932).

Since Rigaux, most New Testament studies on this topic have concentrated on the use of the phrase τὸ βδέλυμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in Mark 13:14. A classic treatment of this passage was presented by G. R. Beasley-Murray in *Jesus and the Future: An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory* (London, 1954). His views presented in this study were later expanded and incorporated in *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London, 1957), and again with his *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Hendrickson, 1993). Beasley-Murray, as most exeges previously, interpreted the phrase τὸ βδέλυμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως with reference to a past historical desecration of the Jerusalem Temple, either in the time of Caligula or in the destruction of the Temple with the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E..

---

40The Danelic phrase נַעֲשֶׂה הַסְּרָה is taken in its several occurrences to refer to the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes IV during the Seleucid occupation of Jerusalem, cf., H. H. Rowley, "Menelaus and the Abomination of Desolation" in *Studia Orientalia Ioannis Pedersen* (Copenhagen, 1953), pp. 303-315. The Olivet discourse, however, refers to post-temporal events, connected either with the predicted destruction of Jerusalem or to a future event related to the apocalyptic advent of Messiah at the end of days.
helpful in his critique of the arguments that have sought to deny this Markan discourse to Jesus, unfortunately he does not explore the questions raised by the Matthean and Lukan traditions and Paul's related use of the motif in II Thessalonians 2:3-10.

Desmond Ford in his 1972 dissertation for the University of Manchester under F. F. Bruce, subsequently published by the University Press of America under the title *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington D.C., 1979), expanded the research of Beasley-Murray on Mark 13:14, arguing that it is part of a Markan midrash on Daniel, and added a corrective to Beasley-Murray's conclusion concerning the historical application of the "abomination that makes desolate." He concluded that it not only applies to the fall of Jerusalem, but, in both the context of Daniel and the Olivet discourse, also to the end of the age. While Ford does not fully trace the Antichrist motif through the Tanach, he provides a hermeneutical paradigm which this present research will employ. While Ford's title, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology*, implies a more general study in Tanach, and he does briefly treat the context in Daniel, he does not venture beyond this to trace the theological-historical development of the motif elsewhere in the Tanach. Ford is typical of writers who have generally assumed that either Daniel or contemporary apocalyptic writers were responsible for the concept. Furthermore, Ford does not make the connection with Temple desecration as the *raison d'être* of the motif, but assumes it is but an application of the motif.

to the Parousia. Along these same lines, F. F. Bruce included in his commentary on I and II Thessalonians in the *Word Biblical Commentary* series. Volume 45 (Word, 1982), the helpful study: “Excursus on Antichrist” (pages 179-188). Bruce makes a positive identification of “the man of lawlessness” with the Johannine “Antichrist” (cf. 1 John 2:18), and provides a concise survey of the relevant literature as well as the interpretation of the figure and related ideas through the post-Constantinian age (to the seventh-century).

A more recent contribution to the study of Jesus’ use of this motif has been the publication of a paper produced from the Tyndale House Gospels Research Project. This work by David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse* (Sheffield, 1984), interprets the phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως as “the desolating sacrilege,” and examines the parallel usage between the Synoptic writers and the Johannine and Pauline texts. Wenham’s work, however, is limited to the New Testament corpus, and does not concern itself with the origin of the motif nor its developmental history in Tanach. Rather, his concern is with the comparative use of the phrase in order to justify his defense of the unity of thought in the eschatological discourses of Jesus and Paul.

Focusing on a particular parable with an intent to explore the desecration motif is the contribution of William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree* (Sheffield, 1980). Telford has produced a redaction-critical analysis of the cursing of the fig-tree pericope in Mark in order to show the relation between this statement and the cleansing of the Temple tradition.41 Although Telford does not treat any of the texts or motifs dealt with specifically in our study, he does provide an excellent model for analyzing related motifs.

---

Of particular assistance in this area of comparative research between Tanach and the New Testaments has been the research in the field of apocalyptic literature, both biblical and extra-biblical. Gregory Beale’s Cambridge dissertation “The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the Revelation of St. John” (Cambridge, 1980) provided a useful model for tracing comparative eschatological motifs, especially in light of the acknowledged dependence of apocalyptic writers on the Danielic material.

Of related use is the collection of articles by David Flusser of the Hebrew University, Judaism and the Origins of Christianity (Jerusalem, 1988). Flusser offers special treatment of both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic, and particularly as they are in relation to one another (as in the use of the Tanach by the New Testament). Two articles in this collection have been especially helpful in our study: “The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran” (pages 207-213), which treats the apocalyptic figure Belial as a precursor to the New Testament Antichrist, and “No Temple in the City” (pages 454-468), which deals with an eschatological concept of the Temple equally attested in both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature. In addition, his Jewish Sources in Early Christianity (Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1989) has a chapter “Jesus and Second Temple Pietism” (pages 33-37) which contributes to the background of research on the attitudes of various Jewish sects toward the Second Temple. Yet, while Flusser deals with the Dead Sea material and rabbinic material, his contribution is related primarily to the use of heavenly-image terminology in the apocalyptic literature of the New Testament, and not to specific Temple motifs.

In summary, studies to date have tended to isolate the motif of desecration from its wider ancient Near Eastern and biblical context when applying it to an eschatological event such as the destruction of the Temple. Those writers which have best set the stage are those such as Luzarraga and Kline, whose focus was upon the immanence of God and have sought to trace the concept of the divine sanctuary throughout Tanach and between the Testaments. Such studies have provided the theological framework for understanding the problem of Temple desecration by the resultant effect of the departure of the Divine Presence due to a
lack of corporate holiness. Apocalyptic researchers have opened up new vistas for comparative study, especially with the recent release of long-unpublished Dead Sea Scroll fragments, which appear to significantly enlarge our understanding of the messianic and cultic beliefs of the Qumran Community, and perhaps other sects of Second Temple Judaism. Yet, generally, the field of New Testament studies has continued to manifest a theological inclination in favor of replacement, due in part to the lack of a comprehensive comparative study of both the negative (desecration) and positive (restoration) elements of Temple imagery throughout the biblical canons and the inter-biblical literature. The present dissertation will hopefully make a useful contribution in this direction.

**THE USE OF THE TERMS "ESCHATOLOGY" AND "APOCALYPTIC"**

Our research spans the prophetic genre in particular, with its concentration on the biblical pre- and post-exilic prophetic periods, the non-canonical intertestamental period, and the New Testamental prophetic period. Although we recognize that formal prophetic activity is not identified as such until the period of the monarchy, we have nevertheless begun introduced the survey of our motif of Temple desecration and restoration in the Pentateuch, and especially with Genesis, since protology (the beginning of history) and eschatology (the end of history) are tied together in the recurrent motif of the Temple as the Garden of Eden, an idea which has deep Near Eastern roots.42 Because our research involves the closely related phenomenon of eschatology and apocalyptic, it will be helpful at this point to attempt a distinction between the two.

One of the problems in making this attempt, however, is the lack of the adoption of a uniform definition of these terms by the various writers in the field of biblical studies. Perhaps it has been felt that no consensus was possible, for as Gerhard Von Rad once said of apocalyptic:

---

no satisfactory definition of it has yet been achieved.” 43 In like manner, Robert Webb, introducing his study of the term, noted: "... 'apocalyptic' is a very slippery term and requires careful delineation." 44 The same may be said for eschatology, for Neil contended that the term was "used in half a dozen senses. 45

Let us begin with an attempt to distinguish between eschatology and apocalyptic in the traditional sense, and then consider the separate classification of apocalyptic eschatology now advanced in modern scholarship.

The Use of the Term "Eschatology"

The term “eschatology,” derived from the Greek ἔσχατος ("ultimate" or "final things") refers to the final and definite salvation of man. This has been considered in terms of the finis ultimus, the ultimate end of man, i.e., beyond and after this earthly life, 46 or within this life at the ἔσχατον, or “end of the age.” This latter sense is expressed by the Hebrew term ἔσχατον ("the end of days"), which always appears in the same form and with the same preposition as a fixed form of speech. 47 The eschatological connotation of this formula is


47 Cf. the cognate Akkadian term, ina ahrāt umi (from the Sumerian ina ahrìtu umi), often shortened to ina ahrāti (“in the future,” or “for [all] the future”). In like manner בֶּן א ра ו ("in the future, in time to come” (e.g. Deuteronomy 4:30; 31:29; cf. אֻנֶּשׁ "a future," Jeremiah 29:11). Though parallels have been sought as sources for Israelite eschatology, it appears more likely that eschatology in Israel was an inner-Israelite development, and that extra-Israelite parallels simply represent concepts common to the entire ancient Near East.
especially prominent in the biblical Prophets (e.g., Isaiah 2:2; Jeremiah 23:20; 34:20; 48:47; 49:39; Ezekiel 38:16; Hos 3:5; Micah 4:1) and Daniel (Daniel 2:28; 8:19, 23; 10:14; cf. 12:8).\footnote{Daniel uses in addition to the standard formula אֲדֹנָי הָיָם the expression יָּמִים, whose substitution of לַאֲדֹנָי הָיָם only strengthens the decisive meaning of "the end" as "the final period," since לַאֲדֹנָי is the proper Hebrew expression for a completion of time, coming from the root לָא ("cut off").} although it is by no means limited to them, and is found as early as the Pentateuch (e.g. Genesis 49:1; Numbers 24:14; Deuteronomy 4:29-31). This formula is also taken over by the apocalypticists of Qumran\footnote{Both the expression אֲדֹנָי and לַאֲדֹנָי are used with יָּמִים in the Dead Sea Scrolls; with הָיָם having the sense of the "messianic" time, which comes, in distinction to לַאֲדֹנָי comes after the "end" (לָא) of wickedness. Examples of usage are: לַאֲדֹנָי הָיָם (D IV. 4, 10)/לַאֲדֹנָי הָיָם (pHab II. 5; V. 3-6; IX. 6), and לַאֲדֹנָי (D VI. 10, 14; XII. 23; XV. 7, 10; pHab VII. 7, 12) (S IV. 16; pHab VII. 7, 12).} and by writers of the New Testament where the expression is אֲדֹנָי לָאֲדֹנָי הָיָם or קָרָם.\footnote{In most instances χρόνος appears to be used synonymously with קָרָם. Often the term נֵסֶף is also used to express this eschatological period. Examples of New Testament passages for the formula are: Matthew 8:29; Mark 1:15; 10:30; 13:33; Luke 1:20; 19:44; 21:8; Romans 3:26; 12:11; 13:11; I Corinthians 4:5; Galatians 6:9; Ephesians 1:10; 5:16; Colossians 4:5; I Thessalonians 5:1; II Thessalonians 2:6; I Timothy 2:6; 4:1; 6:15; II Timothy 3:1; Hebrews 9:9; I Peter 1:11; 4:17; 5:6; Revelation 1:3; 11:18; 12:14; 22:10.} Kosmala in his study of this formula argued that it is not used consistently to mean "the end time" in the biblical texts, and that the Christian sense of the term differs from the primitive Hebrew concept.\footnote{Hans Kosmala, "At the End of the Days," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 2 (1963). Edited by Hans Kosmala (Leiden: E. J. Brill), pp.27-37.} However, even if the connotation of the formula should differ between early and later texts, this might be expected since a developmental aspect (assuming progressive revelation) would naturally account for the more definite meaning in the later apocalyptic literature and the New Testament.
Understanding the opposing viewpoints of the scope of eschatology in the Tanach, in this study "eschatology" holds its traditional meaning of "last things" (Greek εσχότος "last, final"), and applies in the nature of our study to the "last things" of "the world" (τῆς γῆς), rather than of "the individual" (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). This broad definition has come in modern times to mean more than the events that will attend the end of the age. It is now used inclusively of a system of interpretation of history that describes a program of events that lead to the fulfillment of a predicted hope.

Among Christians, the Bible has been thought to contain texts whose proper interpretation and arrangement will lead to the correct program of final events. The "proper interpretation," of these texts has been subject to debate over whether "the consummation" will include an interval (millennium) between the Parousia [of Messiah] and the final judgment/resurrection (premillennialism), immediately followed by a new heavens and earth (amillennialism), or be fulfilled within history through the dominion of the Church via the Christian gospel (postmillennialism).

There has been little agreement among scholars as to the scope of eschatology. Statements range from "all prophets of the Tanach, including the pre-exilic prophets, are eschatologists," to "there is no pre-exilic or prophetic eschatology." Some Jewish interpreters claim that eschatology can be traced for

---

52 This term was coined in the early 19th century by Christian theologians to refer to a division of systematic theology dealing with the afterlife, judgment, and the resurrection, however, has since been used more broadly to refer to the end of history and the transformation of the world which particularly characterized early Judaism and Christianity, cf. D. E. Aune, "Eschatology," The Anchor Bible Dictionary (2:549).

53 The focus of these terms is not their relation to the "interval" per se, but to the Parousia, which they hold in common. Therefore, pre-millennialism looks for the Parousia before a millennial age is established, post-millennialism looks for the Parousia after the establishment of the millennium (i.e. the Kingdom of God in the Church), and a-millennialism, rejecting the concept of a millennium as a definite period of history, looks for the Parousia to usher in the eternal state.

54 Cf. for views from the German school (1) the former view: Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (1929), pp. 74-77; 82-87 and Paul Volz, Jesaja II, übersetzt und
the explication of the development of later motifs to the pre-prophetic period. Hartman, as a representative of this view, contends that: "In the age of the Patriarchs, of Moses and Joshua, and of the Judges, and in the first few centuries of the monarchy there is little evidence of true eschatology. Yet the basis of later Israelite eschatology was really laid down in that early age."\(^{55}\)

This foundation of eschatology in the pre-prophetic period is based on the concept of the election of Israel in Abraham, an election which included the covenant established with YHWH and its promise of an ideal "anointed" (מֶּשֶׁךְ) king with an enduring dynasty (cf. II Samuel 7:11-16), and a uniquely-favored relationship with YHWH in the "Promised Land" (cf. Genesis 12:1-3; 15:7-21; 17:1-5; 21:16-18; Deuteronomy 18:15-19). It was through Israel’s election that YHWH would accomplish His universal reign over mankind, and this expectation became an eschatological hope, that developed in detail as divine revelation, coupled with interpretive insight, progressed through the ensuing centuries.

This hope of the fulfillment of Israel’s destiny became more refined in the pre-exilic period, when prophets, such as Amos, related the punishment of Israel to its restoration around the election/covenant status of the Nation (cf. Amos 3:2), and looked for resolution in the הַיָּלָד הָיוֹם ("Day of the Lord"), an expression first used by Amos, but apparently already in popular usage. It was this term designating the time of future divine punishment that was especially developed by the exilic and post-exilic prophets as well as by later Jewish apocalypticists (cf.


erklärt (1932), and (2) the latter view: G. Höscher, Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatology (1925) and Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh. Trans. by G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 126-133. Cf. also, J. Lindblom, "Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?" SlTb 6:2 (1953): 79, and especially his bibliographic references of the various extreme positions. He himself takes a middle course, employing "eschatology" in the broader sense.
The Use of the Term “Apocalyptic”

The term “Apocalyptic” is used commonly to signify the sudden catastrophic intervention of God in the affairs of earth to right all wrongs and to terminate human history. In general, the term has come to designate a literary genre "apocalypse" (derived from Greek ἀποκάλυψις "revelation, disclosure"), and the special type of eschatology contained therein, separating from prophetic literature in only minor respects. Apocalyptic took on a strictly eschatological meaning in the absolute sense in Judaism in the last centuries before the destruction of the Second Temple. The eschatological formula כִּי הָאָדָם ("the end of the days"), which we have seen has its beginning in Daniel (along with the frequent expression כִּי הָיָה "the time of the end"), cf. Daniel 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9.

Moving to a more specific delineation of the term, it should be noted that it has been scholarly convention to use the adjective "apocalyptic" as a noun, although this lends itself to semantic confusion. Paul Hanson has argued for clarification by distinguishing the following terms according to the sense required: "Apocalypse" identifies a particular literary genre or a work within

56 Other variations appear as יָוֵם נֵבֶר וּיוֹדָה ("the Day of YHWH’s wrath"), Zephaniah 1:18; והיום והיום ("that Day"), Isaiah 2:11; Zephaniah 1:15; and והיום והיום ("the Day"), Malachi 3:19; cf. Ezekiel 7:7.


58 Differing semantic possibilities include "apocalyptic" as a literary work, a literary genre, a single idea, a set of motifs, an ideology, or a sociological phenomena. This confusion moved T. F. Glasson, "What is Apocalyptic?" NTS 27 (1980): 105, to call for an abandonment of the use of the term.

that genre; "Apocalypticism" specifies the symbolic universe of an apocalyptic movement in which apocalyptic eschatology has been transformed into an ideology providing identity and view of reality for the movement; "Apocalyptic" should be reserved as a term for use in adjectival phrases such as "apocalyptic motif" or "apocalyptic genre." Despite the effort Hanson has made to distinguish these terms, confusion still remains due to the blending of idealization of the ideology of apocalyptic with the social realities of the movement. We prefer to continue to use the generic term "apocalyptic," simply because it has become conventional to do so, although we recognize the need for the specification of Hanson. Before attempting to offer a formal definition of "apocalyptic," let us consider the features of this genre that distinguish it from eschatology.

The Features of Apocalyptic

The early approach to Apocalyptic literature defined it by a description of its basic traits and gave it the following general characteristics: (1) *Revelatory in a special sense* - by dreams, visions, or heavenly journeys - in which the apocalypticist obtains knowledge of the future not accessible otherwise. (2) Visions and dreams *are described in literary form*. (3) **Pseudonymity** is a trait of apocryphal and pseudopigraphical apocalyptic, but not biblical. (4) **Pseudo-prophecy** marks apocalyptic, borrowing names and historical references from the past to aid the guise of prophecy. The writer poses as living in the ancient past, communicating from that period to the present, at which time it becomes vague, except for the presentation of the kingdom of God as imminent. (5) **The use of symbolism** (cf., Daniel, where the use of metals and animals are employed to represent world empires and rulers).

Michael Stone, however, objected that these thought patterns are not restricted only to apocalypses, and that further distinction was needed between apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic literature in relation to eschatology. Such distinctive features of apocalyptic have been isolated and identified, and may be

---

summarized in ten categories\textsuperscript{61} which include, but significantly enlarge upon the above traits:

(1) Dualism: a conflict between two ages: \textit{δ ἀλών ὅτος} ("this age") and \textit{δ ἀλών μέλλων} ("the age to come"),\textsuperscript{62} usually characterized by thesis and antithesis as "this evil age" (the dominion of Darkness) versus "the new age" (the Kingdom of God).\textsuperscript{63} Ponthot, looking at the correspondence between two antithetical worlds as two opposing reigns, notes that the antagonism of the moral realm is hypostatized into a war between two conflicting powers\textsuperscript{64}: that of Belial, Antichrist, or Satan and their acolytes, and that of the Messiah or God and His saints.

(2) Visions, Visionaries, and Otherworldly Journeys: the supra-historical or mythic-realistic insights or revelatory travels of the seer. According to Lindblom, these may be allegorical, pictorial, estatic auditions or visions, hallucinations or literary visions.\textsuperscript{65} These have been categorized by Koch as "discourse cycles," in which the seer, with the assistance of an


otherworldly or angelic interpreter, review the history and destiny of mankind.66

(3) Symbolism: the vehicle for the portrayal of the historical milieu, events, and characters in accord with the visionary experience. It is ideographic rather than pictographic, i.e., it represents the attributes, rather than the [physical] reality, of some character or event in a coded form to communicate the message more dramatically. In other words, it is the manner of revealing divinely hidden or imperceptible spiritual realities which behind actual history.67 For example, in Zechariah 6:12 the historical figure of the Temple builder is symbolically portrayed as a "Branch." In this case, the symbol represents the character (most likely messianic) of the future figure who will construct the Temple in time.68 While a common feature of apocalyptic, symbolism is not restricted to it, and Kloppenberg gives examples of symbolic eschatology that represents the end times without the catastrophism of apocalyptic.69

(4) Pseudonymity: generally the apocalyptist assumed the name of an historic personage or prophet.70 Motivations suggested to explain the use of a pseudonym may have been to add authority to an unknown writer's message in order to gain acceptance for his apocalypse, to avoid


67Cf. E. Johnson, "Apocalyptic Genre in Literal Interpretation," p. 205, who notes: "When the future events are designated by a symbol, the designation is not direct but metaphorical. Still, the event designated may be historical and real."


(5) \textit{Messianic Deliverer}: a messianic advent motif precipitated by present persecution or a hostile foreign presence, that usually includes the following items in an established pattern:\footnote{Adapted from Paul Hanson, "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern," \textit{JBL} 92 (1973): 37-59.}

(a) the appearance of the divine warrior,
(b) strategic combat with the oppressors of Israel, especially Jerusalem,
(c) a theophanic manifestation accompanying ultimate victory,
(d) military and spiritual deliverance for Israel, and
(e) the reign of messiah or the establishment of a righteous kingdom.\footnote{Cf. J. W. Bailey, "The Temporary Messianic Reign in the Literature of Early Judaism," \textit{JBL} 53 (1934): 170-187. Examples of a temporary messianic or future earthly kingdom, followed by an eternal state of blessedness are: I Enoch 10:17-22; 24:1-25:7; 28:1-32:6; 45; 51:4-5; 16; 71-72; 91-103; II Enoch 33; 65-66; Jubilees, Tobit; Adam and Eve 42; Sibylline Oracles; II Apocalypse of Baruch 29:3-30:1; II Baruch; Assumption of Moses 9:1-10:6; IV Ezra 7:26-30; and Testament of Dan 5:10-13; Testament of Joshua 19.}

(6) \textit{Otherworldly Beings, Angels, and Demons}: usually present as a celestial army in the cosmic conflict between the messianic deliverer and the principal powers among this group: Belial/Belial, Uriel, Antichrist, or Satan. The conquest of these beings in the cosmic realm demonstrates the sovereignty of God as the eschatological Judge, which will resolve the problem of theodicy in the present world.\footnote{Cf. William Murdock, "History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism," \textit{Int} 21 (1967): 179.} In other words, what is occurring in the earthly arena of history is the mirror image of the spiritual reality taking place in the heavenly arena. In this regard, world oppressors were often
caricatured as the instruments of evil celestial powers. However these malevolent beings could also assume historical contours and terrestrial roles in the form of the oppressive rulers (e.g., Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Herod the Great, Nero), as precursors of the eschatological Anti-messiah (or Antichrist).  

(7) Paraenesis: (by mediator to the recipient) is an uncommon, but sometimes present feature that "aims to jolt the careless and the indifferent, it is a final appeal to the misguided, it reassures the persecuted faithful and nurtures their hope." Such apocalyptic timetables were not speculative, but employed as practical warnings with the purpose of secure covenant fidelity.  

(8) Survey of History: an attempt by the writer to present the essential character of the prophetic periods considered while also offering an interpretation of the course of world history. Such an account of history functions as (a) either an explicit recollection of the past, used as a timetable to orient the reader to their proximity to the ultimate event, or (b) vaticinium ex eventu ("prophecy after the event"), which is styled as predictive prophecy in order to establish the credibility of the seer.

---


76 Only about five of thirty-nine accepted Jewish apocalypses contain paraenesis (e.g., Daniel 9; Florilegium 4Q174; Assumption of Moses; Apocalypse of Abraham; and I Enoch).


(9) **Determinism**: is the pessimistic certainty of a crisis of catastrophic predetermined judgment for the present world, associated with theophanic intervention, and announced through predicted eschatological woes, along with the expectation of triumphal salvation in the world to come. This feature of apocalyptic views this world as corrupt and degenerating under the dominion of Satan and his evil emissaries, which produces a preoccupation with the messianic kingdom and the world to come. A pattern of "crisis-judgment-salvation" is observable in eschatological predictions, which are characterized by national and spiritual restoration for Israel.\(^8^0\) The cosmic scope of this restoration is seen in the inclusion of resurrection for the dead. The New Testament continues the future anticipation of the unfulfilled aspects of predictive prophecy in the Tanach to the consummation, i.e., the epiphany of Christ, when God's judgments will be manifested and the eschatological purpose fully revealed.

(10) **Suffering in a State of Anomie**: a situation characterized by the collapse of a well-ordered world view, which thrusts men into a chaotic, valueless, and meaningless experience.\(^8^1\) This suffering is not punitive or retributive, but the result of the persecution of the righteous by Satan and evil forces, and therefore is seen as senseless, vindictive, arbitrary, and malicious attacks upon God's elect.\(^8^2\) Such suffering will find its vindication in divine intervention, which brings final retribution upon the wicked and delivers the sufferer, revealing the true meaning of the disorder that formerly characterized the present world.

---


Definitions of Apocalyptic

Based on our overview of the traits of apocalyptic, we may now consider a formal definition of the genre. In 1979 the Society of Biblical Literature published the first systematic analysis of all literature that has been traditionally regarded as "apocalyptic." The research showed that the genre does share significant traits that can distinguish it from other genres, and they proposed the following definition. Specifically, an apocalypse is: "a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world." However, this eclectic approach, however, defined the genre only in terms of form and content, but not function. David Hellholm proposed the following addition to the SBL Apocalypse Group definition in order to clarify the literary function. He adds: "intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation by means of divine authority." However, Hellholm's addition suffers due to its joining of literary function with social setting ("a group in crisis"). In order to distinguish these further, an SBL Seminar on Early Christian Apocalypticism drafted a revised addendum, which less specific than the SBL Apocalypse Group's first definition, was nevertheless adopted as a second part of the official definition. Webb, seeking to strengthen this second part by making more explicit its connection with the first part, presents it in revision as follows [Webb's revision is in italics]: "intended to interpret present, earthly

---

83 The SBL Apocalypse Group incorporated into its study and definition not only Jewish apocalypses, but also Gnostic, Greek, Latin, Rabbinic, Mystic, and Iranian apocalypses.


circumstances in light of that other supernatural world (spatial axis) and of that envisaged future eschatological salvation (temporal axis), and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of this interpretation substantiated through divine authority. Even with this revision, one must still further address the issue of social setting and function, since this definition deals only with literary function.

The Development from Prophecy to Apocalyptic

Despite the distinctions which have been proposed, the boundaries between eschatology and apocalyptic may not be need to be as tightly drawn as some, like Hanson, have done. Thompson speaks of "transformational boundaries," and contends that these are "soft and permeable, and open to passage" by the seer. He notes, "Therefore, distinctions between objects in the seer's world are not absolute and categorical; they are relative, with one object blending into the next ..." He further notes that the use of metaphor and homology are actually passports between what is termed "myth" and actual history. "While "eschatology" may find its origin in the pre-prophetic period of Israelite history, "apocalyptic" appears as a more specific genre developed or transformed from prophecy in the prophetic period (pre- through post-exilic).


87 E.g., Paul Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment," RB 78 (1971): 35, who distinguishes apocalyptic eschatology from prophetic eschatology by viewing the context of later as real history, while the former is that of the cosmic realm.


89 Ibid., pp. 120-122.

The inability to fix categorical distinctions between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic, may be better understood in view of the development of apocalyptic from prophecy.

Research into the development of apocalyptic has provided evidence of its developmental link with prophetic eschatology. While other influences have been suggested for the formation of apocalyptic, such as the of the Persian Zoroastrianism,91 and the wisdom school,92 the eclectic view that adopts the biblical Prophets as its major source has gained recent consensus. Objections to this view have been that primary characteristics such as dualism, determinism, and pessimism are incompatible with biblical prophecy,93 that apocalyptic does not manifest the providential control of YHWH in Israelite history,94 and that there is an absence of citations from the Prophets by the apocalyptists.95

(24-27; 34-35) and Ezekiel, and continuing into the post-exilic period with Zechariah.


Nevertheless, as Vawter cautions, similarities, not deviations, should be the test of compatibility and dependence, and on this basis apocalyptic is seen as the historic successor to prophecy. Edwards, focusing on these similarities, has concluded:

What, then, marks the transition from prophecy to apocalyptic? ... it is the combination of spiritual readiness and historical events. So the visions of the prophets become extended, elaborate and literary, as their symbolic acts are turned into symbols. The close relationship of these writers is seen in their concentration on the two focal points of time: the historical event of the fall of Jerusalem and the despair it brought; the historical fall of Babylon and the hope it brought. And between, the picture of the reactions of a displaced people.

We see something of what Edwards describes in the apocalyptic of Qumran. Collins has noted that "The distinctive aspect of Qumran, and of apocalypticism in general, lies in the patterns they disclose and the projection of those patterns into the eschatological future." Collins would align these patterns with the wisdom school in its attempt to find order and structure in the world, however, as we will see from the development of our desecration/restoration motif, the hostile order resisted at Qumran was that of Belial, whose antecedents grew from the prophetic typology of a Temple Desecrator, and especially Daniel's image of the "Abomination of Desolation." In this regard, the Qumran community was projecting the eschatological motifs of the prophets into a predetermined future, in which they saw themselves, and the events transpiring around them, as a part.

---


Biblical evidence of the development from prophecy to apocalyptic has been cited by Hanson, based upon his study of prophetic texts that reveal proto-apocalyptic motifs (Ezekiel 38-39, Isaiah 24-27; 56-66, and Zechariah 9-14). He concludes that Jewish apocalypses: "emerged in an unbroken, inner-Israelite development out of pre-Exilic and Exilic prophecy, though greatly expanding upon several archaic mythic motifs which had been held in check by the classical prophets."\(^99\)

Evidence of such development is likewise suggested in the progressive sequence of dependence between Jeremiah (cf. 25:11), considered prophetic literature, and Daniel (cf. 9:2), which is considered proto-apocalyptic, and the later use of Daniel in the classic apocalyptic literature, and finally, in its use in the eschatological discourses of the Synoptic Gospels and the apocalyptic work of the Book of the Revelation (the Apocalypse). This development, from prophecy to proto-apocalyptic, proto-apocalyptic to apocalyptic, apocalyptic to eschatology, and eschatology to apocalyptic, may indicate that the differences between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic may not as distinct, especially in relation to the context of history. Johnson suggests that the question of the relationship of apocalyptic to history, due to its apparently supra-historical, or mythic, imagery, may be a difference of degree rather than kind. He notes that "prophetic literature focuses on the will of God," while "apocalyptic literature focuses on the decreed events from God." In the former, the expression of God's will is "at a particular time in history, but potentially extending to history's end," whereas in the latter, the expression of decreed events deal with "the ultimate resolution of historical issues," and therefore, "are envisioned and described."\(^100\)

---


**Apocalyptic Eschatology**

The recognition of the continuation of prophetic eschatology into apocalyptic has resulted in the new classification of Jewish "apocalyptic eschatology," which serves as a useful construct to epitomize certain phenomena discernible in the sources. Tremper Longman III has suggested on the model of Akkadian prophecies that instead of separating prophecy and apocalyptic into two distinct genres that we can posit a single genre containing a prophecy-apocalyptic continuum, which would lean to the apocalyptic side.\(^{101}\) Rappaport moved in the direction of definition for this combination genre when he observed that "the trait which is typical and necessary for an eschatological work to be an historical apocalypse is a historical consciousness and specific literary framework." \(^{102}\)

This general observation has been expanded by Hanson into a technical definition as:

a religious perspective which focuses on the disclosure (usually esoteric in nature) to the elect of the cosmic vision of Yahweh's sovereignty - especially as it related to his acting to deliver his faithful - which disclosure the visionaries have largely ceased to translate into terms of plain history, real politics, and human instrumentality due to a pessimistic view of reality growing out of the bleak post-exilic conditions within which those associated with the visionaries found themselves.\(^{103}\)

While eschatology is usually associated with the genre of apocalyptic, Hanson and Collins have sought to separate apocalyptic eschatology from the literary genre, characterizing it as "a set of ideas and motifs that may also be

---


found in other literary genres ...”

This means that apocalyptic eschatology, though it may find its most vivid expression in apocalypses, is not confined to such works. New Testament research has found this definition helpful in identifying certain conceptual affinities (motifs) between Pauline thought and Jewish eschatological expectations that might be labeled “apocalyptic,” even where specific terminology is not present. This definition assumes the concept of eschatological dualism between “this age” and “the age to come,” proposed by Phillip Vielhauer as the essential characteristic of apocalyptic.

Working from this position, Martinus de Boer has sought to demonstrate that Jewish apocalyptic eschatology took two distinct tracks in the New Testament period. These heuristic models each seek to describe an internally coherent or consistent configuration of motifs, and are based on evidence from the primary sources (e.g. 1 Enoch 1-36; apocalypse of 2 Baruch).

The first track is called cosmological-apocalyptic eschatology, and is characterized by a world (including God’s own people) that has become led astray.

---


by idolatry and is waiting for divine intervention to defeat the evil powers and deliver the righteous remnant (the elect) in a final cosmic battle.

The second is called forensic-apocalyptic eschatology and is characterized by individual responsibility and accountability to the Law, which will be rewarded or punished at the Last Judgment.

Both models are theocentric and primarily concerned with God’s claim on the world as His creation and its rectification. While not agreeing with de Boer that these features may be demonstrated in every detail in the Pauline corpus, the models as they employ eschatological motifs, are useful for linking Pauline eschatological thought with both Tanach and non-canonical Jewish apocalyptic literature. In consideration of the eschatological motif of desecration/restoration, this definition permits an identification of these elements in the non-apocalyptic epistolary material.

With these acceptable definitions of eschatology and apocalyptic, we will proceed to describe our plan for research through a survey of the chapters of this dissertation.

The Plan of Research

The objective of this study is to trace a theological concept through the literature of the biblical and post-biblical periods. The focus of this research will deal with the negative concept of profanation rather than the positive idea of sanctification.  It is the motif of desecration that appears as the pivotal phrase ἀπελνωμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in Daniel (9:27), and serves as the model for the use of the comparative construction το βδέλωμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in the New Testament (Synoptic Gospels). The need for restoration to the divine ideal, brought about by the fact of profanation, that ultimately establishes the positive eschatological concept in the prophets. In order to understand the nature of the positive fulfillment, the negative situation must be thoroughly observed. The

108 The writer has previously studied the eschatological significance of the concept of sanctification in his master’s thesis, Theocratic Theodicy: The Eschatological Restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36 (Dallas Theological Seminary, 1981).
research involves a biblical-theological study of the motif, buttressed by exegesis of the significant texts in the Tanach and the New Testament.

The design of this research begins with a study in the second chapter of the concept and history of the Temple in Israel. The concept of a temple in the ancient Near East (Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Canaan) will be compared to the significance of the Jerusalem Temple. The historical review of the Temple will begin with the Tabernacle, as a precursor of the Temple, and continue through the First and Second Temple periods ending with the destruction of the Temple in 70 C. E. This preliminary investigation will provide the groundwork for an understanding of the importance of the motif in its historical form. The chapter will conclude with a complementary study of the concept of the מִזְבַּח as the archetypal eschatological Temple and its relation to the historical Temple, which will give background to the identification and significance of our eschatological motif.

Chapter three introduces the concept desecration and restoration by a study of cultic purity, beginning with the general Hebrew terminology, and narrowing to a focus on the specific expression and relationship of ritual desecration and defilement. The focus then narrows further to the use of desecration and restoration in eschatological expression, particularly as an inseparable motif conveying the polar extremes of despair and hope in apocalyptic determinism, and to the contribution of this motif to biblical theology.

Chapter Four develops the eschatological motif of desecration/restoration by tracing its expression through the Tanach. A brief consideration of pre-prophetic imagery, called by some "sanctuary symbolism" in the protology of the Pentateuch, provides background for the later eschatological application of such imagery in the Prophets and the New Testament Book of Revelation. Continuing the consideration of pre-prophetic imagery, the concept of analogical correspondence (typology) is investigated with an examination of the exodus Pharaoh as a possible symbolic Temple Desecrator. The motif is next traced through the historical books of Kings and Chronicles in the form of a literary drama of desecration that sets the stage for the prophetic declarations of
desecration and restoration in the pre-exilic Prophets. Here, we will selectively study Jeremiah's Temple sermon as representative of the cultic dilemma, and as the model for the New Testament pericope of Jesus' "Cleansing of the Temple," and Ezekiel's prophecy, particularly chapter 36, as the clearest theological expression of the motif, and chapters 40-48 as representative of the eschatological Temple motif. This pre-exilic prophetic background prepares the stage for the post-exilic explication of the motif by the restoration prophets (Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi).

Chapter five deals exclusively with the use of the motif in Daniel. An overview of the eschatological interpretation of Daniel, and especially of chapter 9, verses 24-27, sets the stage for an examination of the Danelic presentation of the desecration motif in the expression שָׁפָרָאָם נָאָם אֱלֹהִים רַבִּי ("abomination that makes desolate"). This term is analyzed within the context of Daniel, and an explanation for its form and interpretation proposed, particularly in relation to its use as a motif of Temple desecration. This results of this investigation will serve as a theological reference for the later study of the application of this expression (from Daniel 9:27) in the New Testament. Finally, as with the previous examination of the exodus Pharaoh as a type, the figure of Nebuchadnezzar as an historic Temple desecrator is considered as a type of the eschatological Temple Desecrator, the Antichrist, as providing additional background for the interpretive proposal of Pauline usage of Daniel 9:27 (in II Thessalonians 2) in this manner.

Chapter six prepares for the transition from the Tanach to the New Testament by a study of the use of the desecration/restoration motif in the non-canonical apocalyptic literature, including that of the Qumran community and the significance of their unique concept as a background to the New Testament usage. First, a study of the concept of the Temple in apocalyptic thought provides an understanding of the need for, and expression of, an eschatological Temple. Next, the concept of desecration, and of an eschatological Desecrator, is considered in light of texts which present an "end time" scenario applying the motif from prophetic eschatology and Daniel.
Chapter seven is an extensive chapter dealing with the New Testament use of the motif. This study begins with a re-examination of the attitude of New Testament toward the Temple by a focus on the attitude of Jesus as reflected in the Synoptic Gospels, especially Jesus' "Cleansing" of the Temple pericope, with its use of Jeremiah 7 and prophetic citations, and his eschatological discourse on Olivet, with its use of the desecration motif via Daniel 9:27. Complementing the examination of the attitude toward the Temple reflected in the Gospels, is an examination of the attitude of the apostles (with special attention to Stephen's Temple sermon) and of Paul in the Book of Acts.

Building upon the study of Paul in Acts, this chapter next treats the use of the Temple as a spiritual metaphor in the Pauline epistolary literature (Galatians, Ephesians, and I & II Corinthians), paying special attention to the question of theological replacement as historically linked to the use of the Temple in these texts. In addition, the use of the desecration/restoration motif as a metaphorical motif of sanctification/purification is explored in these contexts. Continuing the investigation of the Pauline use of the motif, we examine the use of Daniel 9:27 and of the interpretation of the Antichrist as the antitypical Temple Desecrator in II Thessalonians 2. Finally, we complete our tracing of the motif in the Johannine Apocalypse. The date of the composition is considered in light of a pre- or post-destruction interpretation, and its structure is considered in light of a Danelic apocalyptic paradigm. In an examination of selected contexts, the concepts of the future earthly, eschatological, heavenly and new Temples are considered as applications of the eschatological motif of desecration/restoration.

Chapter eight presents a summary of our study of the desecration/restoration motif, and of its significance in evaluating the theological interpretation of the replacement of the Temple, and national Israel, by the Church and Christianity.
CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF THE TEMPLE IN ISRAEL

In order to trace a motif essential to the theological development of the Jerusalem Temple, it is important that we first understand the concept and the significance of the Temple in Israel. Since no archaeological remains of Solomon's Temple exist\(^1\), we are dependent upon biblical descriptions of building procedures\(^2\) and of the cult.\(^3\) Following a brief definition of "temple," we will

\(^1\)While it has been claimed that some remains of Solomonic masonry are extant in and around the Temple enclosure, notably at the southern and eastern walls (e.g., the "scam"), nothing directly connected to the Temple has yet been discovered. In conversation with Meir Ben-Dov, chief archaeologist for the Temple Mount excavations, he has stated that he believes the Second Temple, which completely erased all traces of the First Temple, stood at least three meters above the present azurah, and therefore, no remains of even the Herodian structure could be extant. However, subterranean structures connected with the Temple service may have been discovered, cf. e.g., Ronnie Reich, "Two Possible Miqva'ot on the Temple Mount," IEJ 39 (1989): 63-65, and the more comprehensive work by Meir Ben-Dov, תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א תשמ"א (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1982) [Hebrew], and English ed. transl. by Ina Friedman, In the Shadow of the Temple: The Discovery of Ancient Jerusalem (New York: Harper & Row, 1985)

\(^2\)For a discussion of the various chronological, philological, textual, and architectural problems related to the study of the temple of Solomon see Jean Ouellette, "The Basic Structure of Solomon's Temple and Archaeological Research," *The Temple of Solomon*. Edited by J. Gutmann; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976): 1-20. One of the crucial difficulties in reconstructing the Temple based on the historical sources is their lack of agreement in architectural details. This is also the case, for example, in western Asia, where it is rare to find an instance of the union of excavated temple remains and texts which can be unequivocally related to the ritual practices of the temple. In Egypt, however, some such examples can be found, cf. E. A. E. Reymond, *The Mythological Origins of the Egyptian Temple* (Manchester/New York: Manchester University
examine the function of temple in the ancient Near East. In this study, comparisons exhibiting possible cultural continuity between the ancient Near Eastern temples as cultic institutions, and the functions of the Jerusalem Temple reflected in the biblical text, which will serve as an introduction to the subsequent presentation of the unique functions of the Jerusalem Temple (hereafter, the Temple). A brief overview of the history of the Jerusalem Temple will be considered for background to the theological concepts of desecration and restoration. This chapter will then conclude with a study of the concept of the eschatological Temple.

THE DEFINITION OF A TEMPLE

The Hebrew term הָרָכִיל, also found in Canaanite and Ugaritic hkl, is probably based on the Akkadian ekallu, which stemmed from the Sumerian e-gal

Press/Barnes and Noble, 1969). For the most recent architectural research in relation to the Temple Mount, and especially the archaeological identification of the various historical additions to the azurah, its dimensions, and the most probable location of the First and Second Temples, cf. Leen Ritmeyer, "The Architectural Development of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1993) and idem. "Locating the Original Temple Mount,"BAR 18:2 (March/April 1992), p. 45. To this should be added Asher S. Kaufman's detailed study The Temple of Jerusalem: Tractate Middot (Jerusalem: Har Yéra'èh Press, 1991) [Hebrew], which incorporates into the commentary the latest archaeological and scientific research on the Temple's location and construction (however, from Kaufman's perspective that the Temple was situated north of the present Dome of the Rock).

3In general, the word "cult" indicates the observable actions of a people, singly or in community, in which they engage in conjunction with their religion. We will use the term in this manner with reference to foreign (pagan) religious practices. Our primary usage, however, is with reference to the biblical form of Israel's worship, which included the Temple, its sancta and its associated services. For the most recent and thorough description of the Temple cult cf. R. Chaim Richman, The Odyssey of the Temple (Jerusalem: Israel Publications and Productions, Ltd., 1993).

4אֶסְכָּל is derived from the root הָכִיל or הָכִיל, which has the basic meaning "to contain," cf. BDB, s.v. "", p. 228. For further definition of the term see W. B. Kristensen, The Meaning of Religion (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960), p. 369. If the literal idea of the root is retained in the noun הָכִיל, it has been
meaning "big house." The Greek root τέμνω, from which τεμένος ("a piece of land marked off from common uses and dedicated to a god, precinct," derives, also has a predecessor in Sumerian temen, which appears, for example, in the inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash. In this special place of theophany, not made with human hands, the god appears as revealer, healer, or giver of fertility, but does not dwell there. The usual rendering of יִשְׁעַר in the LXX, however, is with ναός, which may distinguish, like τεμένος (although more precisely the sanctum sanctorum,) the place where the deity's presence was manifested. English versions of the Tanakh use the word "temple," derived from the Latin templum after the Greek τεμένος, which could apply to any of the pagan centers of


In its most general sense, יִשְׁעַר sometimes was used to refer to a royal palace (cf. 1 Kings 21:1; 2 Chronicles 36:7), although its primary reference is to the "house of God." The more general word for "palace" is יִמְלָה, which signifies a fortified part of the royal complex (cf. I Kings 16:18; II Kings 15:25), but is never used with reference to the Temple. Cf. Menahem Haran, Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1978), p. 13.

Liddell & Scott, A Greek Lexicon, p. 1774. refers specifically to a clearly marked area where a theophany once occurred and was again expected on the ground of tradition. Usually, it is a place distinguished by nature, e.g., the grotto of Zeus on Crete, the rock cleft at Delphi, or the holy grove at Olympia.


Cf. our discussion of this term in chapter 7, especially with reference to its New Testament usage.
worship\textsuperscript{10}, primarily for the sacred edifice erected in Jerusalem, and sometimes
distinguish it for exclusive reference by capitalization: Temple. We will employ
this distinction in our study.

Biblical Hebrew, however, rarely uses this term. It prefers to describe the
Temple as היכל יהוה בתי ("house of the Lord"), or בית אלוהים ("house of God"),\textsuperscript{11} and
the LXX usually follows this rendering with ἱερον ("house"). This expression
better denotes the basic idea of the Temple as "a place where God dwells," which
continues the general meaning of the Hebrew term for the Tabernacle, מַעֲנֵי ("dwelling place").\textsuperscript{12} The modern Hebrew expression for the ancient Temple is
בית המקדש, however, the noun מקדש ("sacred place," "sanctuary") is not
used exclusively of a temple, but also of any article or object possessing sanctity
(e.g., the tithe, Numbers 18:29). While the term מקדש is used of temples in Israel
other than the Central Sanctuary (Amos 7:9, 13), as well as for those outside the
Land (Isaiah 16:12), it is also used for the Jerusalem Temple (Isaiah 63:18;
Ezekiel 5:11; 9:6; Psalm 74:7; 96:6; Lamentations 1:10; 2:7, 20). The expression

\textsuperscript{10}The English versions normally use the translation "shrine," or "sanctuary," to
distinguish pagan cultic installations.

\textsuperscript{11}Haran concludes that the expression "arises from the basic concept of a divine
residence and expresses the inherent, intrinsic nature of the institution, which
primarily was conceived of as the god's dwelling place, "Temples and Cultic
Open Areas as Reflected in the Bible," Temples and High Places in Biblical
Times (Jerusalem: The Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew

\textsuperscript{12}The term מַהֲלָה (rendered in the English versions "tent," "dwellings") is used
once in connection with shepherds (Song of Songs 1:8), and generally describes
the dwellings of nomadic groups (Judges 6:3-5, cf. Ezekiel 25:4). The term is
used in biblical poetry in parallelism with בַּיִת (Numbers 24:5; Isaiah 54:2;
Jeremiah 30:18; Psalm 78:60; cf. Job 21:28) and also in the Ugaritic texts (though
here as mythological residences of the gods, cf. 2 Aqht v. 31-3), C. H. Gordon,
(1971-2), pp. 19-20. Hillers has discovered the word מַהֲלָה in the Aramaic
inscriptions of Hatra, D. R. Hillers, BASOR 206 (1972): 54-56, however, as Haran
points out, Temples and Temple Service, p. 196, n. 12, its meaning in these
inscriptions appears to be "abode," "dwelling place," rather than "tabernacle," or
even "shrine."
is used of the Holy of Holies (Leviticus 16:33), and in the Holiness Code the term מַקְדֵּשׁ הַמִּסְכֵּן appears to denote the entire Tabernacle complex (Leviticus 19:30; 26:2), and later in Ezekiel's Code, the entire district of the Temple (Ezekiel 43:21; 44:1, 5, 7-8). The modern term apparently developed from the Mishnaic בֵּית מַקְדֵּשׁ ("house of holiness"), the common phrase for the Temple, which has one biblical occurrence in II Chronicles 36:17.

The LXX follows the Tanakh in its understanding of בֵּית מַקְדֵּשׁ by its selective use of the term ναός, derived from ναίω, "to dwell" or "inhabit." In Classical Greek ναός referred to the "abode of the gods," with specific reference to the innermost part of a shrine which contained the image of a god.\(^{13}\) Thus, while the LXX might have only used where the קְדֻשָׁה קְדֻשָׁה was in view, it employs ναός 55 out of 61 times to translate הֵיכָל. Usually it has the non-technical sense of a "palace" or "temple," if the LXX had wished to indicate "a temple" in general it might have used λεηφόν.\(^{14}\) "The result of this limitation," as von Meding observes, "is that ναός becomes a purely cultic term, referring exclusively to the true temple of God" [i.e., the Jerusalem Temple].\(^{15}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Cf. e.g., Homeric usage in Iliad 1, 39; Odyssey 6, 10; 12, 346.

\(^{14}\) Moulton and Milligan suggest that Koine Greek, following Classical usage, may have distinguished between the use of τὸ λεηφόν (neuter of λεηφόν, "holy," used as a noun) and ναός. The former may have had a wider and more general use, with reference to the entire edifice (i.e., the Temple complex with all of its courts), while the latter may have been restricted to the most sacred part of the Sanctuary (i.e., the κυρίον), cf. M&M, s.v. "ναός," p. 422. This distinction may hold true for the New Testament, since the older term for the site of a "temple", τεμενός, is not used, cf. Otto Michel, TDNT 4, s.v. "ναός," p. 887. One example usually cited for support is Matthew 27:5, where ναός apparently refers to the βασιλεία του κυνηγούμενος. However, this distinction is contested since in other instances the two terms appear to be used interchangeably, e.g., John 2:20, where ναός is here apparently used of the entire Temple, cf. BAGD, s.v. "ναός," p. 300.

\(^{15}\) W. von Meding, NIDNTT, s.v. "ναός," p. 783.
THE FUNCTION OF A TEMPLE IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

What constitutes a temple and its ritual in the Tanakh can only be derived by a comparative study with ancient Near Eastern archaeology (architectural remains), ancient Near Eastern religions (historical and cultural texts), and the socio-political dynamics of temple-building. While the Jewish Temple can stand alone as a product of Israelite monumental architecture and the Tabernacle tradition, it displays common structural and symbolic features with temples of the ancient Near East. Most of the functions of ancient Near Eastern temples have a counterpart in the biblical text, although modified by theological distinctives. Because of the possibility of regional differences in the theological thought of the ancient Near East, it is necessary to consider the concepts of the temple in different geographical and cultural settings before presenting general conclusions. Here we will survey some of the various functions of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Canaanite temples as revealed by relevant cultic texts. This study should develop our concept of temple, and particularly lay a framework for the following comparative study of the Israelite Temple.

Features Common to Ancient Near Eastern Temples

The following twelve features have been considered to be common to ancient Near Eastern temples. Not all of these features are typical of every

16 The comparative method can yield positive results if "kept within closely adjacent historical, cultural or linguistic units," and if "the comparison be between a total ensemble rather than between isolated motifs," Jonathan Z. Smith, Map is Not Territory SJLA 23 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978) ix. The comparative method involves the issue of cultural continuity versus discontinuity. George Mendenhall has documented the cultural disruptions in the ancient world, and noted that there were areas of equally extraordinary cultural, historical and religious continuity, George E. Mendenhall, "Change and Decay in all around I see": Conquest, Covenant and the Tenth Generation," BA 39 (1976); 152-57 and cf. his documentation of such continuity, "The Ancient in the Modern - and Vice Versa," Michigan Oriental Studies in Honor of George G. Cameron. Edited by Louis L. Orlin (Ann Arbor: Department of Near Eastern Studies, The University of Michigan, 1976), pp. 227-53.

17 Much of the material used to compile this list, as well as many of the comparative references have been adapted from the important studies of Hugh
temple. but together they represent an overview of the mythic symbolism and religious and/or socio-political function that may have informed the different cultural traditions of the ancient Near East.

The Cosmic Mountain:

Richard Clifford has set forth a proposition that behind the temple traditions in the ancient Near East there stood the symbol of the "cosmic mountain," of which every temple was the architectural embodiment. ¹⁸ While


¹⁸ The term "cosmic mountain" is used here as defined by Richard J. Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East. Harvard Semitic Monographs 4 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), pp. 2-3, who distinguishes it from the older mythological usage of a previous generation of scholars. Clifford's point is not that the cosmos is envisioned in ancient Canaan as a mountain, but rather that a mountain is given universal scope. We use his with the qualification noted by Elizabeth Gaines, The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period (Ph.D. dissertation Princeton Theological Seminary, 1980), p. 38, that "The cosmic mountain or Weltberg conceived by nineteenth-century German scholarship never existed in Mesopotamian mythology; however, the term itself may be preserved as a useful designation for those sacred mountains in the ancient world that were associated with the gods." The details of this symbolism are presented in the following section on the Pentateuch in which the literary parallelism between Genesis and Exodus reveal the proper biblical usage of this motif. It should noted at this point that I am in essential agreement with Yechzziel Kaufmann, who in his monumental קבוצת ממהנדס יס Ampel (Tel-Aviv, 1937-1956): I-III abridged and translated by Moshe Greenberg, The Religion of Israel from its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile (Chicago and London, 1961) and vol. IV by C. W. Floyson, History of the Religion of Israel (New York, 1977), distinguished Israelite monotheism as a non-mythological religion unrelated to the pantheistic pagan mythology that envisioned the temple as arising from a cosmic order. Rather, as Kaufmann contended, the ancient (biblical) Israelite conception of Deity was one of an omnipotent Sovereign, undetermined and unlimited by the natural order or system of laws. However, the use of mythological symbolism for literary purposes by the biblical writers does
Clifford’s concept was drawn primarily from the Ugaritic (Canaanite) traditions, the motif of a sacred mountain has been considered to be common to the conceptions of most temples in the ancient Near East. According to Clifford, the "cosmic mountain" is consistently characterized by the following elements:\(^{19}\)

(a) The mountain was the primeval hill of creation from which all life originated.
(b) The mountain was the center of fertility, the source of the rivers and underground springs that gave life to the land.
(c) The mountain sustained the whole order of creation by virtue of its immovable presence at the center of the cosmos.
(d) The mountain had at its roots the netherworld, while at its peak heaven and earth were joined.
(e) The mountain was the dwelling place of the high god, who presided over the assembly of the divine pantheon.
(f) The mountain was the place of theophany where the divine and the human met.

**The Source-Waters of Life:**

The ancient Near Eastern temple is often associated with the waters of life which flow forth from a spring within the building itself, incorporate the spring within itself, or as having been built upon such a spring. Such springs are depicted as existing in temples because they are viewed as the primeval waters of creation. In Egypt, this spring was known as Nun in Egypt\(^{20}\), while in Mesopotamia as Abzu. Established on these primeval waters, the temple thus becomes the source of life-giving substance, capable of watering the whole of

---

not necessarily assume an adoption of that theological viewpoint. Rather, such usage may be argued to be selectively employed either for typological or polemical purposes, and as literary devices do not warrant the older textual evolutionary theories or the concept of religious and/or cultural borrowing.

\(^{19}\)Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain*, p. 5.

creation. Nibley observed that "at every hierocentric shrine stood a mountain or artificial mound and a lake or spring from which four streams flowed out to bring the life-giving waters to the four regions of the earth."\(^{21}\) In Mesopotamia, the life-giving streams are a major motif in the Sumerian myth of Enki and Ninhursag (ANET, p. 38). In this text in lines 55-59 the waters of the earth that bring abundance to Dilmun are reminiscent of the subterranean waters of the Garden of Eden.\(^{22}\) In this connection, mythical rivers appear in Akkadian texts in association with other mythological elements such as the tree of life. It is between the river of two mouths that Enki, Shamash, and Tammuz dwell.\(^{23}\) At Ras Shamra the Canaanite mythology also employed the figure of the waters in connection with the cosmic mountain abode of 'El at the source of the two rivers. In a similar association, Widengren has also connected the figures of the water, tree, temple basin and a sacred grove.\(^{24}\)

---


\(^{22}\)The identification of Akkadian *edu*, a Sumerian loan word meaning "flood," with Hebrew מים (Genesis 2:6; Job 36:27) has been made by E. A. Speiser, "ED in the Story of Creation," *Oriental and Biblical Studies: Collected Writings of E.A. Speiser*. Edited by J. Finkelstein and M. Greenberg (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1967), pp. 19-34, reprinted from *BASOR* 140 (1955): 9-11 and *Genesis, AB* (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1964), p. 16. He arrived at the conclusion that מים in Genesis 2:6 refers to an underground swell that emerges above the surface of the earth to water the Garden of Eden, however, he did so only by arguing that *edu* was synonymous with Akkadian *butuqutum* ("breakthrough") and *milu* ("flood, groundwater"). While phonetically feasible, a better proposal has been offered by Dhorme, and defended by Albright, relating the Hebrew to the Akkadian *id*, another Sumerian loanword meaning "river." This etymology has the strength of not being dependent upon inference from synonymous terms and has mythological associations that more favorably accord with the cosmic waters alluded to in the Genesis context. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1968), pp. 92-95.

Sacred Space:

In this concept, the temple is built on separate, sacral, set-apart space. In the Egyptian temple complexes, sacred space was often associated with mountains, the Nile, or some other feature that had acquired sacred character. Texts from Late-Period Egypt also depict the process of deep excavation used to create temple foundations. They cite as the reason for such immense trenches filled with sand, the mythological belief that the bed of sand represents the primeval mound, which is founded in the primeval waters of Nun.  

Celestial Orientation:

It has been observed that observed that the temple is oriented toward the four world regions or cardinal directions, and to various celestial bodies such as the polar star. As such it is, or can be, an astronomical observatory where sightings are made, the purpose of which is for those who come to the temple to orient themselves in the universe. The buildings might face the sun at its rising.

---


26An example of a long maintained tradition of orienting the corners of temple buildings to the cardinal directions see the prehistoric temples of levels 11 through 6 at Eridu (Tell Abu Shahrain) and the partly contemporaneous northern Ubaid period temples of levels 14 through 12 at Tepe Gawra; see Ann Louise Perkins, The Comparative Archaeology of Early Mesopotamia SAOC 25 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1949): 67-70, 87. The burials discovered in the Ubaid period cemetery at Eridu were oriented in the same direction as the temples; cf. also Max Mallowan, "The Development of Cities from Al-'Ubaid to the End of Uruk 5," CAH; 3rd ed.; 1/1 347.

27A temple observatory at Akkad in the time of Sargon the Great may have existed; for the evidence and discussion cf. John D. Weir, The Venus Tablets of Amnizaduga (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch Archeologisch Instituut, 1972), pp. 40-47.
or other celestial bodies. This cosmic orientation has long been recognized for the Egyptian and Mesopotamian temples, such as at Ziggurat of Nanna at Ur. Lindquist cites a Seleucid period tablet for a temple ritual at Uruk which reads in part: "In the first watch of the night, on the roof of the topmost stage of the temple-tower of the Resh temple, when the star Great Anu of Heaven rises and the star Great Antu of Heaven rises in the constellation Wagon, (he shall recite the composition beginning? ....") And further on in the same text, "Upon seven large golden trays, you shall present water (for washing) hands to the planets Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, Saturn, Mars, the moon, and the sun, as soon as they appear" (ANET 338).

A Source of Fertility and Prosperity:

The temple is associated with the bestowal of fertility and prosperity. This concept may be observed as a major motif in the Sumerian epic Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta, and in the Mesopotamian literature from the example of a simple, but direct, statement found in the inscription of Arik-din-ili I (RIMA I 121 ll. 14-18). In this text the king says that he built the Shamash temple to insure the fertility of the land: "I planned to rebuild that temple in order that the harvest of my land might prosper." Again with reference to the Gudea Cylinder (SAK 101= A XI 1-27), we find in a promise made by Ningirsu of agricultural abundance that will come from heaven when the foundation of the temple is laid, and that there will be a fullness of water, oil, wool, and that harmony and light.

A Royal Construction:

The pattern and measurements of the temple are divinely revealed to the king, whose task it is to exactly execute the designed plan. Ahlström has observed in Hittite, Egyptian, Mesopotamian texts, as well as the Mari documents, that the

---

28Lundquist, following the lead of John Sorenson, cites as a reference for evidence of this conclusion, Andrzej Wiercinski, "Pyramids and Ziggurats as the Architectonic Representations of the Archetype of the Cosmic Mountain," Katunob 10 (1977), pp. 71-87.
king as administrator of the god’s territory, was not only the builder of the country, but also the caretaker, restorer, and organizer of temples and their cults.\(^\text{29}\) For instance, Nabopolassar stated that he took the measurements of Etemenanki, the temple tower in the main temple precinct of Babylon, under the guidance of Shamash, Adad, and Marduk, and that he kept the measurements in his memory as a treasure.\(^\text{30}\) Lundquist notes Gudea’s famous dream in which the temple of Baga, wherein was revealed to him the plan of the temple to Ningirsu which he was to build. He was shown a lapis-lazuli tablet with the temple plan on it, and was given a sacred brick mould which contained the bricks to be used in the building (\textit{SAK} 89-97 [= Cylinder A I-VIII]). In the Ugaritic texts, Ba‘al does not build his own house, but the artisan god Kothar-wa-Hasis. While a king does not execute the plans, nevertheless it is by a secondary deity who functions under Ba‘al’s instruction.

\textit{A of Place of Rest}

In the ancient Near East the concept of a temple as a place of rest is also seen. The Akkadian terms used to express this concept (though the exact nuance in each case is not always ambiguous and must be determined in its individual contexts) are: \textit{nàhu}, \textit{nehtu}, \textit{nehu}, \textit{nēhu}, \textit{pasahu}, and \textit{tapsahtu}, which have connotations of “rest” (from physical exertion), “calm” (from anger), and “peace” (from the cessation of hostility or warfare). Hurowitz in one of his appendices lists several royal building inscriptions where this concept is mentioned.\(^\text{31}\) For example, Enlil-bani, king of Isin, builds a temple to \textit{4Nintin-ug\(_3\)-ga} called \textit{é-ni-diûb-bûi}, “house of relaxation,” while temples at Ur built by Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin are called \textit{ki-tus ni-dûb-(bu)-(da-ni)}, (“[his] dwelling place will provide rest”).


\(^{31}\)Hurowitz, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 330-331 (Appendix 5).
An expression approximating the biblical concept, *subat nehtim* ("resting place"), is used in relationship to human beings in their lands as well as to gods in their temples (*CAD* N II: 150-151). In connection with the notion of a divine rest we find Nabonidus, in a prayer to Shamash, calling Ebabbar *subat tapsuhi*ka ("the residence of your rest"), and praying *ilan i alika u bitika lisapsihu kabatatka* ("may the gods of you city and your temple cause your heart to 'rest'") and the prayer of the kalu priests recited during a building ritual: *inu Anum ... parak nuh libbisunu ina matim ipus* ("when Anu built in the land a dais for the rest of their heart").

**A Unifying Institution:**

The temple in ancient Near Eastern society served as the one central unifying institution. The Gudea Cylinders (e.g. *SAK* 101-3 (= A XI. 18-27), and *SAK* 123 (= B I. 10), as well as the economic and social role of the Mesopotamian temple attest to this concept.32

**A Dwelling for Deities:**

The ancient Near Eastern temple was considered as a dwelling place for the local or patron deity. Temples housed images of the deities as well as kings, temple priests and worshippers, which were symbolically initiated into the presence of deity, and thus into eternal life, by being washed, anointed, clothed, fed, and enthroned.33 This idea of a temple as the place of ritual initiation into divine life has also been considered a common feature in Egyptian religion (cf. *ANET*, 4-6: 329-330). Also in the temple a cult drama (perhaps *themenum a elish*), was reenacted during the New Year, the time when sacred marriages were

---


performed.\textsuperscript{34} This drama recounted a cosmic war, the final triumph by the forces of good (led by the principal deity), and the creation of the cosmos, cities, and temples.\textsuperscript{35} Temples were also considered as temporary dwellings for deities who had been displaced from their own sanctuaries because of mourning rites, the institution of cultic dues, or for some other reason. Several Mesopotamian texts reveal this practice, such as one which records Nabonidus' claim that he placed Shamash in a temporary dwelling while restoring Eabbar,\textsuperscript{36} and his report that his predecessor had placed Anunitum of Sippar in a chapel in Sippar-Amnun and provided her with the regular offerings, because her own temple had been destroyed.\textsuperscript{37} Enil is also said to have taken up a temporary residence in a small temple after Ekur was demolished and Guti pillaged the land.\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{An Economic Power}

The temple in the ancient Near East functioned as an economic institution.\textsuperscript{39} The power wielded by the Mesopotamian temples, for instance,

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34}Cf. the washing and clothing of Inanna in "garments of power" in preparation for the sacred marriage rite as described by Samuel Noah Kramer, "The Dumuzi-Inanna Sacred Marriage Rite: Origin, Development, Character," \textit{CRR\textbf{A}} 17 (1970), pp. 136-40.
\item \textsuperscript{36}Langdon (1912): 254 no. 6, col. I 30-31(=from reference in Hurowitz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 328).
\item \textsuperscript{37}Cf. Langdon (1912):276, \textit{Nabonidus} no. 8, col. IV 14-33 (=\textit{ANET}, 309), from reference above.
\item \textsuperscript{38}Cf. \textit{Curse of Agade}, \textit{ANET}, 650.
\item \textsuperscript{39}In this discussion we might also include the political influence of the temple as an administrative power, however, the comments concerning the temple as a unifying force have generally expressed our intention.
\end{itemize}}
included the ownership of all lands, which forced laborers worked for the temple establishment. In addition, royal gifts and offerings from worshipers supplemented the temples' income.\textsuperscript{40} The Mesopotamian temples also served as a commercial center for merchants and craftsmen, and attempted to exert a stabilizing economic influence by the maintenance of a standardized system of weights and measures.\textsuperscript{41} Egyptian temples, like their Mesopotamian counterparts, controlled the destiny of the common man, who was not permitted to have a part in their ritual, but whose existence was maintained in support of its system.\textsuperscript{42}

\textit{A Sacrificial Center}

There seems to be no doubt that temples throughout the ancient Near East had as a primary function the offering of sacrifice as an aspect of temple worship. The presence of sacrificial altars at temples in Egypt, e.g. the temple of Karnak in Luxor, as well as the ubiquitous references to לם at Canaanite worship centers throughout the Tanakh and the Ugaritic literature,\textsuperscript{43} all reflect this almost universal cultic function of the temple. Lundquist reports that in Mesopotamia, recent excavations at Tell Chuera in northern Syria, have yielded important

\textsuperscript{40}Samuel Noah Kramer, \textit{The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character} (Chicago: University Press, 1963), pp. 75-58.


\textsuperscript{43}Though the text refers to these multiplied sanctuaries throughout Israelite and Judean cities, surprisingly few לם have actually been uncovered from the monarchical period. However, this may well be due to either incomplete excavation or incorrect identification of the installations; however, the number is increased if we add the so-called bench-rooms found at Tell-ed Duweir and Kuntillet ‘Ajrud (cf. II Kings 23:8).
archaeological evidences for ancient sacrificial practice. During the Akkad period, the *Nord-Tempel* yielded remains of an offertory stairway at the east entrance along with what appeared to be an offering table and an adjacent *Wanne* which would have received the blood of the offerings. The excavators of Tell Chuera compare the remains of this installation with the well-known scene of the White Obelisk of Assurnasirpal I, which shows an elaborate cult installation of sacrificial offering in front of a temple.

**A Repository for Law Codes**

The temple and the legal documents or law codes were interrelated in the ancient Near East in that a building or restoration of a temple was often perceived as the moving force behind the codification of basic legal principles, as well as the organization of the social order. However, the action which gives rise to this "codification" of "just laws" is in Lundquist’s opinion, is not only the rebuilding or rededicating of a temple, but also the appearance of the king in the temple early in his reign. Thus, it was as much the impetus by the king to *compile* the existing body of judicial precedents as a result of duties connected with the temple, as the temple itself, which motivated codification.

While all of these traits may not be represented in every temple tradition, they do reflect primitive universal imagery which may have informed other traditions, or a collective tradition from which other cultures might have

---


45 The Prologue of the Code of Hammurabi emphasizes his concern for his cult centers stating, just before the "laws" proper begin: "When Marduk commissioned me to guide the people aright, to direct the land, I established law and justice in the language of the land..." (*ANET*, 165). This commission from Marduk would presumably have come to Hammurabi in Esagila, where in fact a stela containing the laws was placed (*ANET* 178). The Epilogue also states that "I, Hammurabi, am the king of justice, to whom Shamash committed law" (*ANET* 178).
borrowed. Whether or not we can argue that these traditions were transferred to other Near Eastern concepts of temple, and especially the Mount Zion traditions, we can now proceed to examine these respective features and functions in three Near Eastern temples: the Egyptian, the Mesopotamian, and the Canaanite.

THE EGYPTIAN TEMPLE

Because the people of Israel had resided in Egypt for about four hundred years prior to the Exodus, if any similarities in symbolism exist to the Israelite Temple in the ancient Near East, they would be expected to be present in the Egyptian concept of a temple. Harold Nelson maintains that the Egyptian temple was originally conceived of as a house for the god, just as an Egyptian dwelling was a house for its human master.46 In this regard, he observed that the interior decoration of the Egyptian temple gradually came to portray the wider world in which the deity was believed to live.47 Thus, the great temple complexes of the New Kingdom period arose from early undecorated structures, with rooms and halls being added gradually added to the original plan. Yet, these complexes continued to be viewed as special "houses" for the deity. While in Israel the thought was "one house for One God", the Egyptians did not seem to be bothered by the apparent contradiction between the unity of a cosmic deity and the plurality of his residences (sanctuaries). This may have been due to the distinctive thought patterns which characterized the ancient Egyptian culture.48


47Ibid., pp. 150-151.

48William W. Hallo and William Kelly simpson, The Ancient Near East: A History (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971), pp. 216-217. The worship of one of the principal deities, e.g., Re, did not require that the cults devoted to the worship of minor deities be eliminated. An individual god might be worshipped at many temples without destroying his unity, or requiring that any other gods be worshipped at these temples. The official theology did not geographically restrict the presence of a god to a single temple, and therefore it
The presence of the Egyptian deity was maintained through magical rites designed to animate the idol in order to retain the effectiveness of the presence of the deity in the image.49 In this way the cosmic reality behind all earthly reality, and which governed Egyptian private life, and especially religious thought in the concept of da'at (divine order), was brought into a proper balance. The Egyptian temple portrayed this realm of the afterlife, as did the tombs of royalty and nobility. Reymond has noted that practically every temple or shrine of the Late period was considered a replica of the first temple, built upon the primæval mound in the midst of the water of the Nun.50 In similar fashion, all temples in Egypt are depicted as representing the primeval hillock from which flowed the primordial waters. It has been suggested that such patterning after a cosmic mountain reflects the symbolism of the Sinai as the mountain itself becomes the cosmic sanctuary, after which the Tabernacle was modeled in a structural and functional correspondence.51


THE MESOPOTAMIAN TEMPLE

Although Moses and the Israelites may not have had direct contact with Mesopotamian temples or their cultus, they were aware of Mesopotamian religious concepts received as traditions, since the Patriarchs had their historical origin in that region, or from reports of such practices during their own day. In Mesopotamian religion, no such word as "temple" existed, the divine abode being called by the same names (ekallu, "house" or "palace") as the abode of a king. The temple was therefore erected as the house or palace of a deity, comparable to the palace of a king or noble, and immense temple complexes were constructed. The temple was not designed for religious assemblies, therefore it was inaccessible to the common man. The temple rituals, performed by ordained priests, consisted primarily of ministrations to the physical needs which a god was believed to have: that is, food (sacrifices and offerings), drink (oblations), incense, etc. Man’s duty was to supply divine wants, and in return for the service thus rendered, he could hope for divine rewards.

In Mesopotamian religious texts, the motif of the cosmic mountain is frequently applied to the temple. Thus in various texts we find the refrain: "the

---


53Despite the presence of Mesopotamia deities in the temples, it was not thought that they were restricted to their temples. Temples were for the convenience of worshipers, but they did not impose limitations on the deity, cf. G. Ernest Wright, "The Temple in Palestine-Syria," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*. Edited by David Noel Freedman and G. Ernest Wright. Anchor Books (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), vol. 3, pp. 169-170.

great house, it is a mountain great; the house of Enlil, it is a mountain great; the house of Ninlil, it is a mountain great." 55 From the time of Sargon II onwards the cult room of Assur in the temple of Assur was called the "House of the Great Mountain of the Lands." 56 In addition, Lundquist points out that it is not necessary to have an actual building in order to be in what could be called a "temple" setting in the ancient Near East. In many cases the ancient religious texts are permeated with temple symbolism and describe an encounter between the deity and a person which did not occur within a building, yet bears all the distinctiveness of the "temple" relationship. 57 Such temple ideology is revealed by the act of appearing "before the Lord."

In one text describing the enthronement of Enmeduranki of Nippur in the temple of Ebarra, Geo Widengren compares the Sinai theophany of God where a meeting between Moses and the elders took place in which the men ate a sacral meal in the divine presence following the sealing of the covenant with blood, and the tablets were handed over to Moses (Exod 24:8-11). 58 In the epilogue to the Hammurabi law monument it is stated that the stele was erected "In Babylon, the city which Anum and Enlil raised up its head, in Esagila, the temple which like heaven and earth, its foundations are firm" (CH xL 63-69). This language is similar to that of Psalm 78:69 which reads: יִבְרָה וְהָעָם נָסִיךָ ("He built His Sanctuary like the heavens ..."), however, may imply nothing more than the popular conception that temples are built by deities. In like manner, in a temple hymn to Ezida in Barsippa it is declared: "Barsippa resembles heaven, rivaling Esarra, is lofty Ezida. Its foliage reaches the clouds ..." (Kocher 1959). In both

55SAK 113 (= Gudea Cylinder A XXI 23), 141 (= Gudea Cylinder B XXIV 9); "Hymn to the Ekur," ANET, 3rd ed., 582-583.


57John Lundquist, "What is a Temple?" p. 207.

of these Akkadian passages the temple is clearly of cosmic dimensions, filling the universe.59

As in the Egyptian texts, so too in the Akkadian texts the cosmic mountain represents the primordial hillock from which first emerged from the waters that covered the earth during the creative process. For example, as Lundguist has shown,60 the Eninnu temple, built by Gudea, is depicted as arising up out of the primeval waters (apsu) and raising its head to heaven in SAK 113 (Cylinder A XXI 18-27). This same temple is called the "foundation of the abyss" temen abzu in SAK 113 (Cylinder A XXII 11), and the "house of the abyss," in SAK 127 (Cylinder B V 7). The Gudea Cylinders are filled with the motif of the house (= mountain) rising up out of the primordial waters. Thus, in Mesopotamia, the Akkadian texts reveal many characteristics associated with the cosmic mountain motif.

In Mesopotamia, several instances where the sacred character of a site for temple-building can be observed. Anton Moortgat has noted, for example, the fixing of buildings immovably in the earth by means of foundation figures.61 Joan Oates has also noted the practice of incorporating the foundations of earlier temples into the platform of later ones by filling in the surviving chambers of the earlier temple with mud brick.62 Lundguist further notes that from the Early


62 This practice was first documented in the excavations of Eridu, Uruk and in the Diyala Valley by Joan Oates, "Ur and Eridu, the Prehistory," Iraq 22 (1960): 45. This same practice has been documented more recently in Syria by G. van Driel, "De Uruk-Nederzetting op de Jebel Aruda: een Voorlopig Bericht (Stand eind 1976)," Phoenix (Voorafrischa-Egyptische Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux") 23 (1977): 46.
Dynastic Mesopotamian Temple Oval at Khafaje, a procedure like that described in the Egyptian texts, of creating temple foundations by excavating huge trenches, which are subsequently filled with sand. A "mythological" setting for the practice, documented at Khafaje, would seem to be present in the temple of Enki at Eridu, which was also believed to have been founded in the primeval waters (Abzu). As Spencer states: "The effect of religious beliefs on architecture were not, as some have claimed, a vague symbolism, but were an important part of the construction of the temples, necessary for the buildings to fulfill their symbolic role.  

THE CANAANITE TEMPLE  

Upon entering the Promised Land, Israel found Canaanite temples and high places (חֵגֶּשׁ) already in existence and functioning. Moses had warned the Israelites to destroy such pagan installations and to diligently avoid adopting any of their cultic practices. Canaanite religious concepts regarding the temple were in many ways similar to those of Egypt and Mesopotamia. The most popular Canaanite deity, adopted from Mesopotamia, was Ba'âl (also Hadad), who was depicted as a warrior storm god, riding on the clouds, and was responsible for both human and agricultural fertility. The Ugaritic texts record the construction of a "house" for Ba'âl, however, as in the other Near Eastern religions, the Canaanite worshiper could not conceive of Ba'âl being confined to a single physical building as his sole dwelling. A Central Sanctuary to protect the unity


66In this regard Roland De Vaux states: "The temple was, of course, his dwelling place, but he could have several temples in the same country, or even in the same town, and the great gods, whether their name was Marduk or Assur or Ba'âl, could
of the deity was unnecessary in official Canaanite theology, however, the popular religion viewed each temple as dedicated to the worship of a distinctive local deity. The Tanakh implies this popular fragmentation of the deity when it describes Israel's apostasy to Canaanite religion as רָוְלָליָא אָלָלִים אֶלֶּהָא ("and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that surrounded them; and they served Ba'alim"), Judges 2:11-12 (cf. verse 13; Hos. 2:13, 17).

The Canaanite concept of the temple as the cosmic mountain has a rich tradition in the Ugaritic mythological texts from Ras Shamra. While, as we have seen, the concept was widespread in the ancient Near East, the motif is generally thought to have been incorporated into Israelite literature through Canaanite channels, since the closest parallels in the use of the motif exist between Ugaritic literature and the Tanakh. Since our focus at this juncture is the Canaanite concept, we will present several of the parallels as illustration of the Canaanite mythology without commentary on the biblical texts.

The head of the Canaanite pantheon, 'El, dwelt on a mountain whose location is at "the source of two rivers, midst the streams of the double deep" (mbk act throughout the length and breadth of the universe," Ancient Israel (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), vol. II, p. 283.

This same fragmentation and worship at local sanctuaries was also true of the other Canaanite deities such as Asherah, the mother-goddess and consort of 'El, and Ashtoreth (also Ashtarte), the goddess of fertility and the consort of Ba'al. This fragmentation was probably the result of civil fragmentation, since Canaanite civilization existed as independent city-states. Therefore, the absence of a central temple or temples for the chief deities prevented any movement against the local fragmentation of deities. For a further discussion cf. James E. Anderson, "The Idolatrous Worship of Ba'al by Israel" (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1975), pp. 233-239.

A similar association between the mountain abode of YHWH and a sacred stream are seen in Psalm 46:5: "There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy habitation of the Most High" (לilik נדר מלני יmem בעי אלליות קרש משנין). Poetic language combining these same features also appears in visionary passages in Tanakh describing both the eschatological Jerusalem and Temple (Ezekiel 47:1-12; Zechariah 14:8; Joel 4:18). Taking another Canaanite deity, Ba’al, whose mountain was identified as Zaphen, the Ugaritic texts depict him as having fearful attributes commanding the obeisance of his subjects on earth. For example in CTA 4. 7.25-37 we read:

Ba’al uttered his voice,  
Ba’al repeated the [issue] of his lips;  
(he uttered) his [holy] voice [(and)] the earth did quake,  
[(he repeated) the issue of his lips (and)] the rocks (did quake);  
peoples afar off were dismayed [ ] the peoples of the east;  
The high places of the earth shook.  
The foes of Ba’al clung to the forests,  
the enemies of Hadad to the hollows of the rock.

Psalm 48:1-8 has been identified as having many elements similar to this Ugaritic passage, especially in the association of Mount Zion with the "far north" (ריבכי צפון) in verse 3, and the note of confidence in YHWH as a sure defense, causing even kings to tremble (verses 6-7). Other biblical passages having one or more parallels with this text are Psalm 46:5-7 and Isaiah 14:13-14.

From these examples it may be seen that the influence of Canaanite mythology was present in Israel. It may well be suggested that the presence of such conflation of mythological characteristics in the biblical texts was a deliberate attempt by the author to portray YHWH’s superiority to the Canaanite pantheon. By using popular Canaanite terminology, the Israelite was to understand that YHWH was Lord, not Ba’al, and that all that the Canaanite religion boasted, YHWH produced.
THE ISRAELITE TEMPLE

The Israelite Temple in Jerusalem contains many similar features and functions of its neighboring counterparts, however, having admitted this, we must quickly add that in its theological origin and purpose, it remains uniquely distinct. The following twelve "functions" of the Israelite Temple reveal these distinctions in their religious expression.

The Temple as the Site of the Divine Presence:

We have already considered this concept in Tanakh in a general way, especially in I Kings 8:27, and concluded that the Tabernacle and Temple were not considered even temporary dwellings for YHWH, but rather representatively localized His divine presence among men by the manifestation of the Shekinah (Tabernacle: Exodus 25:8, 22; 29:42-43, 45-46; Temple: I Kings 8:10-13; cf. II Chronicles 7:1-3). The Sages later used the expression "confinement" to explain the presence of the Shekinah in a sanctuary, but understood this to signify a "special concentration of the Divine Presence in a given place, and the more limited the space is the greater is His might." This "concentration" of the Divine Presence was expressed by a circumlocution that He had caused His Name to dwell there (Tabernacle: Jeremiah 7:12; Deuteronomy 12:11; Temple: II Chronicles 7:16; Ezra 6:12; Nehemiah 1:9).

This representative expression thereby bridged the immanence and transcendence of God without reducing YHWH to the state of tribal deity enclosed within a temple-residence.

---

69On the usage of the term הָרֵא שֵׁהָקִינָה ("confinement of the Shekinah), Pesigta de-Rav Kahana, Ki tissa", p. 73; Exodus Rabbah 34:1; Leviticus Rabbah 29:4; also cf. Midrash Shir ha-Shirim, p. 15b; Numbers Rabbah 7:8.


71Cf. e.g., Rabbi Joshua ben Levi in response to the contention based on Isaiah 66:1 that the Temple could not constitute the Divine residence: "Just as a cave on the sea-shore is filled by the waters of the sea, yet is not thereby diminished, so the glory of God fills the Temple yet does not thereby contract" (Pesikta de Rabbi
Temple (YHWH's actual "abode") did the earthly Temple have the connotation of His "house." Some scholars have tried to find a biblical parallel to the Mesopotamian temple initiation ceremonies in the account of the Israelite washing and clothing rituals (Exodus 19:10-11, 14) and the elder's ritual meal (Exodus 24:11) in YHWH's presence, which took place at Sinai as part of the covenant ceremony prior to and following the giving of the Law.\textsuperscript{72} But these are clearly for the purpose of ritual purification and communion in connection with approach to the holiness of YHWH's presence (cf. the similar preparation for approach in Exodus 3:5 "take off sandals"..."holy ground," and 19:12-13 "set boundaries"..."holy mountain").

The significance of the Temple in connection with the Shekinah has been suggested by Rabbi Shemuel bar Nahmani, who stated: "Until the Temple was constructed the world stood on a throne of two legs; once the temple was built the world was firmly established."\textsuperscript{73} In other words, with the existence of YHWH in Kahana 2b; cf. Numbers Rabbah 19:13). The argument, then, is that YHWH is omnipresent and the Temple was not intended as His sole dwelling place.

\textsuperscript{72}Lundquist for one, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 215-216, considers the Exodus passage as a biblical parallel to the sacral, communal meals carried out in connection with cultic ritual, often at the conclusion of or during a covenant ceremony in the ancient Near Eastern Mesopotamian temples. He cites as evidence the Gudea Cylinders, which end with the conjunction of a festive meal attended by all of the gods and the fixing of the destinies, and the \textit{aktu} festival which was supposedly concluded by a great sacrificial meal of which all, the gods, the king, the priests, and the people, partook. The \textit{Enuma elish} III 128-38 also contains an account of the gods entering the sacred chamber where the destinies are decreed, at which time they partook of a festive banquet (\textit{ANET} 65-66). He also finds support in the recurring theme of formal act and sacral meal, the same phenomenon he contends is seen in I Kings 8:54, 65 where, following Solomon's dedicatory prayer for the Jerusalem temple (a prayer carried out "with the hands spread up to heaven"), the king held a feast. However, the feast was not a "sacral meal" in which YHWH could have, in some form, partaken, but the celebration of Succot, which reminded the Israelites of their temporary residence in the wilderness (Leviticus 23:34-42), something YHWH had never known, since as Solomon himself declared there was no house that could contain Him (I Kings 8:27; II Chronicles 2:6).

\textsuperscript{73}תלמוד הירושלמי § 9.
the world, via the Shekinah, the world becomes firm through His existence in one place. The presence of the Shekinah at the Temple likewise established Israel's status as the People of God as Urbach has noted:

The unique character of the Tabernacle, and subsequently the Temple, as the place of the Shekhina is related to the idea of election. The place 'where He shall choose to cause His name to dwell' (Deuteronomy xiv 23) is 'the Chosen House' [Bêt ha-Behira, i.e. the Temple].

This connection will become important in the eschatological development of the restoration motif, since in the messianic kingdom age, and in the New Jerusalem during the eternal state, the localized Presence of God will be what constitutes those present as the People of God (cf. Ezekiel 37:27; Revelation 21:3). The expectation of the eschatological return of the Shekinah is first made by Ezekiel in terms of the desecration/restoration motif. Ezekiel pictures the Shekinah's departure at the desecration of the Temple (Ezekiel 11:1-25) and its return at its restoration (Ezekiel 43:1-12). A similar thought was echoed by the Sages concerning the inviolability of the Temple:

When the Holy One, blessed be He, wished to destroy the Temple, He said: "So long as I am in it, the Gentile nations will not harm it. I shall, therefore, cease to regard it and I shall swear not to give it heed until the time of the End" ... Behold, Israel seeks the Shekhina, but it will not return until the End comes.

Thus, according to rabbinic thought, the Temple as the dwelling of the Shekinah becomes a focal point for the divine program concerning Israel's ultimate Redemption in the world to come. Since the Shekinah was removed because of the sins of Israel, Rabbi Eliczar believed that as only Israel's repentance could bring the Redemption, so only with the removal of all of Israel's iniquities would the Shekinah be restored to its place. In this same vein, Rabbi

---


75 *Lamentations Rabbah*, proem § 29

76 *Tiferet Yisrael*, § 173 (on Deuteronomy 18:11-12).
Akiha envisioned restoration in the messianic era: “All the time that Israel is in bondage, the Shekinah, so to speak, is in bondage with them ... And when they are destined to return, the Shekinah will return with them.”77 Though these comments represent a later post-biblical theology, they reflect both the dilemma resulting from the Temple's desecration, and the need for a prophetic perspective toward restoration, they capture and preserve the intentions of the biblical Prophets in their concern over the Temple as the site of the Divine Presence.

The Temple as a Repository for the Law

In the Tanakh, the Tabernacle and the Temple functioned as a repository of the Law. The tablets of the testimony (Sepher Torah) were apparently placed beside the Ark of the Covenant to function as a legal witness to the Nation (Deuteronomy 31:26). Within the Ark were the tablets containing the Ten Words, which were enshrined as an archival document of the Sinaitic Covenant (Exodus 25:16; Deuteronomy 10:2). The Tabernacle, and later the Temple were both built for the express purpose of housing the Ark (Exodus 25:9 with II Samuel 7:2, 5), and therefore of preserving the Law contained therein. In the eschatological context, e.g. Isaiah 2:3, the Torah is said to go forth from Zion (Mount Zion), i.e. from the Temple, “mountain of YHWH”/“house of YHWH”/“house of the God of Jacob,” verses 2-3) which is to be the center for the dissemination of Torah to the world in what the rabbis later termed the “last days” (אזכותי והמשה), verse 2.

The Temple as a Symbol of Security and Refuge

YHWH has established Zion (and the Temple as the place of His presence) as a symbol of security (בְּמֶשֶׁם) and refuge (מְשַׁפָּם), in which His people can safely trust (לֶשֶם). Because YHWH is at the center of the Nation, via the Temple, those who look toward the Temple via prayer, will find protection (individually), as will the Nation (corporately). Most of the texts which reflect this concept are from the

77TB Sanhedrin 65b.
Psalter and include e.g. (Psalm 46:1-12; 48:4-15; 76:2-3, 7-11; cf. Psalm 74:2; 122; Zephaniah 3:15), especially because YHWH’s presence is there, as represented by the Temple (Psalm 9:12-13; 24:1-3; 47:4-9; 62:2-11; 80:2-3, 4, 8-12, 19; 84:9; 89:9-15 [no mention of Zion, but it is obviously the place of “his throne”], et. al.).\(^\text{78}\) The notion of the inviolability of Jerusalem, because of the Temple’s presence, undoubtedly was influenced by such texts.\(^\text{79}\)

**The Temple as a Sign of the Covenant**

The religious impact of the Temple, as well as that of the City of Jerusalem, is directly related to it being understood as a symbol of covenantal security.\(^\text{80}\) This concept accords with that of the Temple’s association with the Law, and is best seen in the denunciations against covenant-breaking made in the prophetic literature.\(^\text{81}\) For example, in Jeremiah 7:7-15 the prophet, in his charge of covenant unfaithfulness (verse 9), begins by referring to the people’s trust in the promise of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants that Israel would dwell in the Land forever (verse 7) as a false security (in view of the conditional nature of the promise which rested on covenant obedience), verse 8. The particular focus of the charge is against those who “stand before Me in this house which is called by My Name [the Temple], and say: ‘We are delivered.’” To support his argument historically, Jeremiah recalls the removal of the first Central Sanctuary which temporarily stood in Shiloh (verses 12-13) and connects it with the imminent

---


destruction of the Temple and the exile (verse 14-15). When Israel finally puts away abominations that desecrate the Temple (i.e. is loyal to the covenant), then YHWH will dwell with them forever (Ezekiel 43:8-9). Thus, the desecration of the Temple by YHWH (by foreign instrumentality, i.e. YHWH’s “rods,” cf. Isaiah 10:5; Habakkuk 1:6; Lamentations 3:1) is a witness to covenant desecration by Israel.

The Temple as the Center for World Renewal

When Isaiah entered the Temple upon the death of Uzziah seeking a vision of the uncertain future for the Nation (Isaiah 6:1-13), he encountered the presence of YHWH in His transcendent-immanence (a theophany), verses 1-7, and was given a commission to petrify the hearts of the people with the news of YHWH’s pronouncement of unrelenting judgment (verses 8-10). The natural reaction of the prophet was to inquire as to the duration of the “hardening,” and the divine response was given in verses 11-13 as a future time of restoration after the period of desolation. It was fitting that this prophecy was made within the Temple, for Isaiah is foremost among the prophets in depicting the eschatological Temple as a place to which all the nation will come (Isaiah 2:2-4; cf. Micah 4:1-5), and which will serve as a בֵּית-פֹסֵל כָּל-הָעָם (“house of prayer for all peoples”), Isaiah 56:7. The Temple is even the place from which YHWH’s wrath will go forth against the enemies of Israel (Isaiah 66:6), and which will stand as a symbol to the world of the end of all war (Isaiah 2:4; cf. Micah 4:3). Therefore in these passages, along with companion restoration texts in Isaiah such as Isaiah 11:1-11(cf. 65:25); 60-66, the Temple is envisioned as the center of world renewal, drawing all nations and peoples to the covenant people (Zechariah 8:23) and to cultic worship (Zechariah 14:16).82

---

The Temple as Symbol of the Divine Presence

The Temple's significance to the Jew (both for those in the Land of Israel and those outside in the Diaspora) is that it was the place where God's Presence was represented among His people. Shaye Cohen has made the observation that the ideology of the temple served as a binding force, representing both monism and exclusivity, so that only one place was suitable for God's home on earth, and that place was the temple mount in Jerusalem.83 Because God was not, and could not, be localized on earth (I Kings 8:27), the Temple stood as the visible symbol of His invisible Presence. Thus, God's "house" was a fixed place where God in both His transcendence and incomparability was accessible to man. Non-Israelite temples were places where man through the service of the cultus attempted to meet the needs of the gods. By contrast, in the Israelite Temple God, through the cultus, was able to meet the needs of man. This association is a favorite motif of the writing prophets of Israel. Their use of the motif can be seen in a brief summary of their description of the Temple:

The Temple, is, in their words, the mountain of the Lord, the holy mountain (Isa. 11:9; 56:7; 65:11,25; Joel 2:1; 4:17; Zeph. 3:11, et al.), wherein the Lord dwells (Ps. 74:2), and the Temple is the house of the God of Jacob and the Lord's house (Isa. 2:2-3; Jer. 23:11; Ezek. 8:14,16; Joel 1:13-16; Micah 4:1-2; Haggai 1:14, et al.). The habitation of the Divine Presence (Ezek. 9:3; 43:5-9; Joel 4:17,21; Hab. 2:20, et al.), the place where the Divine Presence reveals itself to the prophet (Isa. 6:1; Amos 1:2; 9:1).84

This distinction of the Temple as the dwelling place of God as places of the præsentia Dei reælis among His people (Exodus 25:8) is expressed in Hebrew by the two verbs ישב ("sit," "dwell") and ישב ("settle," "live in"). We find both verbs present in I Kings 8:10-13 where we read: "Then Solomon said: 'YHWH has said that He would dwell (ישב) in a dark cloud; I have indeed built a


84Encyclopedia Judaica, 15: 954-955.
magnificent Temple for You, a place for You to dwell (הַשְּפָם)." Here is expressed both the theophanic manifestation of YHWH (וָאָבֵד) and the Self-disclosure of YHWH (göttlichen Selbsterweis) through the cultus (כְּלֵי).

The theophanic "dwelling" was originally connected with the presence of the Ark, for it represented the footstool of the Shekinah, the Divine Presence (Ex. 25:22; II Sam. 6:2; I Kgs. 8:6-11). Yet, even long after the Ark had disappeared,85 the Temple was still regarded as the place where God dwelt.86 Josephus, the first-century Jewish historian, records the words of Eleazar, the last of the Zealots, at Massada shortly after the destruction of the Second Temple to this effect: "Where is this city that was believed to have God Himself inhabiting therein?"87 In like manner the Roman historian Dio Cassius wrote that the Roman soldiers who burnt down the Second Temple were afraid to enter the Temple "for superstitious reasons" and only did so after being compelled against their will.88 The idea of the

85Rabbinic tradition asserts that the Second Temple did not contain the Ark nor the Shekinah, but the סְפָם וְה ("Holy Spirit"), cf. TB, Yoma 21b; Leviticus Rabbah 21.9 (on Leviticus 16:3); Numbers Rabbah 15:10, although this latter source also states the opinion that they were present, but not as helpful as in earlier times. Other traditions believe that the Ark was hidden beneath the Temple Mount (below the Holy of Holies) and communed sanctity from this repository, cf. TB Shekalim 6.1-2 and rabbinc debate over II Chronicles 35:3. Cf. further discussion in Llyod Gaston, No Stone On Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. NTSup (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), pp. 114-117, who points out other texts asserting the Temple’s inferior status to that of the First Temple (e.g.s. I Enoch 89.73; Assumption of Moses 4.8; 5.3-4; 6.1; Testament of Levi 16.1; Jublees 23.21; Psalms of Solomon 1.8; 2.3; 8.13; II Baruch 68; Tobit 14.5).

86Rabbinic tradition not only speaks of the Temple being imbued with the Divine Presence, but the entire City of Jerusalem and even its people. However, these traditions may have been motivated by apologetic concerns to minimize the psychological and spiritual effects of the destruction of the Temple. Indeed, others dealt with the destruction by acknowledging their loss, and by transforming the concern over the Divine Presence into an expectation in the eschatological realm, e.g., cf. Numbers Rabbah 15.10, where a future restoration of the ; and other features missing from the Second Temple is envisioned.

87Josephus, Wars vii, 8,7.

88Dio Cassius 6, 65.
divine Presence forces us to ask the question: did God Himself live in the Temple? As we have seen, this was the common conception in the near East where temples were built as royal residences for the gods. There the priests would enter to feed, clothe, and care for the god who was present in the form of an idol. But the God of the Israelites was not a local god. His Essence could not be limited to any physical structure, and needed no place of shelter or sanctuary.

This understanding of God's Being may be seen in Psalm 50:9-13 where the psalmist corrects the notion that God required the Temple sacrifices for food. In verses 12-13 we read: "If I [God] were hungry, I would not tell you; for the world is mine and all it contains. Shall I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" Therefore, it was alien to the Israelite concept of God to view Him as being contained in a temple in order to have His needs met by man. When the Temple was finally built, this was explained to the Israelites present at its dedication: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain You. How much less this Temple which I have built," (I Kings 8:27). This statement makes it clear that God's Presence did not dwell in the Israelite Temple in the same way a god was present in all the other temples of the world. The God of Israel was not represented in form by an idol, He was not localized in any sense. He did not require the Temple to house His Being or to meet His needs.

David had desired to build God a house after he realized the inequity of himself dwelling in a palace while the Ark still remained in a tent (II Samuel 7:1-2). Yet, David did not believe that God could dwell in a house like a man (cf. Psalm 11:4), and this is evident from I Chronicles 29, in which David's preparations for the Temple and a benediction concerning the people's offerings for the work are recorded. We read in vs. 1: "the Temple is not for man, but for YHWH God". From this statement we may infer that God was not to be conceived of as having a residence like a man, or even a
king. To David, YHWH was too great for such comparison, and therefore he enlarged upon the concept of YHWH’s incomparability in verse 11 with a descriptive praise of YHWH attributes: " Yours, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory and the majesty, indeed everything that is in the heavens and the earth; Yours is the dominion, O Lord, and You exalt Yourself as head over all.

The concept of God dwelling in the midst of His people had its historical origin in the first historical mention of the Temple. In the "Song of Moses," recorded in Exodus 15:17 we read: "You will bring them and plant them in the mountain of Your inheritance, the place, O Lord, which You hast made for Thy dwelling, the sanctuary, O Lord, which Your hands have established". In this verse, Moses, who had just witnessed God’s manifested Presence in the pillar of cloud that protected him and the Israelites from the Egyptian soldiers, and who had passed through the divided sea on dry ground, looked forward to the time when God would permanently dwell with His Chosen people in the Promised Land.89

The Temple as a Fulfillment of Covenant

Another factor, distinguishing the Temple, and brought to light in the David narratives, is that of covenant. The Presence of YHWH in the Tabernacle and Temple presupposed a covenant relationship, based apparently on the model of the Hittite suzerain-vassal treaty, in which the suzerain (YHWH) would conditionally protect and prosper His vassals (Israel). This aspect of covenant is to the fore, and presented ironically, in II Samuel 7:5, 11 where David is disallowed the role of Temple-builder (לְךָ בְּבֶןֶךָ, “a house for You”), but YHWH will assume

89This verse did not find its fulfillment for almost 500 years. Though the Benjamites partially inhabited Jerusalem from the time of the Judges (1:8, 21), the city was not fully under Israelite control until the time of David. Even then, the building of the Temple had to await David’s son, Solomon. Nevertheless, until that time the Divine Presence did appear in the midst of the people in a "holy place," the Tabernacle (שֵׁם הָקְדֶשׁ), Exodus 25:8.
the role covenantally and build a house for David (לך דוד), i.e., the Davidic royal dynasty. This concept of the covenant, and its provisional terms predicated on obedience, is the theme of the Prophets as they point out YHWH’s abandonment of His Temple for Israel’s desecration (Ezekiel 10:1-22), and the delay of His return to the rebuilt Temple in the post-exilic period for related offenses (Zechariah 1:1-6). Meisner makes this point succinctly when he writes: “Throughout the writings of the prophets reference is made to the condition of the Temple and its services. The condition of the Temple was in direct correlation to the spiritual condition of the nation.”

The Temple as a Source of Divine Blessing

In the Tanakh, the Temple (i.e., YHWH’s Presence at the Temple) is seen as the source of divine blessing. For instance, the dedicatory prayer of Solomon (I Kings 8) draws a cause-effect relationship between the Temple and the bestowal of rain and relief from famine (verses 35-39), cf. II Chronicles 6:24-30. In II Chronicles 7:12-14, the lack of or abundance of agricultural prosperity is given as a sign of the Nation’s fidelity to the Temple and its cult, e.g., in the words of verse 14: יִמָּעַר אֶת־אֶתְמוֹן הַמִּשְׁקָה אֶת־הַמְּנֹשֶׁה רֹעָהן יִמָּעַר אֶת־אֶתְמוֹן הַמְּנֹשֶׁה רֹעָהן (“and [if] My people who are called by My Name humble themselves and pray [toward the Temple], and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, will forgive their sin, and will heal their land”).

In eschatological passages the restoration of the cultus from a state of desecration is marked by the botanical renewal of the Land (Ezekiel 36:29, 35), and in Zechariah 14:16-17 agricultural blessings connected with the divine bestowal of rain, are mediated based on Israelite and non-Israelite faithfulness to worship at the Temple at the appointed feast. Haggai 2:15-19 has been compared to Ningirsu’s dream promise, because here the laying of the foundation of the Temple is the condition for the grant of agricultural abundance. We read in this

The Function of the Temple as a Place of Prayer

Since Israel's God was the true God, the God of the covenant, and only He could answer prayer, those who would have prayer answered had to come to the Temple (or pray toward the Temple). The Mishnah, based on 1 Kings 8:48-49 and that of Daniel 6:11 stated that prayer should be made by directing the heart towards the Holy of Holies. The last Tannaitic Sages had a difference of opinion concerning the interpretation of these Mishnaic instructions concerning the Holy of Holies: "To which Holy of Holies? R. Hiyya Rabba said: Towards the heavenly Holy of Holies; R. Simeon b. Halafta said: Towards the earthly Holy of Holies." 91 This divergence was reconciled by the Amora R. Phinehas bar Hama who said: "They do not disagree: the earthly Holy of Holies faces the heavenly Holy of Holies." 92 Thus, in orienting oneself towards the earthly Holy of Holies, one orients oneself at the same time to that in heaven.

The variations in interpretation by the rabbis after the destruction of the Temple reflect on the problem created for Israel by its destruction with regard to prayer. During Temple times, the only access for both Jew and non-Jew to the Divine Presence on earth was through association with the Temple. Without the regular Temple service, there was no direct link between people and their God, and no longer any possibility of atoning for sins, as one of the Sages observed after the destruction of the Second Temple: "Since the day that the Temple was destroyed, an iron wall has intervened between Israel and their Father in heaven,"

91Cf. TP. Berakot 4, 5; cf. Tosefta Berakot 3, 15; Pesiqta Rabbati 149b.

92TP. Berakot 4, 5.
(Berakhot 32b; cf. Isaiah 59:2). In like manner, Simeon the Just underscored the pivotal position of the Temple for Jewish life: "the world is based upon three things: the Torah, Avodah [the Temple service] and the practice of gemilut hasadim ["charity"]." (Pirke Avot 1.2). Given this perspective, the destruction of the Temple undermined one of the pillars of the Jewish universe - Temple service - and caused a complete imbalance in the life of the religious Jew, whose very existence was determined by its order.

This explains why the rabbinic concept concerning the orientation of the earthly Temple facing the heavenly Temple was formulated. If prayer depended upon orienting oneself towards the Shekinah, whose Presence was within the Holy of Holies, then even after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, prayer could be continued (especially the Eighteen Benedictions) in the direction of the desolated Sanctuary. 93 Later Amoraim, however, argued based on Song of Songs 2:9: "Behold, he stands behind our wall," that the Shekinah never left the Temple Mount, and remained at the Kotel (Western Wall), which for them was a remnant of the Sanctuary site. 94

The Temple as a Symbol of Divine Rest

The biblical concept of divine rest is expressed by the three Hebrew terms יִנְפָּד, מְנַחֵה, and נַחֲמָה. The motif of national rest in relationship to entrance to the Land and the establishment of a Central Sanctuary is presented in Deuteronomy 12:9-11:

---

93 While only a speculation, it may be that for a similar reason sacrifice was acceptable on the barren אבן המשת "Foundation Stone" within the Second Temple. Perhaps also because the Ark of the Covenant was thought to be buried in a hidden chamber directly below the Pen of Wood, and therefore directly below the Holy of Holies (cf. Shekalim 6:1-2), it thereby transferred sanctity to the region above, aligned with the true Ark in the heavenly Holy of Holies.

94 Cf. R. Aha. מדרש הרלím, Exodus Rabbah 2.2, 11, 3.
("For you have not yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which YHWH your God is giving you, but when you go over Jordan, and dwell in the Land which YHWH your God causes you to inherit, and causes you to rest from all your enemies surrounding you, so that you dwell in safety, then there will be a place your God will choose to cause His Name to dwell; here you will bring all that I command you: your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and your choice vows which you vow unto YHWH").

Note that in verse 9 the word הֵרָבָיא is found with the definite article (indicating a specific rest, הֵרָבַיָּהוּ, "the rest"), and is paired with הֵרָבָיָהוּ ("the inheritance") as a "gift" (תֹּבֶך) from YHWH. With verse 10, the time of "rest" is connected with settlement in the Land, and in verse 11 the place of rest is connected with building of a Central Sanctuary. We read: הָנָּה לִשְׁפָּרָבָיָהוּ הֵרָבָיָהוּ מִלְּשׁוֹנָה לִשְׁפָּרָבָיָהוּ ("the place which YHWH your God will cause His Name to dwell there").

The relationship to the Temple, is drawn in the dedicatory prayer of Solomon in I Kings 8:56:

The reason for the specificity of Deuteronomy 12:9, the first such use of the term הֵרָבָּיָהוּ with a definite article, is that in Numbers 10:33 the term הָנָּה had described the temporary "resting places" where Israel was to camp during their wilderness sojourn, but with entrance to the Promised Land in view (Deuteronomy 12:10), אֲדוֹת a permanent resting place is envisioned, i.e. a divine, God-given "rest".

Note in I Chronicles 22:9 that Solomon before his birth was appointed as a man of הֵרָבָּיָהוּ ("rest"), which in this text apparently parallels the bestowal of his name שלום (cf. שלום, "peace"). The very next verse (verse 10) predicts Solomon's task as Temple-builder for YHWH's "Name," thus connecting with the two passage discussed above.
("Blessed be YHWH Who has given rest to His people Israel, according to all that He promised; there has not failed one word of all His good promise, which He promised by the hand of Moses").

These words clearly relate the building of the Temple (as the embodiment of the Central Sanctuary) with the fulfillment of the “rest” envisioned by Moses for the Nation in Deuteronomy 12:9. A similar anticipation is expressed in Deuteronomy 25:19, linking the promise of “rest” with Exodus 33:14 and the promise of YHWH’s “presence” dwelling with Israel at the place of rest.97

There is further in the Prophets a sense of eschatological rest, which was necessarily expected since the exile interrupted the promise of a permanent rest within the Land, and the destruction of the Temple removed the symbol of that rest connected with the presence of YHWH, the giver of rest.98 Isaiah anticipates a future “rest” for Israel after her last exile (Isaiah 11:10; 14:3-4, 7; 28:12; 32:17), and associates the longing for it (in remembrance of the former “rest”) with a spiritual purification that will bring eschatological restoration and rest (Isaiah 63:11-14). This rest will be maintained, according to Ezekiel, through the restoration of the Temple and its cultus (Ezekiel 44:30), (literally, לְזָיאָ הָרָא “to rest in blessing”). This concept of eschatological “rest” may be identified as an aspect of the desecration/restoration motif: the desecration of the Temple, the place of rest, causing the loss of rest, and the restoration of the Temple, the preserver of rest, causing a return of rest.

97For references to “rest” during the time of the conquest/judges cf. Joshua 21:43-45; 22:4-5; 23:1; Nehemiah 1:26-28. II Samuel 7:10-11 cites the first promise of a central sanctuary made to Moses in Exodus 25:9, mentioning the temporary rest experienced during the period of the judges, and then linking the whole promise to fulfillment in the house of David. David appears to have believed that this rest was experienced in part during his reign (I Chronicles 23:25-26), and Solomon recognized it as existing during his time with relation to the Temple (I Kings 5:18 [5:4 in English]). Rest is also mentioned during the period of the monarchy during the reigns of Asa (II Chronicles 14:4-6 [14:5-7 in English]; 15:15), Jechosaphat (II Chronicles 20:29-30), and Hezekiah (II Chronicles 31:10).

98Such a loss of rest was predicted in Deuteronomy 28:65 as a result of covenant unfaithfulness (cf. Psalm 95:10-11; Micah 2:7, 10).
The Temple as a Socio-Political Institution

The Temple was not only prominent as a religious institution to the Jewish People, but (especially in Second Temple times) also played a considerable role in the political life of the people. In addition, the Temple was extremely important to Jewish national unity, and Jews in the Diaspora fought for the right to send their contributions to Jerusalem, despite many attempts to deny them that right. In fact, all other institutions, even those unrelated to the Temple service, gained moral stature from their association with the Temple. 99

The Temple, therefore, governed the daily life of the Jew, since this life was lived in view of the festivals, the pilgrimages, the sacrificial rites, Torah reading and study, all of which centered around the Temple. Though later, and especially after A.D. 70, the synagogue, which probably began in the Temple Court, took precedence, it was with the Temple that this institution, and all others, were organically connected. The Temple was the channel by which the religious institutions of Israel became a part of the life of the people. Stipulated hours of prayer were set according to the times of sacrifices, and even those in the diaspora were to turn their faces toward Jerusalem and the Temple. All legal matters were decided by the Sanhedrin, who had their full prerogatives of office only when seated in the Temple, and only when the sacrificial system was operational. 100

This general introduction to the significance of the Temple to Jewish life will be augmented and expanded in later chapters, however, at this point it has been sufficient to impress the importance of the institution, an importance that will now be seen in the religious, historical, and cultural continuity that was imbued in the concept of the Temple.

99 Jerusalem to Jabneh: The Period of the Mishna and its Literature (Ramat-Aviv: Everyman's University, 1980), Unit I.3, p. 15

100 Mishna Avodah Zarah 8b and Sanhedrin 14b (the ruling is based on Deut. 17:8).
The Function of the Temple as a Unifying Institution

In the Tanakh, the Jerusalem Temple served as a unifying institution. The return from exile, considered a disunifying experience, was only completely gained when the Temple was rebuilt. It stood in this sense as the unifying institution for the Nation, as well as its national rallying-point in times of distress. In Solomon's dedicatory prayer for the Temple in 1 Kings 8:22-54 the idea of unifying and organizing the Israelite Nation, as well as all foreign elements, around the Central Sanctuary is clearly seen. As Carol Meyers has pointed out, the Davidic-Solomonic state (with its central, unifying, sanctuary) not only unified the tribal groups inhabiting the highlands from Upper Galilee to the Northern Negev; it also extended its domain to the surrounding regions of Syria and Transjordan. Thus, the Temple brought a unique measure of stability to Israelites throughout the Levant. Lundquist in his bibliographic notations mentions a post-biblical concept of this from J. Z. Smith, who referring to Avot 1:2, "on three things the world stands: on the law, on the temple service, and on piety," observes that: "The temple and its ritual serve as the cosmic pillars or the 'sacred pole' supporting the world. If its service is interrupted or broken, if an error is made, then the world, the blessing, the fertility, indeed all of creation which flows from the Center, will likewise be disrupted." The eschatological Temple likewise is seen to fulfill this function, for in Ezekiel 48, the Land of Israel is divided with the Temple as the central reference point (already seen as providing unity through its river of life which flows to and refreshes all the Land, 47:1-12).


102 J. Z. Smith, Map is Not Territory, p. 118.
THE ISRAELITE TEMPLE COMPARED WITH ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN TEMPLES

One of the fundamental differences between Israelite religion and the popular Canaanite religion was that Israelite theology maintained that Yhwh was not limited to any particular locality. The true dwelling of God was in heaven, and Israelite sanctuaries were merely holy sites where God had revealed Himself, or where access to His Presence was available through the cultus or prayer, rather than places where He was spatially confined in some manner. By contrast with all the religions of the Levant, Israel appears to always have maintained a Central Sanctuary (even in the presence of alternative, competitive Israelite shrines). The very requirement of a Central Sanctuary was to unify all Israel around the One God, the God of the Covenant (in light of disunifying factors of the geographical distribution of the tribes), to prevent deviation from the cultus (in case of civil division), and to isolate Israel from the ritual contamination of the local Canaanite cult.

This was also a God Who reigned in the heavens (Psalm 115:3) and Whose dwelling place was above the clouds (Psalm 97:2; 104:3; Isaiah 14:14), on the holy mountain (Psalm 3:4), and in the heavenly Temple (Psalm 11:4; 18:6). In the same manner, the Temple as a microcosmic world was the site of unpolluted holiness, a true paradisaical garden, made after the pattern of the heavenly Eden (Ezekiel 28:13-14; Isaiah 51:3). Every later development of the concept of the eschatological Temple is derived in some manner from this cosmic paradigm outlined in Tanakh. Levenson illustrates this when he observes:

In postbiblical Jewish literature, both Hellenistic and rabbinic, we find the notion that the Jerusalem Temple (or the Tent of Meeting) was a cosmic institution, either the center of the world, from which the world was created, or

---

103 While later rabbinic theology employed the terminology of confinement, it rather meant a "concentration" of the Divine Presence which resulted in a greater manifestation of power (cf., later discussion in this chapter). The central Sanctuary is said to be the place where only the "Name" of Yhwh dwelt, as distinct from Yhwh Himself. This qualification may have been intended to alleviate the tension between God’s imminence and transcendence.
itself a microcosm, a miniature world.\textsuperscript{104} For example, the first-century historian Josephus (\textit{Jewish War} 3, 265) describes the veil over its door as an \textit{elkaw} ("image, likeness") of the world, with the three parts of the Temple corresponding to earth, sky, and sea.\textsuperscript{105}

As we have seen by the previous parallels with the Ugaritic literature, the biblical text employed the cosmic mountain motif, probably for its own polemical purpose. However, the biblical text also developed its own traditions involving the cosmic mountain with respect to its concept of the Central Sanctuary. The Central Sanctuary was often symbolized in motifs associated with Paradise, Mount Sinai and Mount Zion, each of these reflecting to some degree the cosmic mountain terminology. Biblical texts that suggest this motif are usually exclusive to theophanic accounts in narrative literature such as Exodus, poetic literature such as Psalms, and eschatological discourses in the Prophets.

In the Psalms, the cosmic mountain motif is carried over particularly in visions of the eschatological Temple of the Zion tradition,\textsuperscript{106} which also employs allusions to both Creation/Paradise and Sinai traditions (Psalms 46:4-7; 48:1-3; 76:1-4; 87:1-2).\textsuperscript{107} The Prophets use of this motif can be seen in a brief summary.


\textsuperscript{105}\textit{Antiquities} 3.6.4; 3.7.7; \textit{Wars} 5.5.4; cf. Sukkah 51b; cf. further, Jon Levenson, "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience," \textit{Jewish Spirituality 1 : From the Bible through the Middle Ages}. Edited by Arthur Green (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1988), p. 51.

\textsuperscript{106}However, it is not necessary to restrict our references to these sections, for as Haran has observed: "In general, any cultic activity to which the biblical text applies the formula "before the Lord" can be considered an indication 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,"\textit{Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel}, p. 26.

\textsuperscript{107}Mount Zion and Mount Sinai as sacred mountains share many characteristics of the cosmic mountain. For a complete discussion of the relationship of the two see J.D. Levenson, \textit{Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible} (Minneapolis: Winston Publishing Co., 1985), and R.L. Cohn, "Mountains in the Biblical
of their description of the Temple as "the mountain of the Lord," "the holy mountain" (Isaiah 11:9; 56:7; 65:11,25; Joel 2:1; 4:17; Zeph. 3:11, et al.). As a cosmic habitation, the Temple is likewise called "the house of the God of Jacob" and "the Lord's house" (Isaiah 2:2-3; Jeremiah 23:11; Ezekiel 8:14,16; Joel 1:13-16; Micah 4:1-2; Haggai 1:14, et al.), and "the habitation of the Divine Presence" (Ezekiel 9:3; 43:5-9; Joel 4:17,21; Habakkuk 2:20, et al.). As the place where the Divine Presence reveals itself to the prophet (Isaiah 6:1; Amos 1:2; 9:1), it has cosmic dimensions, especially seen in the theophanic encounter of Isaiah in the Holy Place (Isaiah 6:1-8). Noth contended that the conceptions of Zion as a holy mountain go back ultimately to the inner-Israelite experience of the premiere holy cosmic mountain, Mount Sinai. Thus, the "temple at the site" is the mountain itself, and the later Temple of Solomon is seen as simply the architectural realization and the ritual enlargement of the Sinai experience.108

In the biblical record, the Temple is described in the Psalms as having its foundations firmly rooted on the earth. Gaines argues that the descriptions of Zion found in the Psalms are not based on geography, but on a mythical conception of space determined by qualitative rather than quantitative value. Lundquist, in like manner, applies this idea to the Temple Mount, and finds in the threshing floor purchased by King David an example of the mythical ὀμφαλὸς ("the naval of the earth"). While not in disagreement with the notion of sacred space, Gaines and Lundquist import their concept from Greek mythology, a tendency which requires caution, even though many scholars argue for the close connections between Hellenic and Hebrew thought, and the idea does appear in later haggadic literature concerning the 'Even Shetiyyah ("Foundation Stone").109 Recent work on this

---


motif in the Ugaritic literature has suggested that the concept came into biblical literature by absorption from the Canaanite mythology of the cosmic mountain. However, the only possible reference to this notion in the biblical text is the phrase מִקְסֶר דָּאָר (9:37 in Judges 9:37 and Ezekiel 38:12 (usually translated "middle of the land") though translated as ὅμφαλος in the LXX. S. Talmon and R. L. Cohn both reject this proposal, and argue that the phrase did not have the mythological connotation when the Hebrew text was written, but it was attached to it at a later period when it was translated by the LXX.

In the biblical text, there are allusions both in the Creation account and in eschatological contexts (Genesis 2: 10-14; Ezekiel 47:1-12; cf. Zechariah 14:8; Psalm 29 and Revelation 22:1-5) to waters of life which flow from beneath the Temple or from beneath the New Jerusalem. While the imagery bears traces of the ancient Near Eastern mythological concept, the symbolic nature of the accounts, reveals a patterning of the eschatological upon the protological as a fulfillment of the divine design. The ideal Sanctuary of the Creator in cultic harmony His creature, begun at Creation of the world is to be completed at the consummation of the ages.

The question of a similar celestial or solar orientation for the biblical Tabernacle and Temple has also been researched. For example, the east-west axis orientation of the wilderness sanctuary has received notice in this connection, and Albright has suggested that cosmic symbolism was portrayed in the temple of

---


Solomon, though H. Van Dyke Parunak has countered this proposition by attempting to demonstrate that the positioning of the Solomonic Temple was not in view of solar observation. It would appear from the rather scant textual evidence, most of which has abusive cultic contexts (e.g. Isaiah 38:8; 47:13; Jeremiah 8:2; Ezekiel 8:16), that the biblical Temple's orientation was cosmic, but not in relation to astronomical phenomena, but in relation to heaven itself, where the Controller of the constellations (Job 38:32; Isaiah 13:10) and the designer of the stars (Psalm 8:3; 147:3; Isaiah 40:26) sat enthroned. In this regard only, does the biblical Temple compare with other ancient Near Eastern temples which, in their architectonic orientation, express the idea of a successive ascension toward heaven, though theologically a distinction should be maintained.

In the biblical text we see that, like in the ancient Near Eastern temples, the Temple was considered not only a religious, but also a royal construction. Both Moses (Exodus 25:9; Numbers 8:4) and David (to Solomon), I Chronicles 28:11-19, were given plans for the building of the Tabernacle and Temple by YHWH, and commissioned to build the structures for Him (Exodus 25:8; II Samuel 7:13 and cf. God's appearing to Solomon at Gibeon before and after the building of the Temple (I I Kings 3:4-15; I Kings 9:3-9). Braun believes that the Chronicler deliberately linked the portions of his history dealing with David with those dealing with Solomon in order to portray Solomon as the divinely chosen Temple builder.

---


115 The Mesopotamian ziggurat or tiered temple tower is the best example of this architectural principle. It was constructed of three, five or seven stages or levels. Monumental staircases led to the upper part of the tower, to a small temple which stood at the top.

116 Cf. my discussion on the יָדוּחַ ("pattern," "model") below.

Hurowitz’s study of I Kings 5:15-9:25 attempted to show that the divinely-bestowed pattern and the choice of the king as Temple-builder may have been incorporated from, or modelled after, the ancient Near Eastern form found in temple dedicatory prayers. He concluded that the biblical accounts were written according to a well-known ancient Near Eastern pattern, probably originating in Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{118} His analysis of more than twenty extra-biblical building accounts with an almost identical thematic structure revealed a basic sequence of topics and central events. Among these were: a reason to build or restore a building along with the command or consent of the gods to the proposed project, and conditional blessings and curses addressed to a future king who will repair the building when it falls into ruin. Comparing this structure with that of I Kings 5-9, he found an identical thematic structure, including commonly shared motifs, expressions, and ideas.

In biblical eschatological texts, the king fulfills a quasi-messianic role in relation to the establishment of the Temple, following the ideals of Davidic royal theology (cf. Isaiah 2:4; 9; 11; 32:1 with Psalm 72).\textsuperscript{119} The king is almost a divine-king, or at least the regent of YHWH, participating in what is a divine initiative to build (Zechariah 6:12-14), a view of kingship adumbrated in the Davidic Covenant (II Samuel 7:10-16). This is especially pronounced in Ezekiel 37:25-28 where a Davidic-kingly messiah figure is a participant in establishing, if not the actual builder of, a restored Temple in the eschatological age where there exists a reunited monarchy (cf. verses 21-23).\textsuperscript{120}


While the Israelite Temple never attained a degree of economic power comparable with ancient Near Eastern temples, it did seek to standardize weights and measures (Numbers 3:47, 50). The Temple did maintain a temple treasury, and served as a central economic regulator for the entire cultus worldwide through the collection of the temple tax, whose influence on the social order was considerable (cf. Malachi 3:8-12). Indeed, in Second Temple times, the Hanuyot apparently doubled as a marketplace for sacrificial commerce, and was one source of the conflict with Jesus (Matthew 21:12-16; Mark 11:15-18; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-16). The power wielded by the temple, for instance, included the ownership of all lands, which were worked for the temple by forced laborers.

Nevertheless, the economic influence of the biblical Temple appears to have been secondary to the religio-ethical influence it exercised as a custodian of the Law with regard to social justice (Deuteronomy 23:19-20) and equity in business (Deuteronomy 25:13). This may be seen during the Persian period when the Temple may have wielded a greater socio-economic influence. In one case during this period, Phoenician merchants sought to violate the Sabbath restriction against commercial trade by conducting their business on the Sabbath, and then stationing themselves outside the walls of the city of Jerusalem to tempt Israelites to come out to them for business (Nehemiah 13:15-21). In this case, both the nobles of Israel and the traders were reprimanded for their desecration of the Sabbath, and no further commerce on the Sabbath was permitted.

The relationship of State constitutional and legal (covenental) documents to the Temple, in light of the ancient Near Eastern practice of placement of such in their temples must also be considered. Scholars such as Noth, argue that the Tanakh definitely connects the concepts of “covenant, law and temple” based on

---


this ancient Near Eastern association. He would view Moses' act of appearing "before the Lord" in Exodus 19-24 as what produced the law. While the Tabernacle, and later the Jerusalem Temple contained the tablets of the Law (the broken set within the Ark of the Covenant, and the restored set without the Ark), the Israelite concept of the Temple as a repository of law codes was not connected with an earthly king, who compiled the documents, but YHWH as the theocratic King, Who gave the Law and presided over it from above the Cherubim. Therefore, while the function is similar, the theological perspective is again seen as distinct.

One of the most distinct features of the Israelite Temple in contrast to the temples of the ancient Near East was its function as a Central Sanctuary. Because it incorporates many of the previously discussed Israelite distinctions within its function, we will treat it as a separate issue in this comparative study.

The Israelite Concept of a Centralized Sanctuary

The move to establish a centralized form of worship was largely unsuccessful among the polytheistic and henotheistic cultures of the ancient Near East. While the highest degree of religious centralization in Egypt was attained during the reforms of Akhenaten, yet these reforms fell far short of the kind of centralized worship demanded by the Israelite Temple. Akhenaten correctly surmised that in order his god Aton to receive prominence among the plethora of Egyptian pantheons, temples would have to be built in his honor. Therefore, he constructed temples to Aton between Karnak and Luxor, at Heliopolis, Hermonthis, and Memphis. Yet, Akhenaten saw no necessary correlation

---


between the exclusive worship of Aton and the restriction of that worship to an exclusive site. Certainly he and had no proposition for centralization of worship at a single national sanctuary. Even when Akhenaten moved his palace to Akhetaten (Amarna), the principle temple connected to the palace was supplemented by smaller temples.

This same lack of centralization may be seen in the Mesopotamian and Canaanite temples. Marduk’s promotion over El as head of the Sumerian-Akkadian pantheon was only a matter of the official state cult which did not affect the worship received by lesser deities in the pantheon. In Canaanite worship centers, usually among sacred groves, or on hilltops, a local fragmentation of deities existed, probably influenced by the absence of geographical and political unity among the autonomous tribal city-states. Without this form of centralized government, no centralized worship could have developed.

By contrast the Israelite sanctuary as a Central Sanctuary is without parallel in the religious thought of the ancient Near East, principally because the religious concept which produced it was distinct from Israel’s neighbors. Gilbert Braithwaite has summarized four distinct elements in theological concept of Israel that enabled them to avoid the fragmentation of the deity even under the strong influence of the Canaanite popular religion:

---

124 The new heretical religion of Akhenaten was not properly henotheism, for both he and Nefertiti still received worship as gods, therefore, there was no desire to centralize worship around a site, cf. John A. Wilson, "Akh-en-Aton and Nefertiti," *JNES* 32 (January-April 1973):236-241.


(1) Israel had a strong consciousness that God was not confined to any particular locality, but that His real dwelling place was in heaven.
(2) Israel’s holy sites were places where God had revealed Himself, not places where He dwelt, and which in some way limited His presence.
(3) During the early days of Israelite settlement, it appears that Israel had a central holy place where the Tabernacle was erected.
(4) Israel could conceive of the Central Sanctuary as the place where the “Name” of the LORD dwelt, as distinct from the LORD Himself. ⑫

Another factor in the Israelite concept of the Central Sanctuary may be observed in the literary parallels between the form of Deuteronomy and the form of ancient Hittite suzerainty-vassal treaties. ⑬

As a result of her covenantal relationship with God, Israel perceived the Land of Canaan as a special gift whose final title belonged to YHWH alone under the terms of the Sinaiic Covenant. ⑭


(1) The Great King YHWH: His noble character and gracious acts
(2) The Vassal Nation Israel: The motivation of the vassal to obedience
(3) The Covenant Stipulations: The duty of the vassal
   (a) Basic: Love and Loyalty
   (b) Specific: Detailed commands
   (c) Ratification: ceremonies and provision for covenant perpetuation
(4) The Covenant Blessings and Cursings: The duty of the Great King
   (a) The gift of the Land
   (b) Blessings and cursings in response to the vassal’s obedience
   (c) Provision for repentance

In order to operate under this form of treaty, a central site was required (usually the place of the presence of the king, i.e. a palace) for mandated appearances by the vassal state before the suzerain. Deuteronomy 26 specifies the rituals for the presentation of the first fruits and for the declaration of the payment of the third year tithe. The choice of these two ceremonies reveals the emphasis of Deuteronomy on the governmental significance of the Central Sanctuary. Similar appearances of the vassals before the "great king" of the ancient Near Eastern treaties were considered to be very important to the maintenance of the covenant. For example, in the treaty between Mursilis II of Hatti and Nigmepa of Ugarit, the following provision is found: "Now come thou before the King at the appointed time! When I summon thee to the court, comel and if thou keepest not the appointed time of thy coming, report to me what hindered thee."  

The Assyrians also required appearances from the governors of their vassal states. Morton Cogan has observed in this regard that the circumspect ruler prevented the destruction and take-over of his homeland by appearing at the Assyrian court, along with other tribute-bearers, to proclaim his allegiance publicly. Tribute payments included fixed sums (biltu u madattu), occasionally enhanced by special gifts in honor of state events (tamartumamurtu, igise). Such parallels to the Israelite pilgrimage festivals may well confirm the model of the suzerain-vassal treaty as a religio-political raison d'être for the Israelite Central Sanctuary, nevertheless, their own distinctive monotheism, coupled with the need for a unifying force to preserve national identity and allegiance within

---


the concerns of geographical separation and isolation, was sufficient to have produced the form.

**THE HISTORY OF THE TEMPLE**

One of the problems that scholars have met in attempting to identify the conception of the Temple from the biblical and archaeological materials is the historical difficulty that not one, but three different sanctuaries have existed in Jerusalem in three distinct time periods.¹³³ By historical convention, we have referred to these three temples as the First and the Second Temples. Although the Second Temple was begun by Zerubbabel in 515 B.C.E., and was completely reconstructed from its foundations upward by Herod the Great in c. 20 B.C.E., the latter is not considered a Third Temple. A new temple is constituted by a destruction and an intervening period in which the cultic institution is unable to be performed within the Temple precincts. The reason Herod's rebuilding did not constitute a new temple (even though it was a third building) was because during the period of reconstruction the cultus never ceased to function - not even a single day.¹³⁴

**The Preparation for the First Temple**

The Tabernacle had been a temporary structure, moving from place to place, and housed within a tent, until the Israelites were unified politically and spiritually. This occurred when David conquered Jebusite Jerusalem and made it not only the capital of Israel, but also the City of God. For the first time in Israel's history the civil and the religious authority were centralized in one geographical location. I Kings 8:16 records that since the time of the exodus until that day (the time of David), God had not chosen a city out of the tribes of Israel in which to build the Temple. This may mean that God had not chosen a place until David,


for the verse and the next adds: ("but I chose David to be over My people Israel. Now it was in the heart of David to build a house for the name of the Lord, the God of Israel"). In this text we do not find God specifically telling David the place of His choice, but we find God choosing a man who knew His choice (cf. I Samuel 13:14; Psalm 78:70-72; 89:20-21, 24-29). David was chosen by God to chose for God the site for the Central Sanctuary. David chose Jerusalem for several reasons:

(1) It was territory that had not belonged to any of the northern or southern tribes, and thus represented a neutral region that would not provoke jealousy among the tribes.

(2) It was strategically located and could serve as a central location for civil administration.

(3) It had an historic connection with the people of Israel from the time of Abraham, especially in connection with the Akedah, or binding of Isaac, and according to a late midrash, Moriah was traditionally assumed to be "the mountain of God's inheritance" (cf. II Chronicles 3:1; Exodus 15:17). Aggadic legends also give as an etiology for the site.

135 Because the building of the Temple in Jerusalem was seen to be inspired in the heart of David by God (Psalm 132:1-5; I Chronicles 12:13; 28:19; II Samuel 7:1-2), and thereby came to be seen as the historic choice of God Himself (I Kings 11:32, 36; 14:21).

136 H. G. M. Williamson, "The Temple in the Book of Chronicles," Temptum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel. JSNT 48. Edited by William Horbury (Sheffield, 1991), pp. 22-25, cites as reasons for the Chronicler’s connection of the site of the Temple with Mount Moriah as being: (1) “Moriah” may by a popular form of etymology be understood as “the vision of the Lord or the like, comparable to the appellative used of the mountain in Genesis 22:14, (2) I Chronicles 21:22-25 patterns David’s purchase of the threshing floor of Ornan (Araunah) the Jebusite after Abraham’s purchase of the cave of Machpelah in Genesis 23:3-20, e.g., the grammatical parallels: the use of the expression בֵּית הַמִּסְפָּר ("at its full price"), Genesis 23:9/I Chronicles 21:22e; the use of the verb רָכַב for “buy,” (Genesis 23:4, 9/I Chronicles 21:22a), and literary parallels: David, like Abraham, initiating the conversation (Genesis 23:3/I Chronicles 21:22a); the double emphasis in both accounts on the desire to “give” the site (Genesis 23:11/I Chronicles 21:23), (3) Perhaps based on this pattern, from the dispute over the cave as part of the field required in the purchase, the
(4) The legend of two compassionate brothers, who seeking to help each other, meet on the road, at which site the was founded.

Thus, Jerusalem, thought to have been prepared for by God as the designated site for the Central Sanctuary and the unfolding of the eternal purpose, became not only the capital of Israel, but הר שרה (“Mount Zion”), the eternal capital and holy habitation of YHWH, Israel's God, from which blessings would flow to all the earth. For this reason the psalms, composed for Israel's worship, frequently extol the choice, virtues, and divine destiny of Zion as YHWH's house (Psalm 48:2-4, 12-15 [English vss. 1-3, 11-14]; 50:2-3; 53:7 [English, vs. 6]; 68:30 [English vs. 29]; 87; 102:17 [English vs. 16]; 110:2; 125:1-2; cf. [all English] Psalms 2:6-9; 5:7; 9:11-14, 20; 15:1; 20:1-3; 23:6; 24:7-10; 27:4-6; 29:9-10; 51:18-19; 65:4; 76:2; 78:68-69; 84:5-12; 96:6-10; 99:9; 114:2; 122:1-9; 128:5-6; 129:5-8; 134; 138:1-3 147:12-20).

A History of the First Temple

The First Temple was built by King Solomon, though initially provided for by King David during his last years through the royal treasury and a collection taken from the people of Israel (I Chronicles 29:1-9). Following David's death, Solomon completed the Temple primarily through forced labor from the native Israelites (I Kings 5:13-16; II Chronicles 2:2).

extension is made to include the threshing floor as part of the mountain in David's purchase. (4) according to the biblical text, the cave of Macpelah was the only piece of real estate secured by the patriarchs in the Promised Land, a distinction which gave it a traditional significance and value. (5) II Chronicles 3:1 connects these accounts by explicitly stating that “Solomon built the Temple on Mount Moriah, where [YHWH] had appeared to his father David ... on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.” It is important in this respect to note that the Genesis 22 text does not explicitly say Abraham built his altar on the mountain, but, this was assumed by the Chronicler, possibly with a polemical thrust against the Molech cult which practiced human sacrifice in the area, since Genesis 22 was viewed as a statement against such practice. (6) the Chronicler saw a need to provide a continuity between the site of the Temple as a new acquisition with the Nation's earliest history in the Land.
The architectural pattern for the First Temple, like the Tabernacle, was derived from the form of pagan temples of the time. The *tri-partite*, or three-room, temple was common to the architectural tradition of the ancient Near East the Egyptian long room with direct access (to the innermost room bearing a statue of the deity) being an example. The closest models, however, are those from Syria (the temple at Tel Ta'anat) and Phoenicia. In keeping with the custom of his age, Solomon in constructing the Temple relied upon the Phoenician expertise of his father David's material's supplier, Hiram (Huram), king of Tyre (II Samuel 5:11; I Kings 5; II Chronicles 2:3-18). The biblical text records that besides materials, Hiram sent his Phoenician architects and craftsmen to advise their Israelite counterparts on building the Temple to contemporary specifications. One of these was a half-Jewish, half-Phoenician artisan named Hiram or Huram-abi, who was given oversight of the craftsmen. Credit is given to him for the vast array of decorative, cast and overlaid objects in the Temple (I Kings 7:13-45; II Chronicles 2:13-14).

*The Form of the Construction*

In appearance the First Temple was a modest building: about 3,500 feet square, and situated on a platform approximately 10 feet high. This was ascended by ten steps leading up between the twin bronze pillars, named Jakin ("He [God] establishes") and Boaz ("in Him [God] is strength"), each about 40 feet high and 12 feet in circumference. Beyond an entrance porch lay the first, and smallest room of the Temple (הֵיכָל), which led into the main room, called "the holy place," (but in Hebrew, בית המקדש) This, the largest room in the Temple, had its interior walls covered with elaborately-carved cedar panels overlaid or inlaid with gold, and its floors covered with boards of cypress, so that no stonework remained visible. In addition, Solomon is said to have adorned this room with beautiful precious stones. Housed within this awe-inspiring central chamber were the cultic objects from the Tabernacle: the golden seven- branched candelabrum

---

137 Our calculation is based on the royal cubit which was about 20.9 inches.
and the table bearing the sacred presence bread. Elements made for this room, and originally not in the Tabernacle, were ten tables (five on the north side and five on the south), which were accompanied by ten lamps on lampstands, as well as numerous implements used in the priestly service.

The innermost room (דביר) was separated from entrance by the double veil of fabric and by a wall whose only door was kept closed, except on rare occasions. Access to this room, called also the קְרֵסֶת הַכְּבוֹד ("the Holy of Holies"), was forbidden to all except the High Priest, and to him only once a year at the high holy Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur). In this room, a perfect cube (about 35 feet square), gilded throughout with 23 tons of gold, stood the central cult object, the קֶן הַבּוֹרֶה, called variously "the Ark of the Covenant" or "the Ark of the Testimony." The קֶן הַבּוֹרֶה was constructed in the form of a rectangular box approximately 4 feet in length and 2 feet in height and width. Covering this box was the Mercy Seat, a flat lid topped by two cherubim made of one solid piece of gold. These cherubim were in the form of winged-creatures, probably modeled after the Egyptian sphinx, whose combination of human and divine attributes (i.e., power, fecundity, swiftness) represented members of the divine retinue that accompanied the Divine Presence (Isaiah 6:1-3; Ezekiel 1:4-28). These cherubim served as the footstool for the Divine Presence, which was visibly enthroned above and between their wings, manifested as a cloud during the daylight hours and as a pillar of fire at night. Inside the Ark were deposited (according to various traditions) two sacred objects: the tablets of stone on which were carved the Ten Commandments, and the almond-wood staff of Aaron the High Priest that had miraculously budded. The Ark rested on a bedrock platform called in

138 cf., W.F. Albright, "What were the Cherubim?" in The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, I (Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 95-97.

139 The New Testament records a three-item list, including a pot of the last trace of the heavenly manna that fed the Israelites during their forty-year sojourn in the Sinai desert (Exod. 9:4), while the Babylonian Talmud, Yoma 52b adds the following items: a vial of anointing oil and the chest in which the Philistines sent a gift to the God of Israel. However, the account of the Ark's contents in Deut, 10:5, and especially 1 Kgs. 8:9 explicitly states that at this time only the tablets of the Law were present.
Jewish tradition the הַזְדוֹם אָרוֹן ("Foundation Stone"). In front of the Ark was the golden altar of incense. Finally, at this westernmost end of the Temple complex, a belt of storerooms surrounded the holy places.

In the front of the Temple to the east, was an open courtyard in which stood the brazen altar, which may have stood either next to, or upon, the large rock mass, today called by the Moslems as-Sakhra ("the Rock"). Not far away was located an immense basin called "the Brazen or Molten Sea." This water-basin, which contained an estimated 15,000 gallons and rested on the backs of a dozen bronze bulls, was used for the ritual purification and cleansing of the priests engaged in sacrifice. Ten ornamented bronze rolling basins or lavers, stationed nearby on both the north and south sides of the courtyard, transported the water to various places at the Temple.

*The Destruction of the First Temple*

Though elaborately adorned and magnificently constructed, the Temple had its rival in Solomon's palace complex. These palatial buildings, made of high-grade stones and timbers from the forest of Lebanon, were considerably larger, and perhaps more resplendent, than the Temple itself. While the Temple had taken seven years to construct, the construction of these palaces and other royal buildings took another thirteen years. Perhaps Solomon considered the modest size of the Tabernacle as an index, and for this reason built the Temple in a more humble fashion than his personal and administrative dwellings. However, the difference in size may indicate a nascent divided loyalty, that grew with the years and the multiplication of idolatrous worship centers spawned by obligations in his political marriages.

---

140 However, recent historical and archaeological research into the question of the location of the Temple, and particularly the Holy of Holies, has produced new evidence that the rock mass, today housed within the Moslem Dome of the Rock, was the location of the Holy of Holies and not the Altar, cf. Leen Ritmeyer, "Locating the Original Temple Mount," *BAR* 18: 2 (March/April 1992), pp. 24-45, 64-65.
With the practice of idolatry dividing the hearts of those in Jerusalem spiritually, YHWH announced through His prophets that the kingdom would be divided politically (I Kings 11:9-11).\textsuperscript{141} Solomon's son Rehoboam fomented an insurrection that split the kingdom into two: Judah in the south, and Israel (Ephraim) in the north. The presence of the Central Sanctuary in the south stabilized its decline, however, the spiritual decline continued unabated in the north because the kings of the Northern Kingdom, beginning with Jeroboam, built alternate worship sites to keep the people from returning to the Temple and thus coming back under the southern administration of Judah. These actions fostered syncretism and henotheism and secured the prophetic charge of idolatry that brought it first to judgment under the Assyrians in 721 B.C.E.

The presence of the Temple in Judah and of kings in the Davidic dynasty that made occasional reforms from idolatry, delayed divine judgment on the south for 135 years. During this period prior to the judgment, Judah was made aware that the punishment for their sin would find its expression in the Temple. Evidence of this impending judgment came shortly after Rehoboam had divided the kingdom. Pharaoh Shishak of Egypt attacked Jerusalem, specifically targeting the Temple and Solomon's Palace of the Forest of Lebanon, which housed 300 shields of beaten gold. These and other treasures from the Temple he carried back to Egypt (I Kings 14:25-26; II Chronicles 12:2, 9). Only because the royal court "humbled" itself at the instigation of God's prophet, was the Temple and Jerusalem spared further plunder (II Chronicles 12:5-8).

After this, the trend in the south is a series of unsuccessful reforms accompanied by political alliances that demanded Judah pay monetary tribute to superior states, one primary source for which was the Temple treasury and the material wealth adorning the Temple. The attempt to meet these economic obligations, therefore set about the destruction of the Temple piece by piece.

\textsuperscript{141}These continual relapses into idolatry led the rabbis to interpret II Samuel 20:1: אָרָא לַאֲלָהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("Every man to his tents, O Israel") as if it had been originally read: אָרָא לַאֲלָהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("Every man to his gods, O Israel"). Midrash on II Samuel, 42b § 4, and Mechilta 39a.
King Ahaz, for example, stripped the Temple of a portion of its silver and gold, broke up the Temple furniture and utensils, and removed the bronze oxen from the Brazen Sea, in order to satisfy his obligations to the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser III (I Kings 16:7-9, 17-18; II Chronicles 28:21, 24). When Ahaz went to pay his tribute in Damascus, he sacrificed to the Assyrian gods, and desiring to honor them in place of the God of Israel, had a replica of the Damascus altar made for the Temple courtyard in Jerusalem. This being done, he closed the Temple doors, and constructed idolatrous altars throughout Jerusalem.

Even though Ahaz' son, Hezekiah, brought spiritual and military reform to Judah, he also set in motion the final act that would bring the Temple's destruction. In II Kings 20:12-18 the account is given of the tour of the remaining Temple treasures given by Hezekiah to Assyria's future successors, the Babylonians. The Temple was like bait held in front of the hungry eyes of the Babylonians, and it was only a matter of time before the bait was seized. Therefore, God announced through his prophets in II Kings 23:27:


(“And YHWH said: 'I will also remove Judah from My Presence, as I have removed Israel, and I will reject this city which I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I have said: ‘My Name shall be there’

Further idolatry, especially under the reign of Manasseh, whose acts of violence against the Temple (II Kings 21:4-8) were used as a prediction of its ultimate destruction (II Kings 21:11-15), and against Josiah's reforms to the Temple and its worship, signaled that the time for the execution of the predicted judgment was near. It came under King Jehoiakim in 605 B.C.E. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, took Jehoiakim and thousands of the nobility and the skilled labor force (including Daniel and his friends) to Babylon. A second invasion and deportation followed in 597 B.C.E., this time removing all of the remaining Temple treasures to Babylon (II Kings 24:13). The prophet Ezekiel was taken captive in this deportation, and he predicted the soon collapse
of the city and the slaughter of its inhabitants (Ezekiel 9:1-8). In this same prophetic context, Ezekiel saw a vision of the Shekinah glory (the Presence of God) departing the Temple and vanishing over the Mount of Olives to the East (Ezekiel 10:18-19). With the Glory departed, the Temple was set apart as a common thing, ready for destruction. The final Babylonian invasion came in 586/587 B.C.E. and with it the total destruction predicted by Ezekiel. The Temple was burned, along with the palace complex, and all the houses of the city (II Kings 25:8-9; II Chronicles 36:18-19). The sorrowful attitude of the Judeans toward the ruined Temple is well presented by the prophet Jeremiah: יִרְאֶה בּמֵר הּרָע הַנֶּכֶּשׁ, כִּי יֵשׁ נִשְׁטָן מִי מַעֲשֵׂה נְפָשׁוֹת עֲשֵׂרָה עַד אֲרֵבֵי בָּקָשָׁה וִילְעָה. לֹא כִּי יְחַלּוּ בּ מַעֲשֵׂה הַנֶּכֶּשׁ, בָּדֶר אָפִיל הָאָמָנוֹת כִּי לֹא תְחַלּוּ בּ בְּדֶרֶךְ הָאָמָנוֹת וְיֹמָם׃ (“The adversary has stretched out his hand over all her precious things, for she has seen the nations enter her sanctuary whom You commanded [that] they not enter Your assembly”... the Lord has rejected His altar, He has abandoned His sanctuary; He has delivered into the hands of the enemy the walls of her palaces” (Lamentations 1:10; 2:7).

The History of the Second Temple

The First Temple had stood almost four hundred years, but the apostasy of the people in violating God’s ordinances had brought it to an end. One of the ordinances that had been forsaken was the sabbatical rest for the land. To compensate for this violation, the Land of Israel would be desolate for an equivalent period (seventy years for the seventy sabbath rests, one every seven years for the four hundred and ninety years the commandment was unobserved). Jeremiah had explained this divine reckoning and Daniel in captivity studied his writings and prayed for his people’s promised return and the restoration of the Temple (Jeremiah 25:10-12; Daniel 6:10; 9:2-19). God had encouraged the Jews


in the Babylonian captivity toward the fulfillment of this promise by demonstrating to them that the sanctity of the Temple remained. When Belshazzar brought out the captured Temple vessels to a pagan feast, to further desecrate them by using them for a libation to his gods, and to boast of his victory over Jerusalem, YHWH's hand appeared and spelled out Babylon's doom (Daniel 5). That very night the city fell to the Persians, an empire that would also be the divine instrument for the later return of the Jews and the rebuilding of the Temple (II Chronicles 36:20-21).

**The Preparation for the Second Temple**

The Persian king Cyrus had been prophesied by the prophet Isaiah as the specific instrument for the Temple's rebuilding: הָאָרֶץ לִבְּדַעְתָּן‬ וְאֶלֶף‬ הַבָּשָׁם ‬ ("It is I [the Lord] Who says of Cyrus, He is My shepherd. And he will perform all My desire. And he declares of Jerusalem, 'She will be built,' and of the Temple, 'Your foundation will be laid'"). Isaiah 44:28. Just as Daniel had understood the time of the return from Jeremiah's prophecy, so Cyrus learned of his role from this prophecy of Isaiah (Ezra 1:1-2). Josephus Flavius, the first-century Jewish historian, who wrote an account of Jewish history for the Romans, recorded the tradition that the return and rebuilding were prompted by Isaiah's prophecy: "... by reading the book which Isaiah left behind of his prophecies; for this prophet had spoken thus to him in a secret vision: "My will is, that Cyrus... send back My people to their own Land, and build My Temple." Accordingly, when Cyrus read this, and admired the divine power, an earnest desire and ambition seized upon him to fulfill what was so written."¹⁴⁴

The Second Temple of Zerubbabel

In the Restoration period, little is known about the actual physical structure of the Temple. However, from the biblical record we can well outline the history of its rebuilding. Under the leadership of Zerubbabel, about 50,000 Jews returned to Jerusalem in 538 B.C., and began to lay the foundation for the Temple with the help of Phoenician workmen, after the fashion of the First Temple (Ezra 3:7-10). An altar was constructed, sacrifices begun, and the observance of the biblical festivals restored (Ezra 3:1-5). The Temple vessels and utensils that had been taken by the Babylonians were also returned. The construction of the Temple itself, however, met opposition from Samaritan residents of the Northern Kingdom, and was not resumed for another 15 years. The work was finally completed (more than 20 years after it was begun) in 515 B.C. after a decree from the Persian king Darius not only permitted the rebuilding, but prescribed local taxes be paid to the Jews to finance the construction (Ezra 6:1-15).

When the foundation of the Second Temple had been laid, many of the priests and Levites who were old enough to have seen the First Temple, wept because this edifice would only be a shadow of the former (Ezra 3:12-13). No doubt this impression persisted and grew as the years passed and no Temple was erected on these seemingly inferior foundations. But, when God stirred the people to rebuild through the exhortations of the prophet Haggai, He included a word of prophetic encouragement: "The latter glory of this house will be greater than the former, says the Lord of hosts, and in this place I shall give peace..." (Hag. 2:9). This may mean that the Second Temple would be more glorious than the First because Zerubbabel's Temple, though presently smaller, would be greatly enlarged by Herod the Great, and be considered one of most beautiful buildings in the world. Others have suggested that it may refer to the eschatological Temple.

\[145\] However, cf. the excellent article by Sara Japhet, "The Temple in the Restoration Period: Reality and Ideology," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 44:3-4 (1991):195-252, which provides the most complete survey of material to date.
The Desecration of Zerubbabel's Temple

For 200 years the Second Temple of Zerubbabel served as the official center of worship for the Jews of the Land of Israel and those in the Diaspora. During this time, at least three other Jewish temples were known to have existed (at Leontopolis, Elephantine, and on Mount Gerazim), nevertheless, Diaspora Jews respected the superlative sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus accurately represented the viewpoint of Jewry at this time when he wrote: "One Temple for the One God."\textsuperscript{146}

Despite this perspective of exclusive sanctity, the Second Temple had not yet received the "peace" predicted for it by Haggai. The non-canonical documents that record this period of time, tell us that under Persian rule the high priests had become the governing authority in Judea. The transformation of the priestly office to a political office had degraded the spiritual and moral character of the priesthood. Stories of political rivalries, intrigue and murder color the narratives concerning the struggles for the high priest office. An instance of this may be seen in the case of Johanan, the son of Joiada (Nehemiah 12:22), who assassinated his own brother in the Temple itself.

During this period, Judea was controlled by the Greeks (Alexander the Great), Egyptian Greeks (Ptolemies), and by Syrian Greeks (Seleucids). The first two rulers treated the Jews favorably and allowed continued governorship by the high priests, but during the reign of the third, under Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), strife broke out. As a result, two Jewish factions, Orthodox and Hellenist, contended for the high priesthood. Antiochus IV sided with the Hellenistic party, and appointed a high priest who encouraged pagan worship. Events surrounding this man's successor brought an invasion of Jerusalem in 170 B.C.E., in which many Jews were killed and the Temple with its restored treasures was plundered. Antiochus further desecrated the Temple by sacrificing an unclean animal (pig) on the Temple altar and by erecting a pagan statute in the Holy of Holies. This act

of Antiochus Epiphanes was predicted by the prophet Daniel and served as a partial fulfillment of the type of desecration the Temple would suffer under similar future Gentile rulers (Daniel 8:23-25; 9:24-27; cf. 7:24-26; 11:29-45).

The Purification of Zerubbabel’s Temple

After multiple atrocities against the Jews, including the burning of copies of the Torah, forced consumption of pork contrary to the law, and compulsory sacrifice to pagan idols, an Orthodox priest named Mattathias started a revolt which his son Judas (Maccabee) successfully completed. In 164 B.C.E., Judas liberated Jerusalem and purified the Temple, reestablishing the daily offerings. That day has been celebrated ever since as Hanukkah or the Feast of Dedication (John 10:22). In time, the rule of the Hasmonean (Maccabean) dynasty was established over all Judea.

Further desecration came to the Temple when the independent rule of Judea ended in the year 63 B.C.E. with the entrance of the Roman General Pompey into Jerusalem. When it became apparent that Pompey meant to enter the Temple, thousands of Jews threw themselves to the ground before the General and begged him not to desecrate the Holy Place. Such a display only convinced Pompey that the Temple must contain great riches or some hidden secret, and so not only did he enter the Holy Place, but he tore away the veil of separation and marched into the Holy of Holies itself. A record of the event was preserved by the Roman historian Tacitus: “By right of conquest he [Pompey] entered their Temple. It is a fact well known, that he found no image, no statue, no symbolical representation of the Deity: the whole presented a naked dome; the sanctuary was undorned and simple.”\footnote{Tacitus, Historiae 5, 9: 1.} Tradition has further recorded that when Pompey emerged from the Temple he looked around at the Jews in wonder and exclaimed, “It is empty, there is nothing there but darkness!” Pompey’s statement typified the confusion of Gentile rulers toward the Temple and its service, yet, when he ordered the walls of the city to be torn down, he left the Temple intact.
The Second Temple of Herod

Rome was now in possession of the Land, and in 37 B.C.E. it placed in rulership over the Jews a despotic self-made slave of Edomite ancestry by the name of Herod, beginning a dynasty that would continue its rule for about one hundred years. In 23 B.C.E., Herod proposed the massive project of completely rebuilding the Temple of Zerubbabel, which by this time had fallen into a state of disrepair. Because Herod's plans involved the demolition of the Temple, the people feared that he would tear it down and not rebuild it. He therefore had to prepare and transport to the Temple Mount all the stones for rebuilding before touching the Temple itself.

The Construction of the Herodian Temple

Herod began rebuilding the Temple in 19 B.C.E., and the work was dedicated ten years later, although detail work continued on it for the next seventy-five years. His project of expansion included enlarging the Temple esplanade and the construction of a huge retaining wall to support this great platform. The Temple was doubled in height and its width was significantly increased. New compartments were added to the original design, as well as a second story above the innermost chambers. A monumental royal basilica was constructed to serve as a meeting place for Jews returning at the appointed feasts to buy animals for offerings. Herod also transformed the Hasmonean fortress on the northwest corner into the Antonia (named in honor of Mark Anthony). In this

148Remains of this exist today as the western wall, more than 1,000 feet of which are extant beneath the present Western Wall Plaza and Moslem Quarter. Some of the largest building stones in Israel have been discovered as part of this retaining wall, one of which is an estimated 458 tons. Such huge stones apparently were set as "shock absorbers" to stabilize the Temple platform in the instance of frequent earthquakes (from on site excavation report July, 1992 by excavation director Dan Bahat, Western Wall Heritage Foundation, Jerusalem).

was housed the Roman garrison, positioned to quell disturbances on the Temple Mount, and included quarters for the Roman Procurator when in residence (e.g. Pontius Pilate in 26-36 C.E.).

The Herodian Temple, displayed its royal builder's conflict of interests in its construction, namely, to demonstrate to the Jews his support of Judaism, and at the same time to prove his loyalty to Rome. This conflict was embodied in the display of the Roman eagle above the doorway of the Temple. As a bird of prey, it symbolized the character of Rome, but corrupted the character of the Temple as a place of peace. Its presence was also considered a violation of the Mosaic injunction against the making of graven images (whether of men or animals). Because of this desecration, shortly after the placement of this image on the Temple, a riot occurred in 4 B.C.E. and the Roman eagle was torn down and hacked to pieces. Herod severely punished those involved, but months later died himself of a painful disease. This was interpreted as a divine verdict on Herod, who never lived to see the completion of the work he had begun.

At the time of the Second Temple, Jerusalem was considered, even by non-Jews, as the most famous among the great cities of the East, and the Second Temple was regarded as one of the marvels of the ancient world. Josephus tells us that the Temple was made of marble overlaid with gold, and appeared from a distance as a mountain of snow glistening in the sun. A commentary on the splendor of the Temple may be seen in the words of the sages who wrote, "He who has not seen Herod's building has not seen a beautiful building in his life (Succah 51b)." The New Testament records that the disciples of Jesus were so impressed at the Temple's construction that they sought to point out to its latest additions and adornments when they were together at the site (Matthew 24:1; Luke 21:5).

The central significance of the Herodian Temple to the Jews of that period has been well described by Neusner:

From near and far pilgrims climbed the paths to Jerusalem. Distant lands sent their annual tribute, taxes imposed by a spiritual rather than a worldly sovereignty. Everywhere Jews turned to the Temple mountain when they prayed. Although Jews differed about matters
of law and theology, the meaning of history and the timing of the Messiah's arrival, most affirmed the holiness of Ariel, Jerusalem, the faithful city. It was here that the sacred drama of the day must be enacted. And looking backward, we know that they were right. It was indeed the fate of Jerusalem which in the end shaped the faith of Judaism for endless generations to come - but not quite in the ways that most men expected before A.D. 70.\textsuperscript{150}

Neusner is correct in describing the awesome attraction of the Temple, which seemed to render Jerusalem inviolable, but when destroyed, forced a reassessment of theological and historical realities concerning the eschatological promises of the Prophets. Many Jews of the time were perhaps convinced that their Nation had successfully removed them from the threat of Temple desecration and destruction brought on by the "three-sins" concept of the First Temple's fall (i.e., idolatry, adultery, and murder). Yet, the Temple did fall, and predictions of its destruction, as well as explanations for its doom, were as dutifully recorded as had been the earlier warnings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

\textit{The Destruction of Herod's Temple}

Prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, both Jewish, Roman, and Christian traditions maintain that the Temple's destiny was divinely predicted. Various records preserve accounts of miraculous portents that were interpreted as signaling the impending doom of the Temple.\textsuperscript{151} For example, Josephus (\textit{Jewish Wars} 6:293-296) noted that at the time of Pesach c. 66 C.E., the huge Nicanor gate, securing the inner court of the eastern Shushan Gate, was observed at the sixth hour to open of its own accord. This event was ultimately interpreted negatively as evidence of divine displeasure:

This again to the uninitiated seemed to be the best of omens, as they supposed that God had opened to them the gate of blessing; but the learned understood that the security of the Temple was


dissolving of its own accord and that the opening of the gate meant a present to the enemy, interpreting the portent in their own minds as indicative of coming desolation.\textsuperscript{152}

This interpretation is also given in a story told in the Talmud (TB, Yoma 39b) along with another concerning the cultus, which reflected the problem of divine favor:

Our Rabbis taught: During the last forty years before the destruction of the Temple the lot [הָרְכָּז] ("For the LORD") did not come up in the right hand; nor did the crimson-colored string [suspended in the Temple to show the acceptance of the pascal sacrifice] become white; nor did the western-most light shine; and the doors of the Temple (ָּרְכָּז) would open by themselves, until R. Johanan b. Zakkai rebuked them, saying: "Temple, Temple, why will you yourself be the alarmer? I know about you that you will be destroyed, for Zechariah b. Ido has already prophesied concerning you: "Open your doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour your cedars" (Zechariah 11:1).

A similar Christian tradition concerning the rending of the Temple veil (Matthew 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45) also is interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure with respect to the Jewish leadership's rejection of Jesus as Messiah. In the New Testament it is placed at the head of a series of miraculous signs following Jesus' death meant to indicate Heaven's response to the event. This account does agree in kind with the Jewish traditions of supernatural manifestations, and the early Christian apologists did regard such reports as confirmation that the Nation's rejection of Jesus as Messiah had brought its rejection by God, resulting in the city and Temple's destruction.\textsuperscript{153}

On the other hand, the Jewish Sages contended that the problem was the result of the social and religious conditions of the time. Professors Michael Avi-Yonah and Menahem Stern write of this conflict: "In the last years before the


\textsuperscript{153}Some commentators also have connected the reference in Acts 6:7b, to Temple priests who "became obedient to the Faith [i.e., Christianity]" with this event, supposing that their faith in Jesus may have resulted from their witnessing the rent veil during their time of service.
destruction, the social tension grew to such an extent that it affected the order and security of the city. In addition to the general enmity toward Roman rule, there were conflicts among the Jews themselves. On the one hand, there was friction among the different groups in the priestly oligarchy and on the other, the activities of the extremist fighters for freedom from the Romans (the Sicarii), who used violence and were not averse to killing their opponents.\textsuperscript{154}

Therefore, because of such internal contention, the Sages felt that God was displeased and had allowed their own facetiousness to bring the calamity.\textsuperscript{155} Another warning of the impending destruction came with the attempted desecration of the Temple under the notorious Roman Emperor Gaius Caligula around 40-41 C.E. Josephus records that Caligula ordered his own image to be placed in the Holy of Holies, and if the Jews refused, he commanded that they be slaughtered or taken captive. So great was the resistance by both the Pharisees and the more radical Zealots, that the edict was never carried out and Caligula was assassinated shortly after. Nevertheless, it was evident that a confrontation with Rome over the city and Temple, was inevitable.

The inevitable happened in 66 C.E. when riots against Rome erupted over the misrule of the procurators. A sensational act of defiance took place in the Temple when Eleazar, son of the captain of the Temple, ordered an end to the imperial sacrifice (which had been offered to the Emperor alongside the traditional Jewish service during the period of Roman rule). The formidable Tenth Legion attempted to re-take the Temple Mount, but failed, losing much equipment to the Jewish defenders. This defiance, which by now had become a full-scale revolt, soon secured all Judea in Jewish hands. Enraged by the success of this revolt, Emperor Nero sent Rome's best commander, Vespasian, with Rome's finest legions, to crush the rebellion at all costs. By 69 C.E., after years of bitter fighting, the Romans had re-taken all areas but Jerusalem, and Vespasian,


who had recently succeeded Nero as Emperor, put his son, Titus, in charge of the Jerusalem campaign.

Following a siege of Jerusalem, Titus took counsel with the officers of his army concerning the fate of the Temple. While there are conflicting reports as to the orders given, according to the Roman historianTacitus, the majority of the officers were in agreement that nothing less than the total destruction of the Temple would secure a lasting peace. Therefore, on the ninth of the Jewish month of Av, 70 C.E., the city and the Temple were burnt. Josephus says that Titus had given specific orders that the Temple be left intact, and that a soldier acting on impulse, threw a torch through an archway of the Temple, setting the tapestries inside on fire. When the building burned, it is said that the decorative gold on the walls melted and ran into the seams between the stones. Afterward, in an attempt to recover the gold, the Roman soldiers tore apart the stone walls, resulting in the present ruined condition of the esplanade.

The next year Titus made a triumphal procession into Rome before his father Vespasian. In front of Titus were paraded seven hundred Jewish captives as well as some of the treasures from the Temple, including the great Menorah, the Table of Shewbread, and a Torah scroll. Rome had conquered, the Temple was in ruins, and the Jewish people were scattered in exile. Thus, while there is evidence of continued cultic activity on the Temple Mount, as was conducted for a time after the destruction of the First Temple, a variety of responses in Judaism to the Temple’s destruction produced as one response a renewed hope in the biblical tradition of the eschatological Temple.

**THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEMPLE**

We have presented the features and functions of near Eastern temples, and especially of the Temple in Jerusalem, focusing on the symbolic imagery which was common to all, but distinct in theological interpretation and application. We have preferred this approach because architectural and archaeological comparisons fail to furnish distinctions, simply because the Temples described in the biblical and post-biblical sources, whether of Philo, Josephus, Ben-Sira, or the Talmud,
are different buildings from different historical periods. This will prove to be even more the case when we consider the eschatological nature of the Temple.

The only means by which we can derive a continuity between these diverse structures is by the comparative method. As Carol Meyers has observed: "... the various temples of Israel, while different in a variety of significant and insignificant ways, were also identical. The continuity in symbolic function provided the crucial and unbroken link from one concrete rendition to the next."\textsuperscript{156}

Menahem Haran, while affirming that the Second Temple was the direct successor of the First Temple, and served in the same manner as an indispensable expression of the cult, has also observed that the basic continuity in the midst of discontinuity was the function of the Second Temple as an eschatological symbol: "At the same time, however, it already shows signs of entirely new principles while earlier features of the institution of the house of God are fading away. It marks a stage of transition to a new period which was preparing to give up this institution altogether in practice - even while clinging to it as an eschatological symbol."\textsuperscript{157}

What these "new principles" might be, what "earlier features" were disappearing, and how the Temple served as an "eschatological symbol," need to be determined.

R. G. Hamerton-Kelly has proposed that the eschatological Temple tradition developed after the return from exile when the absence of divine blessing from the failure of the Shekinah to return to the rebuilt Temple occasioned the


\textsuperscript{157}Menahem Haran, \textit{Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel} (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1978), p. 45. In a later discussion Haran continued this thought noting: "The temple thus turned into an eschatological symbol, to be resurrected only at the end of days, while for the ongoing daily life new frameworks and channels of communal activity were found," "Temple and Community in Ancient Israel," \textit{Temple in Society}. Edited by Michael Fox (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988), p. 22.
transfer of such hopes to the realm of the transcendant and eschatological.\textsuperscript{158} However, as we will seek to demonstrate from a literary and exegetical analysis of the whole of Tanakh and the apocalyptic literature, this hope was expressed as a divine ideal (in the Pentateuch) which progressively developed with Israel (through the period of the monarchy), but became an active expectation once the need for an eschatological restoration was nationally discerned (in the post-exilic period). Furthermore, this hope was centered on the eschatological restoration of the \textit{earthly} Jerusalem and Temple, rather than replacing an earthly hope with a heavenly one (even in the New Testament).\textsuperscript{159}

The following study will begin to answer the question of the developing symbols that emerged as the earlier features seemed to have disappeared. This will be attempted through an examination of the significance of the Temple in its symbolism. This will be done by first presenting a brief overview of the function of the Jerusalem Temple. Upon this foundation I will introduce the general concept of the eschatological Temple, first examining the concept of the פולח, analyzing the contribution of Gaines' dissertation, and summarizing the interrelated functions for the eschatological Temple.

R. E. Clements, commenting on the post-exilic setting for the Temple, has said: "In heaven existed the true Jerusalem and the true temple where men would enjoy the presence of God...Judaism resorted to its eschatology to provide the solution...to the question, "Will God in truth dwell on earth?"\textsuperscript{160} According to Elizabeth Gaines, the Jewish response to that question took the form of a developed tradition concerning the eschatological Jerusalem. In her 1988 dissertation on the function of the image of the eschatological Jerusalem in the


\textsuperscript{160}R. E., Clements, \textit{God and His Temple}, p. 134.
biblical period, she argued that these traditions were employed in various ways in both Tanakh and in the New Testament. Because of the importance of her contribution to our present study, we need to briefly review the salient points of her research.

**Gaines’ Functions of the Eschatological Jerusalem**

Gaines categorized her study of the collections of eschatological Jerusalem traditions according to four functions:

1. **As a response to the loss of the physical city.** Following both the destructions of the Temple in 586/7 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., the concept of the eschatological Jerusalem, whether understood as terrestrial or celestial in nature, served as a source of comfort and consolation for the loss of the central shrine. After the first destruction, the prophetic adaptation of the ancient motifs helped to inspire a national program of restoration of the temple-city on Mount Zion. After the second destruction, while no attempt was made to reestablish the cult, the literature of the first-century struggled with the questions of theodicy, especially in the apocryphal and apocalyptic texts, which rehearsed a desire for revenge on their and God’s enemies in eschatological visualizations of a final conflict in which the righteous remnant is victorious. The promise of a place in the eschatological city, as a reward for faithfulness, also played a secondary role as an exhortation to righteousness.

2. **As a critique of Judaism’s cultic center.** The use of the image of the eschatological Jerusalem acted as a critique of the corrupt Temple priesthood, displaying the desecration of the current cultic center by comparison. This was accomplished in the apocryphal and pseudigraphical writers by drawing on ancient Near Eastern kingship traditions and contrasting the ideal Davidic King with the corrupt

---

Hasmonean dynasty. At the same time, the glories of the coming eschatological kingdom offered a vision of hope for the righteous minority.

(3) As a theological apologetic. Paul and the author of Hebrews employed the image of the eschatological Jerusalem apologetically to symbolize the dwelling place of God and Christ, to describe a realm that is the true destination of Christians, and as a representation of the superior hope of Christianity. The image is used by Paul, especially in Galatians, of the inheritance of those liberated by faith, who stand in contrast to those whose dependence is upon the Law. It also is used in exhortations by the author of Hebrews as a motivation to perseverance, since it represents an unshakable kingdom that will be their inheritance.

(4) As a motivation for righteousness. In Israel and the Hellenistic world, in both wisdom and the apocalyptic circles, whether Jewish or Christian, the image of the eschatological Jerusalem transcends differences in social settings to serve as an expression of hope in the ultimate justice of God. In Jewish apocalyptic literature (e.g. Ben Sira) and the New Testament Apocalypse, the themes of divine retribution and prayers for restoration are combined. Though the sage awaited the return of the Shekinah to the Temple, while the seer awaited the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem which has no cultic center, the theme of the eschatological city was central to their shared hope in the reward of the righteous. This future expectation served as a present motivation in the ethical realm. Writers employed this through a combination of ethical instruction and ex eventu prophecy in exhortations to community conduct (cf. Tobit 14; Sibylline Oracles 3; 1 John 3).

In Gaines’ survey of the literature, there is a variety concerning the place of the Temple in the eschatological Jerusalem. For instance, in Revelation 21:22 the New Jerusalem has no Temple in the city, while in the third Sibylline Oracle the image of the city has been totally displaced by the Temple as the place of the divine presence. This variety is seen also in the construct of the sectarian
community at Qumran as a temple in opposition to the desecrated Temple in Jerusalem, and apocalyptic writers who envisioned the restoration of a purified Temple in Jerusalem at the end of the eschaton. Since the Temple was originally the reason for Jerusalem’s sanctity, just as there is variety in the function of the eschatological Jerusalem, so there is also variety concerning the place of the Temple in eschatological Jerusalem.

The Function of the Eschatological Temple

It is virtually unnecessary to distinguish between the theological significance of Jerusalem and the Temple proper, since as W. D. Davies has observed, the two are intimately connected:

...the pertinent texts move without warning from the Temple to Jerusalem and vice versa, so that these two entities, in their earthly and heavenly forms, are in constant association.¹⁶²

Thus, while Gaines did not deal directly with the subject of the Temple, she surfaced repeated examples of the desecration/restoration motif in each of her four functional categories for the eschatological Jerusalem which may be applied equally to the Temple. Within her collection of these traditions, then, we may extrapolate from the City to the Sanctuary and offer our own summary of the function of the eschatological Temple.

(1) The eschatological Temple was seen as the answer to the quest for theodicy, and as a consolation to Judaism, offering a symbol of permanence and inviolability in the wake of the desecration and destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. The developed notions of the eschatological Temple in later Jewish literature are the reflection of one rabbinic response to the loss of the cultic center.

(2) The eschatological Temple was seen as the ideal heavenly Sanctuary in contrast to the profaned earthly sanctuary. Messianic kingly figures of the Branch (Zechariah 6:12-15) and David redivivus (Ezekiel 37:24-28) were employed by both the Tanakh and apocryphal and

apocalyptic writers as builders of a restored and purified Temple. This at once offered a contrasting model of holiness to the existing corrupt Temple priesthood, and held forth the promise that the ultimate glory of the Temple would be restored.

(3) The eschatological Temple was used within apologetic contexts metaphorically as a reference to the ideal standard of a holy community - unified, performing righteous deeds, engaged in worship, and separate from defilement. Whether at Qumran or in the New Testament (in Paul, Peter, and Hebrews), the employment of the image represented the inheritance of the faithful and the embodiment of the holy qualities communicated by the cultic center.

(4) The eschatological Temple served as a motivation for righteousness and continued fidelity in the face of persecution and loss. In the intertestamental literature, the desecration of the present sanctuary demanded a restoration, and this was centered in the eschatological hope of messianic advent and apocalyptic judgment with a view to a restored cultus.

The New Testament’s focus on the eschatological Temple is almost completely overshadowed by its attention to Christ and the restored order that will come with his messianic advent, however, the image does find expression in light of the desecration of a future earthly Temple which signals the imminency of the awaited restoration. This is seen in those eschatological texts announcing Temple desecration in Matthew 24:15; II Thessalonians 2:4, and especially in Revelation 11:19, where the heavenly Temple is seen in contrast to the earthly Temple of verses 1-2. There is also in the Apocalypse, the description of the heavenly Temple (in contrast to the New Jerusalem which has no temple, Revelation 21:22), which promises respite and rewards to the faithful remnant for continuance in tribulation (Revelation 3:12; 7:15; 11:19; 14:15, 17; 15:5-8; 11:1, 17).\textsuperscript{163} The heavenly Temple receives brief mention in the epistle to the Hebrews

\textsuperscript{163}For a further discussion of four interrelated motifs involving the eschatological Jerusalem as well as the specific focus of the Lukian perspective cf. J. Bradley
(Hebrews 8:2, 5; 9:11, 23-24) in each case with reference to the cultic performance of Jesus as a heavenly High Priest (Hebrews 8:1, 3-4; 9:11-14). 164

The Eschatological Temple as a Heavenly Archetype (דָּבֶרֵךְ)

Our survey of the function of the eschatological Temple would not be complete without reference to the cryptic image of the דָּבֶרֵךְ which laid the foundation for later interpretation of the eschatological and heavenly Temple. In order to understand how the motifs concerning the Temple’s desecration and restoration can be used by the canonical and non-canonical writers eschatologically, it is important that we gain a preliminary perspective of the eschatological nature of the Temple through a study of this concept.

In preparation for the actual dwelling of YHWH on earth via a cultic installation, in both the Pentateuch (Exodus 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8; Numbers 8:4) and in the historical books (1 Chronicles 28:11-19) we are confronted with the account of a דָּבֶרֵךְ (generally, “model,” or “pattern”) revealed to those ordained to make possible the erection of the structures. The term דָּבֶרֵךְ itself is somewhat difficult to translate because the intended meaning is less than certain. The

---


164 The argument of the epistle of the Hebrews concerning the necessity of Jesus’ heavenly priesthood is based on the premise that since he was descended from the tribe of Judah (cf. the genealogy through Joseph, Matthew 1:1-17; and through Mary, Luke 3:23-38), he was not qualified (Hebrews 8:4), to serve in the Aaronic priesthood in the earthly Sanctuary (Numbers 18:1-8, 23; cf. Exodus 28:1). Therefore, his sphere of priestly service had to be in the heavenly Sanctuary, and his order of priesthood according to Melchizedek (Hebrews 5:4-10). The latter is based on an antitypical analogy drawn from Genesis 14:18-20. Melchizedekian traditions are also preserved in apocalyptic texts from Qumran such as the Genesis Apocryphon (22:14) and the 11Q Melchizedek, in which Melchizedek in the heavenly figure of a divine redeemer wrestles with Belial (lines 9-11). Cf. further, M. de Jonge and A. S., van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," NTS 12 (1966): 306; J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London, 1971), pp. 245-267; and F. L. Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition. SNTS MS 30 (Cambridge, 1976).
Kochler-Baumgartner Lexicon, for instance, gives as many as eight separate meanings such as: “original, prototype, copy, duplicate, model, image, something like architect’s plan.” Therefore, the term could denote either the original from which a replica is constructed, or the actual replica itself.

According to Tanakh, Moses and David, who were alone shown the "tabernacle in their respective roles in preparation for the building of the Tabernacle and Temple, received their information concerning the tabernacle orally and by vision. Based on the two denotations of the term, five interpretations of the nature of the object designated by this revealed instruction have been offered:

1. An original miniature model;
2. A miniature model which is a copy of the original;
3. An architect’s blueprint or plan;
4. An architect’s plan which is based on an original;
5. The original itself; i.e., the heavenly Sanctuary. Of these interpretations, only three merit more detailed presentation.

An original miniature model.

According to b. Men. 29a, Rashi and Ramban to Exous 25:9, 40, Moses was shown such a miniature model of the Tabernacle and its furnishings.

---

165 KB, s.v. “tabernacle,” p. 1018.


167 This view combines the idea of a replica with that of the actual heavenly Sanctuary, and was suggested by Umberto Cassuto in his commentary on Exodus.

Traditional exegetes have ascribed a didactic function to the ḫevit ḫevit, maintaining that it was necessary to help Moses understand the complex instructions. While the substance of the model conceived of by these commentators was one of miraculous fire, it was still envisaged as a teaching model which Moses, and later David, studied in order to communicate to the “skilled workers” (Exodus 35:10; I Chronicles 28:21) the divine design.

An architect’s blueprint or plan.

According to Hurowitz, this is the plain meaning of the various verses referring to Moses’ revelation, i.e., that he was shown an exact copy of the Tabernacle which he was to make. His evaluation is based on an analysis of the use of the words ḫevit ḫevit and its parallel expression דָּרוֹחַ (“pattern”) in several biblical passages, some of which are from cultic contexts, and especially on Exodus 25:40 and Numbers 8:4, which are considered the most unambiguous references. He takes דָּרוֹחַ in its basic meaning of “form”, “structure” or “shape,” to denote a “replica.” In I Chronicles 28:11, 12, 19, he finds that דָּרוֹחַ means “a (written) model blueprint,” while in I Chron. 18.28 it has the meaning of “replica.” He further argues from I Kings 16:10, where a ḫevit ḫevit sent

---

169 S. E., Loewenstamm, Mishnah Encyclopedia Miqra ‘it, V, col. 534, cites an incident from the Atarahis myth in which Ea draws a picture of a boat for Atarahis (who claims to have had no experience in boat making) as a parallel to the didactic function of the ḫevit ḫevit. cf. Lambert and Millard 1969: 128 DT 42 (W) 14-15: "ina qaqgari esir usurtul lu.surlu Ilumurma "w-eleppa [hupus-J] [Draw the design on the ground that I may see [the design] and [build] the boat]."


171 He cites as references for uses of this meaning: Joshua 12:28; I Chronicles 28:18; cf. Ezekiel 8:3, 10; 10:10: Deut. 4:16, 17, 18; Psalm 106:20; 144:12; Isaiah 44.13.

172 Therefore, he sees two meanings for the term in Chronicles according to the context of its appearance. In verses 11, 12 and 19, it is the “blueprint” for what Solomon is to build, while in verse 18 it is the (earthly, yet to be constructed) replica of the heavenly דָּרוֹחַ. He also finds the word bears the same two meanings in 2 Kgs 16.10, however, simultaneously.
by King Ahaz to Uriah the Priest is a depiction of the "original altar" seen by the
King on a trip to Damascus, that it is at the same time a "model" for the duplicate
altar to be built and installed in the Jerusalem Temple (i.e. the original object that
is to be imitated).

Hurowitz usage of הבנית in Exodus 25:40, however, is not "double-duty." In
the passage itself: ראה את ה AVC יבנה את לכה את הארץ נצרה יבנה וקרב ("and look and
make according to their tabnit which is shown you on the mountain"), he observes
that the pronominal suffix ראה in יבנה is antecedced by כל הלחים ("all these
implements"), mentioned in verse 39b. Based on this clue, Moses is being shown
the הבנית of what he himself is called upon to manufacture, and the הבנית is
therefore a "replica" of the earthly, as yet unconstructed, Tabemacle. His
conclusion is that since the word (even where it is "double duty") never
designates the actual object, but only a representation of it, it cannot be taken to
refer to the heavenly abode of God, although he admits that it is not unlikely that
the earthly Tabemacle was considered to be a replica of a Heavenly Divine
Abode. However, he feels that this can be deduced only as an inference from
comparative material.

The original itself, the heavenly Sanctuary.

In contrast to Hurowitz, it is argued that "in most of the references to
tabnit in the OT there seems to be an indication of a solid object, not an architect’s
plan." This view is found in Jewish and Christian sources from the Hellenistic

---

173 Following Hurowitz argument further, just as הבנית does not indicate the object
itself, so neither does המראת. Numbers 8:4 records that Moses was shown a המראת of
the Menorah which he is to construct (i.e. make a duplicate). Moshe Greenberg
related to Hurowitz his opinion that המראת frequently was used as a "buffer"
between an object and a viewer, when it is desired to indicate that the viewer is
hesitant about identifying that which has been seen as a real object, despite the
exact visual identity between the two.

174 Angel Manuel Rodríguez, "Sanctuary Theology in the Book of Exodus," 
Andrews University Seminary Studies 24:2 (Summer 1986): 142. From this
period onwards, and contends that Moses was shown the divine heavenly dwelling, of which the Tabernacle was to be an earthly replica and counterpart. The arguments for this position derive from two sources:

(1) From the universal ancient Near Eastern notion of the heavenly or cosmic mountain as the model for temples, cult objects, and laws. In this tradition, Cross believes that the נֶפֶל was a cosmic Tabernacle, which concept was the result of Israelite borrowing of the earthly/cosmic dualism of the Canaanites. However, there is no warrant for this supposition, rather, Israelite and ancient Near Eastern practices reflect a common source. We have already examined illustrations of this ancient Near Eastern cosmology in our investigation of the concept of the eschatological Temple.

understanding of the term, the נֶפֶל, as a solid, three-dimensional object, could be either a miniature model or the real archetypal Sanctuary.

This view is also particularly popular today among scholars who utilize a comparative and tradition-history approach.


(2) From the many references in Tanakh that indicate that there is a
heavenly Temple where YHWH dwells,\textsuperscript{178} For example, in the psalms
YHWH is depicted as in His holy Temple (or holy mountain, cf. Psalm
3:4) looking down upon men to test them (Psalm 11:4), and to hear their
cries of distress (Psalm 18:6; 102:18-19; cf. 1 Kings 8:30 also of prayers of
worship), and in the Prophets (cf. Isaiah 6:1-7; Micah 1:2). Of course, the
existence of a the heavenly Temple does not necessarily prove that the is
that reality, but it does lend weight to the identification since the account
in Exodus 24:9-11 of the elders of Israel in YHWH’s presence on the
mountain actually saw some sort of physical manifestation, which Ezekiel
(1:26-28) related in cultic-priestly terms as a temple-throne.\textsuperscript{179}

In the Book of Exodus, it is the structural correspondence of the heavenly-
earthly that requires a functional correspondence between YHWH and Israel as a
holy Nation. Indeed, it is Freedman’s contention that Mount Sinai/Horeb was
itself the place where this correspondence was most perfectly demonstrated: with
the heavenly Temple on the mountain’s top, and the earthly Tabernacle at its
base.\textsuperscript{180} He writes: “It was on this mountain that Yahweh’s palace stood, a palace
made by Yahweh for himself with its throne room and throne, on which he is

\textsuperscript{178}For a listing and discussion of the relevant texts cf. Niels-Erik Andreasen, “The
Heavenly Sanctuary in the Old Testament,” \textit{The Sanctuary and the Atonement},
pp. 67-86.

\textsuperscript{179}The description in Ezekiel 1 is more of a throne-room than a temple, however,
in the context, it appears that YHWH has revealed Himself to Ezekiel in His
heavenly Temple as a dramatic contrast as He pronounces judgment upon the
desecration of His earthly Temple (chapters 4-8).

\textsuperscript{180}Rodríguez, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 131-141 develops this correspondence between Mount
Sinai and the Tabernacle with the top of the mountain the Holy of Holies, the
middle section as the Holy Place, and the base as the outer court (for graphic
sketch see p. 133). Cf. also Jacob Milgrom, \textit{Studies in Levitical Terminology 1}
(Los Angeles, 1970), pp. 44-46, who also identifies Mount Sinai as “the archetype
of the tabernacle.” We will expand on this correspondence in our discussion on
the graded holiness of the Sanctuary in the next chapter.
seated, king forever (v. 18) ...This heavenly temple or sanctuary with its throne room or holy of holies where the deity was seated on his cherubim throne constituted the tabnit or structure seen by Moses during his sojourn on that same mountain.”  

Our conclusion concerning the דְּבִיָן is that as Moses certainly had a definite design communicated to him, and the Tabernacle, built according to this design, was determined by its pointing to YHWH Whose real dwelling was in the heavens, that the was in fact an archetypal Sanctuary. If one finds the evidence of Hurowitz convincing, it is still no difficulty to harmonize the views like Davidson, who thinks it probable “that Moses was given a vision of the heavenly sanctuary and then provided with a miniature model of the heavenly as a pattern to copy in constructing the earthly.”  

The earthly sanctuary was a structural representation of a heavenly Sanctuary, and therefore could serve as a functional paradigm for the Israelite cultus. It will be this understanding that informs the desecration/restoration motif, as the earthly situation affects its divine counterpart, calling for an eschatological resolution in the vindication of YHWH’s Name, which He has caused to dwell in the Tabernacle/Temple.

181David Noel Freedman, “Temple Without Hands,” *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion March 14-16, 1977* (Jerusalem: The Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College, 1981), p. 26. He bases his conclusion in this article on his exegesis of Exodus 15:1-18, 21 and his connection of the divine sanctuary (made without hands) to Sinai, rather than as popularly associated, with Jerusalem and Mount Zion. He includes the insight of Benjamin Mazar on Exodus 3:5 that the expression שֵׁם יִמְשָׁם (“holy ground”) is not to be restricted to a few square meters on which Moses and the bush stood, but to the entire district which bore the name Kadesh (שֵׁם), p. 24.

CHAPTER III

THE DESECRATION AND RESTORATION
OF THE TEMPLE AS AN ESCHATOLOGICAL MOTIF

In the previous chapter the concept of the Temple, and especially that of the eschatological Temple, laid the framework for the specific focus of this chapter on the eschatological motif of desecration/restoration. The primary purpose of the chapter is to examine the theological significance of the concepts of desecration and restoration in the Israelite cultus, and the use of this motif as a model for the communication of the eschatological divine ideal. In this chapter we will survey the sphere of cultic purity, first examining the general field of meaning of the biblical concept of holiness, then narrowing the field by a synchronic word study of the two terms for pollution and profanation, namely נָזָל ("desecration") and מַפִּיל ("defilement"). Finally we will consider the various grades of sanctity that affected the cultus, and seek to isolate the boundaries of the desecration/restoration motif as applied specifically to the Temple.

THE CONCEPT OF BIBLICAL HOLINESS

The concept of holiness has been of great interest to historians of religion. For example, the contrast between the sacred and the profane has played a significant role in the studies of comparative religion by Rudolf Otto¹ and Mircea

¹Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*. Translated by J. W. Harvey (London: Penguin Books, 1959). Otto described five major aspects of holiness as conveyed primarily by the term נָזָל, which he termed the "numinous." These five aspects of holiness, Otto explained, are those which capture and communicate the concept of divine ineffability to human experience. He traced this not only through the
Eliade.\(^2\) The writings they have influenced many recent studies of holiness in the Bible.\(^3\) While Otto and Eliade show that the holiness and glory of God may be unique, holiness for the Priestly writers is not expressed so much in terms of human reactions of dread, vitality and fascination, but through a developed system of cultic laws and prohibitions (for instance, the entire sanctuary is not out of bounds at all times, but only on certain specified occasions, cf. Exodus 40:35; Leviticus 16:17). Further, the biblical presentation of the cult is without the mythological motifs so essential to Otto and Eliade.

Admittedly, these writers have made significant contributions which have stimulated new insights in the text for the biblical exegete, however, Otto did not deal with the holiness concept in the Priestly writings, which are foundational for our concern with the Temple cultus, and Eliade’s analysis is too general to encompass the subtle gradation of holiness contained there.

**The Concept of Holiness in the Priestly Writers**

The concept of holiness for the Priestly writers is, as Jenson has observed: "...located in the God-ordained ordering of the sanctuary, as reflected and

biblical material, but also through the ancient primitive religions, oriental religions, early Christianity and Luther, and even through ancient, medieval, and Chinese art. Otto, however, stresses the subjective and psychological aspects of holiness, and did not properly deal with its use in Tanach, especially in the Priestly writers. For a critique and supplementation of his analysis, especially in his lack of treatment for בֵּית הָרָעִים and the connection of separation with holiness, cf. John G. Grammie, *Holiness in Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 7-8.

\(^2\)Mirea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated by W.R. Trask (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1961). Eliade’s work presents the dualism between the “sacred” and the “profane,” which portrays one of the most important concepts expressed in the translation and understanding of cultic vocabulary. This work built upon the earlier *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated by R. Sheed (New York: Meridan Books, 1963) from the 1948 French edition, which opened up new vistas of comparison with human experiences of the holy for the interpretation of the Bible.

\(^3\)E.g., Muilenburg, whose article “Holiness,” *Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* II (1962), pp. 616-625 employs Otto’s characteristic language.
safeguarded in the laws and institutions of the cult. God's holiness may be ultimately hidden and inviolable in the Holy of Holies, but the primary emphasis is on the visible and realized holiness of the sanctuary, mediating his nearness and accessibility ("before Yahweh").

To understand this concept completely it would be necessary to examine it at the lexical level, which reveals the spectrum of holiness represented by the four Hebrew words: קָדוֹשׁ ("holy"), פָּרָה ("profane, desecrated"), מַדְרָן ("clean") and מַטָּם ("unclean, defiled"). Our treatment of the subject of holiness must set limitations based on our purpose to provide background for the concept of Sanctuary and desecration/desfilement and restoration/purification. In this section we will seek to do this first by a brief survey of the semantic field of holiness,

---


5 Though there are weaknesses to such a general systematic grouping, such a classification permits the observation of certain aspects of the Priestly understanding of holiness and purity, and avoids the more restricted entries in the dictionaries and lexicons isolated from their context. Though this lexical investigation is beyond the scope of our study, for the data connected with such a pursuit cf. R. Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice Israélite* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1921), p. 35 who states that the texts allow us to note four main values of states and objects: מַטָּם ("impure"), מַדְרָן ("pure"), קָדוֹשׁ ("sacred") and קָרוֹשׁ ("most holy [sacro-saint]"). A more complete lexical analysis would include less frequently used words such as נשָך ("desolate"), which will be studied in chapter 5), מָסַע ("abomination"), נַגֵּד ("impurity"), מַסָּה ("abomination"), and the verbs כָּרָה, הֲבָי ("appease, atone") (Pi’el), מָטַה, "sin" (Pi’el, and Hithpa’el), and כָּרָה ("pollute"). For discussions of the lexical field of "clean" and "unclean", cf. from the list in Jenson, *op. cit.*, p. 41: W. Paschen, "Rein und Unrein," *Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament* 25 (1970), pp. 19-30, H. Cazelles, "Puré et impurété," *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement IX* (1975), pp. 491-508, I. Zatelli, "Il campo lessicale degli aggettivi di purità in ebraico biblico", *Quaderni di semitistica* 7(1978), p. 30, A. Vivian, "I campi lessicai della 'separazioni' null' ebraico biblico, di Qumran e della Mishna: Ovvero, applicabilita della teoria dei campi lessicai all' ebraico," *Quaderni di semitistica* 4 (1978), which, as the title suggests, includes Qumranic and Mishnaic texts in this study of biblical "separation." Since a word's general meaning may be relatively constant throughout the Tanach, the Priestly writings have given holiness a range of meaning which also deserves an independent treatment.
moving then to the distinctions in holiness (graded holiness), next to the
distinction between the sacred and the profane, and finally, to a consideration of
the specific sanctity of the Sanctuary as connotated by its association with the root
שד.

The Semantic Field of Holiness

The four lexical entries in the holiness word group may be related to one
another in several ways, however, Leviticus 10:10 is usually cited as a model for
identifying the basic distinctions within the semantic field. The text reads:

(“to distinguish between the holy
and the profane,
and between the unclean
and the clean”).

Here we observe that ילדנה וֹלִשָּׁה (“holy and profane”) and קָרָב
(“clean and unclean”) constitute opposing pairs. While Nilton Amorim has
demonstrated that strict parallelism does not exist between יִלַּדֶּה and קָרָב, the pairs
are equivalent in some respects.⁶ It has been thought best to assume a chiastic
structure to the parallelism (as above), in which the terms are aligned, but not
identical.⁷ Therefore, the lexical aspect of the holiness spectrum can be
represented in both opposition and similarity as Jenson has depicted by the
following diagram:⁸

---

⁶Nilton Dutra Amorim, “Desecration and Defilement in the Old Testament”
(Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1985), pp. 42-44. For a discussion of
semantic opposition and polarity cf. J. Lyons, Semantics. 2 volumes (Cambridge:

⁷For instance, קָרָב often has a linguistic and theological stress of “separation”
which it shares with קָרַב, but not with לֹא.

⁸Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 44. Jenson’s diagram repeated the term קָרַב for
both “unclean” and “very unclean.” Since he is referring to the sphere of
“uncleanness” the thought is not misunderstood. However, I have supplied one of
The terms at the fartherest poles are the least related, while those which are adjacent are more closely related. The distinction between מָנוֹם and מָנוּז, which, we will see, represents a higher degree of desanctification than מַסָּא. This scheme also permits a preliminary look at the gradations of holiness within the holiness spectrum (which can only be properly discerned in each specific context). One limitation of this scheme is that it does not incorporate the sphere of the profane (לֵד), which is important to our study of desecration. If we included elements within this realm which affect the sanctity of the Temple and its sancta, we would add the terms כּוֹרָא (“abomination”) and מַסָּא (“desolating, disgusting [thing]”) which separately (in the Prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel) and together as a phrase (in Daniel, cf. the New Testament) designate the profanation of the most Holy Place, the כּוֹרָא קְדָשִׁים, which would then appear at the fartherest pole as in the modified diagram below:

---

the forms of "uncleanness," מַסָּא אֵבְרֵי הַמָּנוּז, i.e., corpse impurity, to better reflect the opposition to מַסָּא קְדָשִׁים, as "very holy."

Figure 2: Gradations of Profanation in Semantic Field

In this scheme, corpse impurity - the most severe form of uncleanness, מְחָט, has been replaced by that which causes it to be incurred by the entire Nation of Israel, namely, profanation resulting in destruction and exile (cf. this cause and effect in Ezekiel 36:17-19). Here we see the polarity that concerned the prophets when Israel’s social and political life sought to imitate the surrounding nations, and consequently invited foreign invasion of that which distinguished Israel’s separateness: the Temple and its cult. The dynamic of this spectrum is between the divine and human spheres which ought to operate in symmetry (in holiness), but rather function asymmetrically (because of profanation). Jenson summarizes this dynamic when he observes that:

holiness (and its opposite, the profane) represents the divine relation to the ordered world, and the clean (with its opposite, the unclean) embraces the normal state of human existence in the earthly realm. The holy-profane pair represents (positively and negatively) the divine sphere, and this may be distinguished from the human sphere (which is marked by the opposition between clean and unclean).\(^\text{10}\)

In this divine-human scheme in the Tanach, we find that purity relates closest to holiness, e.g. the Land is holy, and may be desecrated by becoming unclean, therefore it must be kept clean. In order to understand this scheme with its dual spheres of the divine and the human, let us consider each in turn.

\(^{10}\text{Jenson, op. cit., p. 47.}\)
The Divine Sphere: יָרָה and הָלַל

The semantic range for the root יָרָה expresses the general idea of "separation" or "withdrawal," however, this was probably not the term's original etymology. Helmer Ringgren, after making a comparative study of the root concluded that "the idea of withdrawal, or separation, is not always very prominent." With this objection noted, Norman Snaith amended the aspect of "separateness" in the root as being the necessary consequence of holiness rather than its meaning. O. R. Jones explains this conclusion:

It seems to me that we may safely say that holiness has generally implied separateness, but that it is rarely to be understood as being equivalent in meaning to "separateness". Things, places and people have been regarded as separate because they were holy, but the converse was not true. Nothing became holy merely by being separated from the sphere of ordinary things. It was only in virtue of its relation to God as his property that anything became holy...

---

11Older etymologies worked from cognate roots such as those in Akkadian, where qadasu has the sense of "set apart to a specific service", e.g. the feminine noun is used for an hierodule consecrated to Ishtar; this is similar to the Ugaritic qds which has three distinct expressions: qdsm ("cultic holy men," i.e. male prostitutes), bn qds, a designation for members of the Ugaritic pantheon, and qds, which was probably a reference to a northern city. In each of these cases the use is secular or common, and while Hebrew יָרָה indeed has a nominal derivative that refers to "male prostitutes" (Deuteronomy 23:18; II Kings 23:7), these are "temple" prostitutes, and therefore the use is still cultic. The fact that יָרָה rarely appears in Tanach in the non-theological sense makes it improbable that "separation" was the original etymology, cf. C.-B. Costecalde, "Sacré," Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément X (1985), pp. 1356-1361, Thomas McComiskey, יָרָה," TWOT, II: 786-788.


Because סֶרֶפ may be defined as that which belongs to the sphere of YHWH’s Being or activity, Jenson suggests something corresponding to “a claim of ownership, a statement of close association, or proximity to his cultic presence.” The primary meaning of סֶרֶפ in Hebrew (as of δύνατος in Greek) is “be holy, sanctify,” denoting a “sanctification” that is “a separation to YHWH”, rather than “a separation from the world,” and therefore it has a positive content. In this sense סֶרֶפ belongs to the divine sphere (the numinous), but is transferred to the human sphere by an act of “setting apart” or sanctification. Thus, the normal state of human affairs is cultic purity (הַסְדָּרָה), and one is only made סֶרֶפ by divine will, usually through a ceremony of consecration (e.g. High Priest and anointing oil, cf. Exodus 40:9-15), denoted by the use of the Pi’el (indicating the results) or Hiph’il (indicating the process) of סֶרֶפ.16

There is a fundamental distinction between the holiness of things and human beings. The holiness of objects is permanent, once they have become sacred they can never again re-enter the realm of the common/profane, and any attempt to desanctify them is desecration and defilement (cf. Numbers 17:2-5 [English 16:37-40].

The divine sphere of holiness pertains primarily to the Temple, the sancta, and the priesthood, and these will be treated separately below. It is important to note, however, that since holiness may implies YHWH’s covenantal ownership (after the form of the Hittite suzerain-vassal treaty) all that is so dedicated to Him is also סֶרֶפ. We see this after injunctions to personal holiness in the repeated use

---

15Philip Jenson, op. cit., p. 48. He finds some support for this notion in the cognate languages, but particularly draws his idea from the Priestly writings in which the theological and personal character of the term is emphasized. Cf. for a discussion of the problems surrounding the deduction of the original meaning of סֶרֶפ, J. A. Emerton, “The Meaning of סֶרֶפ in Lamentations 4.1,” ZAW 79 (1967): 233-236.

of the concluding explanatory clause: יְהֹוָה ("I am YHWH").\textsuperscript{17} This is especially underscored by the general call to holiness based on Israel’s association with YHWH in Leviticus 19:2: יְהֹוָה יִרְשָׁיָהוּ אֶלֶף הַיָּמִים יִרְשָׁיָהוּ ("You shall be holy, for I YHWH your God am holy"). Therefore, Tunyogi argues that קֹדֶשׁ and נְפֶל are antithetical to one another not only in respect to YHWH, but also with reference to the people of Israel and the Land, which are all part of the divine triad, and therefore affect one another.\textsuperscript{18} This agrees with what we will find in the desecration/restoration motif; a cause-effect relationship that requires symmetrical resolution of all elements.

**The Human Sphere:** נְפֶל and מְדָר

Outside the cult, the pair of terms מְדָר - נְפֶל ("clean-unclean") belongs to the normative life of Israel. A state of purity, a concept that is neutral relative to the holy and the unclean, is the expected condition of every Israelite. It is of importance chiefly in that it is a prerequisite for approaching the sphere of the holy. Minor impurity is an expected condition, to which no transgression is imputed, and which is only dangerous in approaching the holy. Purity is an essential, but not sufficient status for consecration (e.g., potential priests must all be descendants of Aaron).

The sphere of the clean and unclean therefore has a certain independence from the divine realm. Ceremonial cleanness was required before approaching the sphere of the holy, not because cleanness possessed any independent virtue, but because the antipathy between holiness and impurity was absolute.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Leviticus 11:44-45; 18:2, 4, 21, 30; 19:3-4, 10, 12, 14, 25, 31-32, 36; 20:7-8; 24:22; 25:17; 26:1.


\textsuperscript{19} It is not within our purpose or scope to consider the various degrees of tolerable and intolerable impurities or examples of the vocabulary of purity and impurity, for such details cf. David P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBLDS 101 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), and his article "Clean/Unclean (OT)," *ABD* VI: 729-741.
injunction in light of the cultus was given in Leviticus 20:7 with the usual concluding covenantal formula: יָתַּחַרְשֵׁנִים וְיִהְיֶה קְדָשׁ הִנֵּה אַתֶּנְה יָהֳウェָה יָהֳウェָה כָּלاعֲדֵי (“You shall consecrate yourselves therefore and be holy, for I am YHWH your God”). Therefore, ordinary Israelites had to be clean to partake of the peace offerings (Leviticus 7:19-21), and Pesach (Numbers 9:13), since these bore a minor grade of holiness. For the priest, who were experts in matters of purity and impurity, these laws were essential because of their affect on the cult. It was this all-pervasive importance of the Temple and the cult that most likely influenced the use of priestly metaphors in the theological and prophetic spheres which interpreted the desecration and defilement of the Land as the result of cultic transgression (cf. Leviticus 18:24-25; 20:22-26; Numbers 35:33-34; Ezekiel 36:18-20).

**Holiness and the Temple**

The sanctity of the Temple is evident in the terms frequently used to describe it: קְדָשׁ (“sanctuary”), קְדָשִׁים (literally, “[chamber] of holiness,” “the Holy place”), תֹּֽהָלִים (literally, “the most holy [place],” “the Holy of Holies,” i.e., the Adytum). As we will attempt to show in the next chapter, the priestly writers saw the establishment of the cultic installation at Sinai as the restoration of the creation-ideal, which had been interrupted by the intervention of cultic transgression in the Edenic “sanctuary.” For this reason they could parallel the language of the two events as below:

**Figure 3: Cosmic/Cultic Parallel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation of the Cosmos</th>
<th>Construction of the Sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָרָא אַל-הוָיָם אֵאֲדַכְּל-אֵשׁ נְעָם הָוָה (“And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good,” Genesis 1:31).</td>
<td>נֹהָרָה שֵׁפֶל לָרָא מְשַׁה אֶדֶּבֶל תָּבָּל (“And Moses saw all the work and behold, the had done it.” Exodus 39:43).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כְּלֵלָהּ תַּקָּפִּיתָם תַּקְּחִיתָם כלּוּ סְפָר (&quot;Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their hosts,&quot; Genesis 2:1).</td>
<td>מָעָרָה תַּקָּפִּיתָם נִתְּנָהּ כָּלָּה בְּעָמָּתָהּ מְשָׁפָּתָה (&quot;Thus all the work of the Tabernacle of the tent of meeting was finished,&quot; Exodus 39:32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַכְּלֶת אֶלֶף הָעָהּ בֵּית הָעָהּ מֶכֶבֶּת אֶלֶף (&quot;On the seventh day God finished His work which He had done,&quot; Genesis 2:2).</td>
<td>מֶכֶבֶּת אֶלֶף מֶכֶבֶּת (&quot;So Moses finished the work,&quot; Exodus 40:33).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נַכְּלֶת קַדִּשָּׁבָה אֶלֶףָה אֶלֶף אֶלֶף (&quot;So God blessed the seventh day,&quot; Genesis 2:3).</td>
<td>נַכְּלֶת קַדִּשָּׁבָה מֶכֶבֶּת (&quot;And Moses blessed them,&quot; Exodus 39:43).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the chart above, Blenkinsopp who suggested this parallel interpreted it according to "the priestly writers who intended to picture in the erection of the Tabernacle the climax of creation.\(^{20}\) Since the Sanctuary is in the divine sphere of holiness, strict lines of separation were enforced (e.g. Exodus 28:43; 30:1-10, 17-21; Leviticus 16), since the priests live both in the sacred and the profane realms (though at different times). Therefore, in order to serve as priests in the divine sphere, they, like all objects used in the service, had to be sanctified or

\(^{20}\)Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” \textit{CBQ} 38 (1976), p. 286. However, I take exception with this as Genesis 1:31 views the creation of man as the pinnacle of creation, as is affirmed by the psalmist's commentary on this text: נַכְּלֶת קַדִּשָּׁבָה אֶלֶף מֶכֶבֶּת ("You have made him a little lower than God, and have crowned him with glory and honor; You have made him to rule over the works of Your hands; You have put all things under his feet [dominion]"), Psalm 8:6-7. Yet, if Adam's role can be seen as that of a priest within an Edenic sanctuary, it might be argued that man's created purpose was to worship God. Therefore, the climax of creation would be God's relationship to His creation via the representative rulership of man, and man's (as a part of the created order) worship of the Creator. With the disruption of this relationship and the removal from the Garden, the erection of the Tabernacle could then be construed as the "restoration" of the creation climax.
consecrated (Leviticus 8-10), and Israel as a Nation, called to be “YHWH’s servants,” likewise had to be sanctified in its relations with other nations (hence, the purity laws, Leviticus 11:44-45; and imitated holiness in moral conduct 19:2). The significance of the holiness of the Sanctuary and its cultus has been summarized by Grammie:21

(1) The priestly theology of holiness strongly endorses clear differentiation between priests and laity and in turn favors singling out one individual priest above others to have access to an area designated as the most holy. This is not only reflected in the gradation of holiness among cultic personnel, but with all people and objects that are associated with the Sanctuary.

(2) The Tabernacle represents the presence of YHWH in His holiness and glory (כָּבוֹד).22 In Exodus 29:42b-44 YHWH sanctifies the tent, altar, and priests by His “glory.” The connection of כָּבוֹד with the Sanctuary is an important one, especially emphasized by the biblical prophetic writers and apocalypticists. Later in his study, Grammie mentions its use in apocalyptic doxologies as a liturgical feature, and observes that for Ezekiel the term is used synonymously with שָׁוֶי to express YHWH’s incomparable holiness that will transform the world to the divine ideal and draw all nations to the divine presence in Zion.23 In

21John G. Grammie, Holiness in Israel (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 16-19 argued significance in six points. I do not find everything in each of his points particularly relevant to this discussion, and therefore, I have been not only selective of his material, but have embellished freely.

22The root כָּבוֹד has the idea of making heavy, as reflected in the Pi‘el form כָּבוֹד (“to ascribe weight”), i.e., “to honor.” In the classic study of the term by Freiherrn von Gall, Die Herrlichkeit Gottes (Gieseen: J. Ricker [Alfred Töpelmann], 1900), he observed that it also had the connotations of wealth, might, well-being, and power.

Exodus, as in the Prophets, the movement of the divine presence was independent of human action and initiative.

(3) The Tabernacle does not represent the fixed presence of YHWH in a given spot or locale. Its collapsibility and portability were a symbol of the mobility of the divine presence and holiness. I would add that this was rather evidenced by the movement of the Shekinah as it came and went from the tent (i.e., Ark), cf. Numbers 12:10, signaling its corresponding movement (Exodus 40: 35-38; Numbers 9:17-23). Moses would go to the tent of meeting only when the divine presence had returned, thus evoking the petition in Numbers 10:36: נַשְׁכֵּל הַיָּarda רַבֹּתָה אֶל אֶזְבָּל (“Return Thou, O YHWH to the myriad thousands of Israel”). This would conform better with the expression of the divine intention to have a central Sanctuary in Zion (Exodus 15:17), and would still permit the symbolism of the movement of divine holiness, since it in fact did depart and return, depending upon the consequence of desecration or consecration of the Sanctuary (Ezekiel 11:1-23; Haggai 2:5-9).

(4) The sequestering of the Holy place and the Holy of Holies from normal view, the slaughter of sacrificial animals at the altar outside the tent of meeting, the daubing of altars and other sancta with blood, the burning of incense in the Holy place, and the cloud of smoke, all suggest a symbolism of the divine sphere of holiness (what Grammie calls “the Other World”), namely the realm of danger and death. If the relationship that we have suggested between the sacred quadrants of Mount Sinai and the divisions of the Tabernacle/Temple existed, then there was in these

24 Contra Noel David Freedman. “Temple Without Hands,” pp. 21-28, who would see this as a reference to Mount Sinai, not Mount Zion. I agree with Freedman that this probably has in view the heavenly Temple, but follow the references forward from Mount Sinai, never intended to be a permanent Sanctuary, to Mount Zion (Exodus 23:20; 32:34; Psalms 2:6; 44:2; 68:16; 76:2; 78:54, 69; 80:8, 15; 132:13-14) where the fit is better with the significance of the ‘Akidah Yizhak (Genesis 22:14).
things a constant reminder of the warnings issued from Sinai to avoid contact with YHWH’s holiness (Exodus 19:12-13, 16-24; 20:18-19).

(5) The holiness of YHWH is set in relief by intentional acts of desecration (Pi‘el of הלולא) that attempt to treat the holy as profane, and receive capital punishment as evidence of the severity of the violation against cultic law (i.e., rebellion against YHWH), cf. Exodus 31:14; Leviticus 22:9; Numbers 18:32. Each of these occurrences is in a context where YHWH’s holiness is compromised (e.g., Leviticus 22:31-32 where הלולא is in opposition to שַׁדַּע).

Jacob Neusner has also identified two general characteristics of this spectrum which are important to our concern with the Temple. 25 First, he observes that purity and impurity are cultic matters, and second, they may serve as metaphors for moral and religious behavior (especially in regards to sexual conduct, idolatry, and unethical action). He notes that in the literature prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, purity occurred as a symbol according to a predictable pattern: in Palestine, as a polemical motif for sectarian discourse and as a means of defining a sectarian community’s (e.g. the Qumran דתא, “commune,” and Pharisaic ח結合, “fellowship”) relationship to the Temple, and in the Diaspora (and after A.D. 70 also in Palestine) as a basis for moralistic allegory (e.g. Philo and the Amoraim).

In the first instance, the reference point of the sects is the actual Temple, whereas with the second, it is of a spiritualized concept of the Temple. Neusner concludes his point with the observation that nearness to the cult will yield concrete and socially significant interpretations of purity, while distance from the Temple will result in the interpretation of purity in terms other than of cultic symbols (i.e., metaphorically). 26


26 This conclusion leads Neusner to the opinion (p. 26) that because this metaphorical regard for purity continued after the destruction of the Temple in Talmudic Judaism, that purity was never a strictly cultic concern (as the Priestly writers, whether historical or prophetic assert). However, he admits that the
Thus, we see that the holiness of YHWH was enshrined in the Temple, and was itself representative of the divine sphere of holiness which was unapproachable except through the cultus and according to specific rules governing personnel, times, and degrees of access. The Temple, then, stood as the paramount symbol of holiness for Israel and the nations. This holiness was communicated in a complex system of gradations, that affected every area of the cultic concern.

The Concept of Graded Holiness

The Tabernacle and later the Temple were accessible on the basis of graded sanctity. We can observe this beginning with the very materials used in the construction, namely gold (most precious) to copper (least precious) and in degrees of workmanship distinguished as ארון, קדש, הַצָּבָא, and (probably varieties of weaving and embroidery). This is also seen in materials used such as כְּנֶפֶץ (a mixture of wool and linen), Deuteronomy 22:11, which is prescribed for some materials (the more holy), but forbidden for private use (the least holy). Moving to the Sanctuary construction itself, these grades of sanctity move from within the Holy of Holies (the most sacred) to the Holy Place (less sacred) to the entrance porch (yet less sacred) to the courtyard (limited sacredness) to outside (not sacred).

This gradation is also emphasized by the type of person who may enter the various precincts, e.g. in Torah: Moses in the Holy of Holies at all times, the High Priest (Aaron) only once a year at Yom Kippur (Leviticus 16:2ff), the Cohanim ("priests"), the Leviim ("levites"), and Am-Israel ("the [ordinary] people of Israel") each assigned to various zones. The clothing of the High Priest also displayed this

immense system of law and observances, especially those preserving the procedural details of the priestly service (e.g. Mishnah tractate Middot), are difficult to explain in light of the later development by the rabbis. It is my opinion that Middot was intended to serve as a priestly manual in the time of the restoration, for why else would such complex measurements of the Temple, which have spiritual significance, be preserved if they did not envision an actual rebuilding of the Temple and the re-establishment of the cultus? Even though the cult was inoperable after A.D. 70, if this was their original intent, then purity should properly be interpreted only in terms of the Sanctuary structure.
concept of gradation, for its degrees of sanctity descended from the head to the feet: mitre (with inscription לֶדוֹת הָרֶשֶׁת), ephod, chazan, and tzitz, and were also reflected in the color scheme from blue (most sacred) to purple (lessened a degree from blue by the addition of a less sacred color) to crimson (least sacred).

Apart from the above gradations in the Sanctuary it has been suggested in the previous chapter that the Tabernacle was constructed with precincts that corresponded to the boundaries and quadrants of revelation displayed on Mount Sinai. These likewise reveal gradation of holiness as one moves from the top of the mountain where YHWH's presence dwelt to the mid-section of the mountain, presumably where Moses and the seventy elders met with YHWH, and the foot of the mountain, where the Israelites were stationed within sacred boundaries, and of course, correspond to the tri-partite division of both Tabernacle and Temple as courtyard/porch (הֵרֶם), Holy place (רֵאל), and Holy of Holies (קְרוֹן).²⁷

Edmund Leach refines this mapping of sacred space according to the biblical texts of Exodus 25-30 and Leviticus 1-10, 16. From these he compared the cosmological space categories or sphere of holiness which threatened potential death and danger to all who approached the Sanctuary complex. This sacred/spatial relationship may be diagrammed as shown on the following page.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Categories</th>
<th>Cosmological Space Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside the camp</td>
<td>Wild Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside the camp</td>
<td>Tame Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Place of Assembly]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of the Tabernacle</td>
<td>Intermediate Zone A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Relatively secular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altar of Burnt Offerings</td>
<td>[Middle Ground]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Fire</td>
<td>Threshold between This World and the Other World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side:</td>
<td>Intermediate Zone B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Place</td>
<td>(Relatively sacred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table, Menorah, altar of incense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtain</td>
<td>Final Limit of This World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side:</td>
<td>[Shrine proper]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy of Holies</td>
<td>The Other World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gradation is also evident in the relation of the degrees of impurity associated with each area of the Sanctuary. Milgrom makes this identification in his description of the aerial quality of impurity, i.e., its ability to defile the sacred sphere from a distance. He observes that the power of impurity to pollute the Sanctuary occurs in three stages, each in relation to a specific area.\(^{28}\)

The first, and least grade of impurity are the inadvertent misdemeanors of the individual, which only pollute the courtyard altar, which is then purged by the application of blood from the מִנָּחָן (usually a "sin-offering," however Milgrom argues for it as a "purification-offering")\(^{29}\), Leviticus 4:25, 30; 9:9.

The second, and next highest grade of impurity are the inadvertent misdemeanors of the High Priest or the entire community, which pollute the Holy place, which is then cleansed by the High Priest by placing the מִנָּחָן blood on the altar of incense and before the veil of the מַעֲטּוֹן ("the mercy seat" or "lid" of the Ark), Leviticus 4:5-7, 16-18.

Third, and the most aggravated offense, is wanton (unrepentant, deliberate) sins, which not only pollute the outer altar, but penetrate into the מַעֲטּוֹן, considered the footstool of the divine presence. Since the sinner in this case is forbidden to offer his מִנָּחָן sacrifice (Numbers 15:27-31), purgation of the Sanctuary must wait until Yom Kippur, when the entire Sanctuary is sprinkled with blood (Leviticus 16:16-19). From this distinction in the grades of impurity, we can see that the severity of the impurity varies in direct relation to the depth of penetration into the Sanctuary, again reinforcing the holiness of the Temple.

---


\(^{29}\)For Milgrom’s defense of this position and further discussion of the logic of the מִנָּחָן sacrifices, cf. his *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity* 36 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984), pp. 67-95.
Holiness and Eschatology

When we move to the eschatological dimension, we have already seen how the earthly Sanctuary is aligned with the קדשׁ or heavenly archetypal Sanctuary. In the same way, the order reflected in the careful gradation of holiness is a mirror of the divine order that has imposed its “blueprint” for harmony in the midst of disorder (sin) through the cultus. The order and perfection of the cult became the very inspiration for the eschatological order (Ezekiel 40-48; cf. Revelation 21). In the Prophets, the expectation eschatological Kingdom, in which was expected the realization of the divine ideal, appears to bind together and focus the various aspects of the cultus. Solomon Schechter's words may reflect this idea in later Judaism:

Holiness is the highest achievement of the Law and the deepest experience as well as realization of righteousness. It is a composite of various aspects not easily definable, and at times even seemingly contradictory. But diverging as the ideals of holiness may be in their application to practical life, they all originate in the conception of the kingdom, the central idea of Rabbinic theology ...  

We will see this also in Daniel, who carefully seeks to discern the eschatological order with respect to his visions (cf. Daniel 2, 7:1-12), and especially the desecration and restoration of the Temple (Daniel 9:24-27). The ariel pollutions of the Sanctuary, which contributed to the desecration or desanctification of the Temple, and its destruction, also experience reversal or sanctification, along the lines of gradation. The restoration begins by a

30Solomon Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 199. Schechter has in mind the visible universal Kingdom of God, which, as he puts it is: “... derived from the Shema ... [and is] described by some Rabbis as the very Truth (or essence) of Torah,” (p. 65). However, the national kingdom, the other aspect of the visible kingdom, is viewed by Schechter as the time in which the real Unity expressed by the Kingship Benediction (Deuteronomy 6:4) will be realized (p. 96).

regathering of exiles (from the least sacred area), cf. Ezekiel 36:24a, then to the return to and revitalization of the Land of Israel (the next highest area of sanctity), cf. Ezekiel 36:24b, 28, 30, then to the purification of the people (i.e. the human sphere, the next highest realm of holiness), cf. Ezekiel 36:25-27, and finally to the restoration of the Temple and cultus (i.e., the divine sphere, the highest realm of holiness), Ezekiel 36: 37-38; 40-48.

Our study of the Holiness Spectrum provides a good starting point for an analysis of the cultic concepts of קַדְשׁ and מָצָא, which will be essential elements in our desecration motif. Purity was necessary for consecration or any approach to the holy, and it was important that no impurity came into contact with the holy. On the other hand, re-entering the profane realm was a natural event. Yet, any attempt to intentionally desecrate the permanently holy was a major offense. Desecration and defilement can also describe activities that were not strictly associated with the Sanctuary, but which had serious effects on the relationship between YHWH and his Israel that stood at the heart of the cult. We will now turn to consider in greater depth, how desecration and defilement affect the Sanctuary in particular as a background to the study of our motif.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif

The motifs of desecration and restoration of the Temple are in themselves separate motifs that are only joined when viewed in the eschatological dimension. It will be necessary, therefore, to first study each of these motifs individually and then under their re-structured form in an eschatological framework. We will first consider the concept of desecration and in particular, desecration of the Sanctuary, paying special attention to the terms לֹא וְיָדָעַ and מִימֶנ, then move to the concept of restoration, again with a focus on the restoration of the Temple. We will then present the eschatological motif as it combines these elements and describe its specific contribution to the theology of the Tanach.
The Concept of Desecration

Having seen the positive side of holiness in the Tanach, we are prepared to understand the negative aspect of the concept, that of desecration. According to Nilton Amorim who has done extensive study of the term, the concept of desecration in Tanach implies the passage (voluntary or involuntary) from the state of רְדֵד ("holy") to one of מִכְרָר ("profane"), i.e. it is the process by which someone or something that has been previously considered holy or consecrated (which is required to approach the realm of the holy), was used or ascribed to be used in a profane way.\(^{32}\) The word "desecration," then, has the specific sense of losing the sacred or holy status (or dimension) and coming to the realm of the common or profane.\(^{33}\)

The concept of desecration is also used metaphorically to signify the breaking of the covenant, since the covenant also has a holy dimension. It can, therefore, be rendered by the various English expressions "profanation,"\(^{34}\)

\(^{32}\) Nilton Amorim, *op. cit.*, p. 162. His support for this definition derives from the apparent distinction that he has argued exist between the nouns רְדֵד ("desecration") and מִכְרָר ("defilement"), and their respective verbal forms מִכְרָרִל and מִכְרָרִל from the same roots. If מִכְרָר ("defilement") is the passage from the state of being מִכְרָר ("clean") to one of being מִכְרָר ("unclean"), then ("desecration") is the process of passing from a state of being רְדֵד ("holy") to being רְדֵד ("profane"), cf. pp. 338-344. One of the primary differences between the two terms is that "defilement" has in view the acquisition of something (usually seen as contagious), while "desecration" has in view the loss of something, i.e., its holy dimension, cf. p. 191, n. 2.

\(^{33}\) One way in which this loss affects what is holy is by reducing or removing the wholeness or completeness (as a dimension of holiness) of a thing. Examples of this are the desecration of stones when they are broken, vines when they are harvested, or virgins when they lose their virginity (outside of marriage).

\(^{34}\) The English term "profanation," has a strictly pejorative connotation while the Hebrew concept of desecration includes both legitimate, voluntary (necessary) desanctification as well as illegitimate, involuntary (unnecessary) desanctification. Since our use of the term is restricted to illegitimate desanctification we will use the English term as a synonym, but the Hebrew distinction needs to be kept in mind.
“desacralization,” and “desanctification.” Our use of the term “desecration” is limited to the negative or illegitimate (involuntary) associated with the verb הָלַשָׁן ("desecrate," “profane”), as the positive or legitimate (voluntary) aspect plays only a secondary role in the concept and is generally regarded as an exception to the rule.

Negative desecration (הלשן) is used in two principal contexts. The first, and most extensive, is related to things normally considered as holy such as the divine Name, the Sanctuary, the sancta, the Sabbath, and the covenant. The second, and less extensive, is in connection with things generally not regarded as holy, e.g., vines, stones, and virgins. Our discussion here will center on the first major context, with a brief discussion of the desecration of the Sabbath and the divine Name, followed by a discussion of the Sanctuary as the object of הָלַשָׁן.

The Desecration of the Sabbath

Both the Name of YHWH and the Sabbath could be “desecrated” by any act of idolatry. A relationship seems to exist between the Sabbath and the divine Name as objects of הָלַשָׁן since the Sabbath was a symbol of creation that pointed to YHWH as the Creator. Therefore, to worship an idol was to profane the Sabbath, since this was tantamount to forsaking the Creator commemorated by it. The Sabbath was also the first object mentioned in the Torah as יִיְדַע.

---

35By the sancta we mean the entire range of cultic offerings and gifts presented to the altar. The term is drawn from its use in Leviticus 22:3 where in pleonastic form the text says “the holy things (והלכד) which the people of Israel dedicate (הלכד) to the Lord.” The regulation of the use of the sancta are found in Leviticus 22 and Numbers 18 where only those ritually pure may partake of the sancta.


37Cf. Exodus 31:17; Ezekiel 20:7, 12-24, 26-31, 43 where the Sabbath was considered a “sign” between the Creator and the creature, and idolatry is seen as
("sanctified"), Genesis 1:3, and as such it was intended as a means to sanctify the people of Israel. Its desecration by idolatry thereby brought desecration to the divine Name, and the predicted retributive results. In this regard, Jeremiah argued that the violation of the Sabbath was one of the causes of the deportation (Jeremiah 17:19-27), a notion reinforced by Nehemiah after the return from exile (Nehemiah 13:17-18). The very fact of deportation and captivity was itself an act of desecration of the divine Name, since it reduced the incomparability of YHWH to that of a common deity in the sight of the surrounding nations (Ezekiel 36:20-22).

The Desecration of the Divine Name

The name was representative of the nature or essence of the one who bore it in the ancient Near East, and therefore, we may assume that the "Name" of YHWH was a hypostasis of His Being, or an extension of the divine Personality

having an equal effect on the people, the Sabbath, and the Name of YHWH. To worship an idol was to deny the creative power of YHWH, which the Sabbath symbolized, and therefore to vitiate the significance of the Sabbath. As objects of הָנַח, the divine Name comes in first with twenty uses, the Sanctuary next, and the Sabbath a close second with eleven uses.

38Cf. Walter Kaiser, "מו", TWOT, Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason Archer, Jr., And Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), II: 934-935; (Johannes Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture (Oxford: University Press, 1959), I-I, p. 245 notes that "in Semitic thought the 'name' is indicative of the character and person to whom it is applied, for it is a revelation of the inner being of a thing, its true essence. To know the name of a man is to know his essence," cf. E. W. Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in the Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), p. 409 who adds, "when used in connection with God, shem has a greater emphasis than if only 'God' were used, meaning 'God Himself,'" cf. further A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God (Cardiff: The University of Wales Press, 1964), pp. 17f; O. Grether, "Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament," BZAW 64 (1934), pp. 59f, E. C. Rust, Covenant and Hope: A Study in the Theology of the Prophets (Waco: Word Books, 1964), p. 133.
(cf. Genesis 32:28; Psalm 20:1; 32:21), and as such was associated with His reputation as the God of the covenant (Exodus 3:14-17; 6:2-4).\(^{39}\)

The holiness of the divine Name is understood, especially from the prohibition of the third commandment (Exodus 20:7), however, in contexts of desecration (e.g. Ezekiel 36) the point is emphasized by the expression יְהֹウェָה ("My Holy Name"). In acts of the desecration of the Name, the agent is usually Israel (some 17 of the 20 appearances of יְהֹוה with הָאֱלֹהִים).\(^{40}\) Four of these references are to the levitical priests (representing Israel as spiritual leaders) who are being warned against committing acts of desecration in regard to idolatrous practices, in relation to the sancta, or in illegitimate offerings (Leviticus 18:21; 19:12; 21:6; Malachi 1:6-8). In one case (Ezekiel 39:7), YHWH appears as the subject of the expression יְهوֹוָה, however, an intermediary agent of judgment should be understood here (generally, the Babylonians), especially since the argument in the passage is that YHWH will not permit His Name to be further desecrated.\(^{41}\)

The causes of the desecration of the Name are primarily connected with idolatry,\(^{42}\) but also with idolatry that has forced YHWH to exile Israel, thus

\(^{39}\) Two examples of this may be noted: (1) The divine Name is connected with a covenant made with the Gibeonites by Israel, which had to be honored because it had been ratified by an oath sworn in the Name of YHWH (Joshua 9:6-7, 15, 20-21), (2) The Name of YHWH is part of the Decalogue that represents the major stipulations of the covenant, cf. for a complete discussion of this association, Jean Kinyongo, Origine et signification du nom divin Yahvé à la lumière de récents travaux et de traditions sémitico-bibliques (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1970).

\(^{40}\) The references either depict Israel as the primary agent of desecration or because of conduct that has resulted in others (usually the foreign nations, e.g. Ezekiel 36:20-23) desecrating the Name. In this later case, Israel remains the subject of הָאֱלֹהִים, and is denoted as the causative agent by the use of the Pi'el stem with an intensive nuance.

\(^{41}\) YHWH, however, is the subject of the action of הָאֱלֹהִים in other texts. For a discussion of the role of a secondary agent in divine judgment texts cf. Walter Harrelson, “Guilt and Rites of Purification Related to the Fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.,” Numen 15 (1968), pp. 218-221.

\(^{42}\) E.g., the worship of Molech through infanticide, a special abuse during the period of the Monarchy, was proleptically connected with desecration of the
bringing His reputation into blasphemous reproach. To prevent this later form of desecration, YHWH was said to have intervened on behalf of Israel in the Sinai despite their acts of idolatry (Ezekiel 20:9, 14, 22). In addition, oaths that are sworn falsely in YHWH’s Name bring desecration of the Name (Leviticus 19:12; Jeremiah 34:15-16). Therefore, we may say that the Name of YHWH is desecrated by cultic practices, usually taking the form of idolatrous acts or false oaths that bring disrepute to the character of YHWH or else misrepresent His attributes among pagans who make Him common as an impotent local deity.

The Desecration of the Sanctuary

Our discussion of the desecration of the Sanctuary will first consider its desecration in light of the terms הָלָל ("desecration") and מֵסָה ("defilement") which we have been discussing, and then, secondly, move to a particular focus on the desecrating object described by the root כֹּסָף which will play an important role in developing the desecration/restoration motif from the Tanach (Daniel) through the apocalyptic literature, and to the New Testament.

When we refer to the desecration of the Sanctuary (קדש) we must also include whatever is identified with it as part of its cultus, in this case the sancta (קדש). First, any desecration of the sancta implied a transgression of those regulations that were given in order to preserve their holiness. This is evident in that of the five occurrences of the sancta as the object of הָלָל, four appear in the form of legal prescriptions, the majority of which refer to the priests (Leviticus 22:9, 15; Numbers 18:32), and one to the people of Israel in general, but probably

Name in the Holiness Code (Leviticus 18:21; 20:3; cf. 19:27-28 and Deuteronomy 14:1 in connection with pagan mourning practices) and Isaiah condemns idolatry that leads to desecration of YHWH’s Name (Isaiah 48:5-11).

43One unusual case that may be added to this list is that of Amos 2:7-8 which involves both a violation of the Holiness Code and a cultic transgression. This may be considered an extension of idolatrous desecration (like that in Ezekiel 22:26 where priests abuse the cultus) or else an exceptional instance of moral violation as a causitive agent (like that in Ezekiel 13:19 which is connected to an ethical injustice).
only with respect to the peace-offering (Leviticus 19:18). In the case of the sancta, it is not idolatry that brings desecration, but a failure to enact the exact legislation connected with it. In this respect it differed from the Sanctuary, which can be desecrated by idolatry, however, the difference may relate to the focus on the priest, who alone managed the sancta and whose conduct either preserved its sanctity or desecrated it.

The Sanctuary was indeed the sancta sanctorum. When compared in sanctity to the Land, Jerusalem, or any other place in Eretz-Israel, its holiness was above all. As we have seen, it had gradations of holiness, beginning at the Holy of Holies which contained the Shekinah, and which was considered the holiest place on earth. As a physical emplacement, its sanctity could be affected by physical contact (i.e., direct contact) with anyone ritually unqualified to approach it (the people or priests), but especially by the presence of foreigners, however, YHWH Himself is also said to desecrate His Sanctuary. Taking these agents of desecration in turn, we find that in the minority of instances the people or priests (or in some cases, kings, cf. II Chronicles 26:16-21) desecrate the Sanctuary, although it is often said that it is “defiled” (מִשָּׂדַך) by Israel.45

---

44These regulations primarily governed the priests since they alone were permitted to use all the offerings, whereas the people in general were only allowed to partake of the peace-offering, considered to be invested with a lesser degree of holiness. Ezekiel 22:26 makes the statement that not only have the priests not made a distinction between the holy and the common, neither had they taught the people the difference between the clean and the unclean. The first distinction is within the realm of the Sanctuary, the domain of the priest, whereas the second, while affecting the priests, relates specifically to the people. In this light, perhaps the idea in Leviticus 19:18 is a specific case of regulation intended to teach these basic distinctions and thus prevent violations of other prescriptions.

45The reason for this, as we will see, is that the primary agents of Sanctuary desecration are non-Israelites, therefore, Israelite violation in relation to the Sanctuary is reserved usually to the realm of defilement. Amoraim, op. cit., p. 216 observes that idolatry only “desecrates” the Name and the Sabbath, but it also “defiles” the Sanctuary. The evidence seems to indicate that the Sanctuary is defiled by indirect contact, i.e., by sins (acts of idolatry, deliberate negligence of purification in cases of defilement, and other moral sins) committed by people, even when they have no contact with it. The only clear allusion to defilement by
Desecration by priests may be demonstrated in two instances, first by the High Priest (Leviticus 21:12) whose physical presence (e.g. on Yom Kippur) would desecrate the Sanctuary if he “went out,” (מָזַלְתָּם לִשְׁנָה) i.e., abandoned his duty for the purpose of a defiling activity (e.g. attending a funeral, cf. verse 11), and second by a priest who is not in a proper cultic condition (e.g. has a disfigurement), and physically enters the Sanctuary (Leviticus 21:23). Still within the realm of direct physical contact is instance of an idol erected within the Sanctuary (cf. Ezekiel 23:39), in which case the presence of the idolater himself is the direct agent of desecration, while the idol (or idolatry) is the indirect agent.

As mentioned above, the chief agent of desecration is the foreign element. While the evidence from Tanach does not unambiguously support the notion that foreigners were intrinsically unclean, the idea did develop during the intertestamental period and appears in various forms in the first-century A.D. direct contact is when idols are actually set up within the Sanctuary itself (see above on Ezekiel 23:39), in which case the presence of the idols is defiling.

46 The argument for Gentiles being considered unclean is derived from two principal texts: (1) Isaiah 52:1 which parallels “uncircumised” with “unclean,” however, not explicitly with reference to Gentiles. The context would allow for the first reference to be Gentiles (“uncircumised”), but the second (“unclean”) might also refer to Israelites whose misconduct had also contributed to the fall of the city. In this case not one, but two different categories of people are in view. Even if it does refer to one group, it may only mean that “Gentiles” will no longer enter the city to establish “uncleanness” (i.e., idolatry) in it any longer. (2) Joshua 22:19; cf. Ezra 9:11; Amos 7:17; Leviticus 18:24-27, where lands outside of Israel are considered to be unclean. However, upon careful examination of the texts, it is not the inhabitants (as “unclean” in themselves) of these lands which render them unclean, but the presence of idolatry (just as the presence of pagan altars in Israel defiled the Land).

47 Cf. A. Büchler, “The Levitical Impurity of the Gentile in Palestine before the Year 70,” JQR 17:2-4 (1926-1927): 1-81. He concluded that the levitical impurity of the Gentile was instituted by the rabbis about the year 1 as a novelty going beyond the law in Leviticus 15. Its first stage was the extension of the rules of the menstruous Jewish woman to the Gentile woman, and the communication of her impurity to her Gentile husband; and as she did not observe the purification rites, she remained permanently in the levitical state of the menstruous woman. Later, the Hillelites attempted the same sort of extension based on corpse defilement, but failed due to the opposition of the Shammaites. Again, in A.D. 66, grave impurity was ascribed to the Gentile, but the outbreak of the Jewish Revolt
Regardless of whether or not the foreigner was considered to be unclean, his presence, by virtue of invasion, in the Sanctuary was an act of desecration (cf. Ezekiel 25:3 of the Babylonians). We find an example of this in Ezekiel 7:21-24 where הַרְעָעִים ("foreigners"), verse 21, and הַרְעֹיֵים ("the worst of nations"), verse 24, pictured as פָּרְעֹיִים ("robbers"), verse 22, invade the Temple and enter into the Holy Place, here called דֶּהָל ("My secret place").

As a result, three times in these verses the Temple is the object of הַדָּלֶל. In Psalm 74:7 the destruction of the Temple, connected here with the divine Name, is considered "desecrated" (דֶּהָל) by the invading Babylonians. YHWH Himself is sometimes seen as the agent of desecration (e.g. Ezekiel 24:21), however, though the causative agent, He is not the responsible agent, since He employs secondary

prevented any practical application. The records show that such assumed levitical impurity only affected the priest on duty in the Temple, and the ordinary Jew when purified for participation in the Temple in a sacrificial meal; it did not restrict private or commercial relations, and the Gentile could even move freely about on the Temple Mount until the first century when the boundary was pushed back by the erection of the סורג. Similarly, with respect to the case of Gentile proselytes, Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I," *JJS* 33:1-2 (1982): 215-225, concludes that "none of the [Jewish] sources we have considered provides decisive evidence that proselytes were actually excluded from the Jerusalem Temple. Rabbinic texts preserve halakhot which presuppose the entrance of נרтем ("proselytes") into the Temple courtyard. The Temple inscription, despite the possibility of taking διάγενεσ [non-Jews, of alien descent, including proselytes] literally, was not applied to proselytes. Thus, it would appear that the Qumran rulings which essayed to keep converts out of the sanctuary belonged to the realm of purest desiderata not realized in contemporary Temple practice, "p. 225. We should add here the account in the New Testament (Acts 21:27-28) which recounts the violent opposition to Paul when it was mistakenly assumed that he had taken a Gentile proselyte (Titus) into the Temple to offer sacrifice. In this record Paul is accused of ἐκκολοικεῖν ("has defiled") the ἅγιον τόπον ("holiest place") i.e., ἱερόν ("the Temple"), verse 28.

48It is also possible that there is another reference to the Temple in verse 24 with the word מְסֻכָּר יָדָד. The Massoretic text points this as a Piel participle ("they that sanctify them"), however many commentators would suggest an emendation to read "their holy places," in which case the plural may refer to the various departments of the Temple, cf. Walther Zimmerli, *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* Translated by Ronald Clements (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 1: 200.
agents (i.e. foreigners) to execute His judgment, and then holds them accountable for any arrogance displayed in being so used (cf. Isaiah 14:4-6; Habakkuk 1:6; 2:4-5). Thus, the desecration of the Sanctuary is seen to be the result of physical contact through the presence of a transgressor (one not in a proper cultic condition). Desecration may be seen to be expected in an ascending order of probability: Israelites (least likely since rarely approach Sanctuary), priests (less likely since are careful to be in proper cultic condition), and foreigners (most likely, since have no concern for cultic condition).

**Desecration and Defilement of the Sanctuary**

We have said that certain things such as the Sabbath and the divine Name can only be the object of הלל, however, the Sanctuary can be the object of both המנין and הלל. The illegitimate defilement of the Sanctuary implies that an Israelite transgressor is in a persistent and deliberate condition of defilement. In Leviticus 15:31 the people of Israel are warned not to incur uncleanness lest they die in this state (having neglecting purification) and thereby defile the Sanctuary (here called מֶלֶךְ, "My Sanctuary").

The same is said for the person who incurs corpse impurity and fails to obtain purification (Numbers 19:13, 20). As already observed, idolatry indirectly defiles the Sanctuary by directly defiling the idolater (II Chronicles 36:14; Ezekiel 23:38-39), and also by the presence of idols placed within the Temple (Jeremiah 7:30; 16:18; 32:34). In these cases it is by a deliberate act (called in Numbers 15:30, "the soul that acts with a high-hand"). We may summarize by saying that the Sanctuary is defiled by intentional acts that culminate in rebellion, the highest degree of which is massive destruction (corpse

---

impurity), and to a lesser degree, the permanent presence of idols, and finally, to the least degree, the individual negligent cultic acts of Israelites.

Sanctuary Desecration and Abomination

In order to properly appreciate the horrific revulsion of the faithful Israelite to the act of Sanctuary desecration, it is necessary that we first survey the language of “abomination.” “Abomination” language refers to a group of related terms all translated by the general word “abomination.” Members of this word group include הֵסַקַּל (“abomination, detestable thing”) used only four times in Tanach (Leviticus 7:18; 19:7; Isaiah 65:4; Ezekiel 4:14) for edible meats that had become detestable (probably “rotten”) and were no longer to be eaten (cf. הֵסַקַּל in relation to the “peace-offering,” in Leviticus, and carcasses torn by animals, in Ezekiel), and הָהָד (“abominable act, wicked device”) from the root לִשְׁמֹם (“devise purpose, plot, scheme) used of acts of lewdness (Leviticus 18:17; 19:29; Jeremiah 13:27; Ezekiel 16:36, 43, 58; 22:9; 23:27-29, 35. 48-49; 24:13; Hosea 2:10), lustful crime (Judges 20:6), immorality (Leviticus 20:14), and evil machinations, plans (Psalm 140:8). These terms have been translated in the LXX by the Greek terms βεβηλωμα and βεβηλυκτος, the first of which renders both הֵסַקַל and הָהָד, and will be important for our study of the use of the expression יִכְפָּר וְכֹסְם (βεβηλωμα τῆς ἐρημωσεως) from Daniel 9:27 in the New Testament. Therefore, our survey will be exclusive to these two terms and will seek to compare and contrast them as expressions of “abomination” relating to Sanctuary and sancta defilement.

The Use of the Term הָהָד as “Abomination”

The term הָהָד, if we follow Albright’s suggestion, derives from an Egyptian stem wnb (“to purify, be clean”), which originally denoted the concept of inviolability or untouchability, and which experiencing polar developments in the cognate Semitic languages came to denote either “holiness” or “abomination.”

50William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1940), p. 176. If the verbal root is יִכְפָּר, then the Hebrew
In the Tanach, הַטְמוּנָה is always used negatively to refer to certain acts that are foreign to the Israelite cultus or the ethical standards dictated by it, and offends the sensibilities of or repulses another, hence “abomination.” It bears this connotation in Genesis 43:32; 46:34 where it was considered an “abomination” to Egyptians to eat with Hebrews, and to associate with shepherds.

Along these same lines of thought, the sacrifices of the Israelites were considered an “abomination” to the Egyptians (Exodus 8:22 [English, verse 26]).51 In most instances, הַטְמוּנָה has reference to that which is repugnant to YHWH, including pagan deities (II Kings 23:13), idolatrous images (Deuteronomy 27:15), [cultic] prostitution (Deuteronomy 23:18), “false weights,” i.e., inaccurate accounting (Proverbs 11:1), perverse attitudes (Proverbs 11:20), lying speech (Proverbs 12:22), illegitimate sacrifice (Proverbs 15:8; Isaiah 1:13), sorcery (Deuteronomy 18:12), sexual deviations [often cultic] (Leviticus 18:22; 20:13), and anything associated with Canaanite cultic activity (Leviticus 18:26; cf. frequent uses in Ezekiel).

From this partial listing (the term appears 142 times), we can observe that הַטְמוּנָה refers primarily to acts that are an “abomination” to the senses. This is the essential difference between it and the other nouns for “abomination,” which refer basically to things that violate the practice of YHWH’s cult. This distinction may permits us to understand the parallel use of קֶשֶׁר in Leviticus 11: and הַטְמוּנָה in Deuteronomy 14:3 as a designation for “unclean animals,” and קֶשֶׁר of in I Kings

verbal form הַטְמוּן must be considered a denominative secondarily derived from the noun הַטְמוּנָה. If the Hebrew, which has a completely negative meaning, derived from a positive root, it might be evidence of the theory proposed by W. Robertson Smith, op. cit., pp. 446-454, that there once existed in primitive communities a close relation (actually, a confusion) between ideas of “holiness” and “taboo,” although the anthropological arguments equating the holy with the unclean of have been contested in recent research, cf. Nilton Amoraim, op. cit., pp. 39-56.

51The source of these offenses may have derived from the cultural bias of the Egyptians who saw themselves as “the people” in contrast to foreigners (cf. Herodotus ii, 41), cf. J. C. Wilson, The Culture of Ancient Egypt (Chicago, University Press, 1956), p. 112.
11:5 and מְרַעֶב in II Kings 23:13 to describe Milcom of the Ammonites. In each case both terms designate that which is repugnant, מְרַעֶב an action repulsive to YHWH, the Israelites, or anyone so offended, and לָטֵס as an [“unclean”] thing repulsive in terms of the cult (for reasons explained below).

The Term לָטֵס as “Abomination”

The root appears forty-five times in the Tanach, primarily as a technical term to denote animals and other things that render the Israelite “unclean.” In its verbal form, occurring only in the Pi’el (לָטֵס) it appears seven times (Leviticus 7:18; 19:7; Isaiah 65:4; Ezekiel 4:14) with the factitive meaning of “abhor, detest,” but since what is detested is that which defiles, it has a causative connotation of “contaminate” or “make abominable.” This association is expressed in Leviticus 11:43; 20:25 where the root לָטֵס is paralleled with מָכָה, and in its close association with the meanings of the Pi’el forms of both מָכָה (“make unclean”) and מָלֵט (“abhor”).

Two nouns, לָטֵס and לָטֶס are derived from this root, both connected with things considered defiling, yet with different uses. The first, לָטֶס, appears eleven times and is always related to unclean animals (for dietary purposes), especially loathsome creatures such as the לַטּוֹ („swarming things,” Leviticus 11:10), and לָטֶס („creeping things,” Isaiah 66:17). The second, לָטֶס, appears twenty-eight times and is primarily used for idols as “detestable things,” and with the idolatrous practices associated with them (Deuteronomy 29:16 [English, verse 16a]).


לָטֶס is related to מָכָה in that the latter refers to dead carcasses (cf. Isaiah 65:4), while the former only to living animals (cf. Leviticus 7:21; 11:10-13, 20, 23, 41; Isaiah 66:17; Ezekiel 8:10).

Cf. Herman J. Austel, “לָטֶס,” TWOT 2: 955, who argues for both a reference to the “idols” and “something associated with the idolatrous ritual.” He adds: “Not only are the idols an abomination, but they that worship them become detestable like that which they love” (Hosea 9:10), for they identify themselves with the idols.”
The connection of קָרֶס with desecration (זָלַلد) is made by the fact that idols and idolatrous practices belong to a foreign cult, and everything that is foreign has the potential of either directly (through physical contact) or indirectly from afar (aerially), desecrating the Sanctuary. Idolatry also defiles (חָם) the Sanctuary, and every Israelite who engages in, or approaches, such idolatry. Our discussion of the use of קָרֶס in Daniel and its compound form מָשָׁלִים will build upon this foundation, and seek to demonstrate that the meaning there has an eschatological dimension that was discerned by the apocalyptic writers and Qumran covenanters, and developed via the LXX's βασανισμα τῆς ἥρμων as an eschatological motif especially in the New Testament by Jesus (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:20) and Paul (II Thessalonians 2:3-4).

In summary, our study of Sanctuary desecration (זָלַلد) has revealed that while desecration does not necessarily render the Sanctuary unholy (by the addition of the element of uncleanness), but only deprives it of holiness, desecration usually precedes defilement (חָם), which not only is the acquisition of a state of uncleanness, but also implies an alienation from the divine plan, requiring a purification. The Temple, however, like the Land of Israel, remains holy even when desecrated and defiled, because they are ultimately YHWH’s

---

55Like the desecration of the Sabbath and the divine Name, the Sanctuary (in the sense of the place of the divine Name), which have non-tangible qualities, and are only affected in a subjective way so that they do not lose their intrinsic holiness, but remain permanently holy, beyond the contagion of חָם. Only tangible objects, such as the Temple implements, and the physical structure of the Temple itself, can be not only desecrated, but also defiled, and thus acquire the pollution communicated by חָם. It should be noted that while holiness appears incompatible with uncleanness in persons, this is not necessarily the case with places. Still, while the condition may not be one of unholiness, it results in much the same affect with the withdrawal of the divine (holy) presence that gave it sanctity.
possessions, and His presence is there. Yet, when defilement occurs, since it is transmitted by acts of Israeli transgression, the covenant is violated, and the result is an abandonment of the Temple (and the Land) by YHWH.

Furthermore, the presence of idols or idolatrous practices is an "abomination" (יהוה), and brings both desecration and defilement to the Sanctuary and the Land which has harbored such "abominations." This is the ultimate loss, since now both Temple and Land are rendered common, and can be violated as any other place. It is this negative event which calls for restoration (and with it cultic purification) which forms the positive element of our motif.

The Eschatological Desecration Motif

Since the viewpoint of the Prophets was towards restoration in view of the rebuilding and rededication of the Temple and the reinstitution of its cultus, it would not be expected that they should have thought of a future desecration of the newly established and reconstituted Sanctuary. However, there was an awareness that Daniel's vision of the future and his reference to the שמדים (Daniel 9:26-27), predicted a second (and perhaps third) violation of the Temple. We will see (in chapter 7) that as the recognition among Jewish sectarian groups that the Second Temple had not conformed to the divine ideal, the viewpoint changed to expect a future desecration (and even destruction) of the Second Temple in order that the proper Restoration Temple might be constructed in its place. As we come

---

56 It does not appear that foreigners can bring about defilement, only desecration, and it is for this reason the Temple could be rebuilt after its desecration and destruction by the Babylonians without a purification ceremony (Ezra 3:2-13), but required purification after its defilement by an apostate Israelite priest (under orders of the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes) who sacrificed a sow on the altar (I Maccabees).

57 This may be the reason why lesser acts of defilement, such as that committed by Nadab and Abihu (Numbers 5:2-3), or those that threatened to defile, such as the case of Joab (I Kings 2:28, 31-34) and Queen Athaliah (II Kings 11:15) if slain in the Temple, do not have the same affect as a massive destruction, which would not only accumulate dead corpses in the Sanctuary (cf. Psalm 79:1; Ezekiel 9:6-9), but would remove the Temple's raison d'être.
to the New Testament and its use of the Danielic expression βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημωτεύσεως, we will see that it expects desecration, not only as a result of the failure of the Nation of Israel to accept Jesus as her Messiah, but as a necessary prelude to ultimate Jewish restoration and a future re-establishment of the cultus within an eschatological messianic setting.

The Eschatological Restoration Motif

The classic concept of restoration is what the French have called a bouleversement ("reversal"). The expression of this concept is presented in Tanach by the phrase שָׁבַּע יִבְרָאָה, which while variously translated is best rendered "restore fortunes." This phrase is built off the root שָׁבַע, which in the Qal stem appears 164 times in covenantal contexts, 113 of these in the literary prophets, with Jeremiah having the highest instance of usage (48 times). The reference in these cases is to the covenant community's "return" to YHWH, usually represented by a renouncing of idolatry, or some other form of cultic transgression (in the sense of "repentance"). These uses relate to a number of contexts in which שָׁבַע means "to return from exile" (in the Qal: Ezra 2:1; Nehemiah 7:6; Isaiah 10:22; Jeremiah 22:10; Zechariah 10:9, et. al.; in the Hiphil: I Kings 8:34; Jeremiah 12:15, et. al.). The association between these uses is of a restoration from exile that leads to a restoration to the covenant. As a result of the


frequency of this phrase and its use to identify restoration contexts, it has been termed the “restoration formula.”

Thus, we can see that the prophets, and especially the prophets of the exile, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who announced the radical reversal of Israel’s original fortunes, i.e. destruction, desolation, and exile, also are the foremost in the anticipation of a reversal of the reversal, i.e., restoration. As we will see, this motif of restoration is comprised of any of the following elements:

1. return to the Land of Israel (eschatological regathering),
2. return to the covenant relationship (a new exodus),
3. repentance for past conduct,
4. restoration of the Land (agricultural prosperity and military security),
5. restoration of the Nation (sociological or numerical increase),
6. restoration of the cultus (eschatological Temple, universal knowledge of YHWH, torah).

While all of these elements are essential to the complete presentation of the motif, our interest lies in the last of this list, that of cultic restoration.

**Eschatological Restoration of the Cult**

Restoration from a state of לארשי must be restoration to a condition of שְׁכָנִי. Since the center of holiness, and its point of dissemination to Israel and the world was the Sanctuary (with its sancta), then its restoration is essential to all other restorations. The familiar covenant triad of YHWH-People-Land should, therefore, be understood in light of the call for a central Sanctuary (Exodus 25:8) as YHWH with His people in their Land within a Temple.\(^{60}\) It was the presence of YHWH, represented by His signature - His Name- on the Temple that guaranteed Israel’s fulfillment of destiny as a chosen people in a chosen Land. In the

---

\(^{60}\) All of these elements equally are part of the restoration motif. The people receive an eschatological cleansing and the bestowal of YHWH’s Spirit (Jeremiah 31:33-34; Ezekiel 36:24-27; Zechariah 12:10), the Land receives an eschatological renewal (Ezekiel 36:28-35; 47:1-12; Zechariah 14:8), and the Temple is eschatologically restored to fulfill the creation mandate (cf. Jeremiah 33:14-21; Ezekiel 40-48).
revelation of YHWH at Sinai Israel’s unique destiny had been announced: יִתְנָה לְמָכְרָה מְכַל הַעַמָּה יִכְלֹם מֵעַמָּה תֹּעַלְמָה אַשְׁכַּמַּם וַהֲמוֹשֵׁנָה בָּכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶּׁמֶךָ יָשָּׁרֶד כְּגַם אִישׁ בְּזֵית אֶלֹהִים (“Now, then, if you will obey Me faithfully and keep My covenant, you shall be My treasured possession among all peoples, for all the world is mine”), Exodus 19:5.

The Temple was the means to faithful obedience to the covenant, for it contained the cultus which provided for Israel’s sanctification, without which the divine Presence could not remain. Without the Temple, the people would be a people without a God and without a Land, and thus, without a means to fulfill this divine purpose. If the Temple were desecrated, it must be restored, as a necessary consequence in the realization of Israel’s creation and calling. The prophets juxtaposed their announcements of desecration/judgment and restoration/salvation to emphasize the bond between these events in the divine destiny. Just as YHWH had dealt with the Nation in “wrath” (הָעֵקָד), so too would He deal with it in “mercy” (רְחֵם).61

As we have seen in our study of the concept of desecration, it must be understood within the context of holiness. So, too, must restoration. Just as holiness in Tanach depends upon YHWH as the Holy One, so also do Israel, its Land,62 and the Temple derive their holiness from Him. Since the Shekinah was understood to dwell in the Holy of Holies, i.e., in the midst of the camp/Nation, then holiness had to be maintained to preserve its presence. When desecration and defilement of the Sanctuary occurred (Ezekiel 8:1-18), that presence departed (Ezekiel 9:3; 4:4, 18-19; 11:22-23), and the announcement of dispersion and exile immediately followed (Ezekiel 12:11-16, 20).

61 Older theologians (especially of the German school) used to consider this schema under the overarching goal of Heils geschichte (“salvation history”). While this indeed explains one of the prominent themes of Tanach, it is perhaps too limiting.

Because the judgment on Israel was cultic in nature, it should not be surprising that Israel’s restoration would also be cultically-oriented. Jeremiah pictures YHWH’s restoration as a re-consecration of His holy mountain (Jeremiah 31:40), upon which Ezekiel sees a restored Temple with a functioning cultus (Ezekiel 40-48). The reason for the restoration of the cultus, in given, in Ezekielian priority, to the closing words of the last verse of his final chapter: יי יבש (‘YHWH is there’). In other words, it is the presence of YHWH that demands a restored Temple and cultus, and which also restores the fortunes lost historically and cultically through desecration.

**Eschatological Restoration of the Temple**

The eschatological period between the לֹא לֶא (“Exile, Diaspora”) and the עולם ה来る (“the present world”) is called ימי המשיח (“the days of Messiah”). During this period of eschatological restoration, later also referred to as the Redemption, the literary prophets of Tanach, as well as the apocalyptic writers who followed there lead, spoke of a restoration in this world for Israel that would unite the Nation (Jeremiah 3:18; Ezekiel 37:1-23; Isaiah 49:22-23; 60:1-9; Micah 7:14-17), promote it as the center of Gentile attraction (Zephaniah 3:20; Zechariah 8:23; Isaiah 14:1-2; cf. Deuteronomy 15:6; 28:13), be characterized as a period of unparalleled righteousness and holiness (Isaiah 32:16-20; 51:3; 55:12-13; 61:10-11; Zechariah 14:20-21), and that especially, the Temple and the sacrificial system would be restored.

This eschatological restoration was seen as first a restoration of the holy mountain (the highest in the world) as the foundation for the Temple (Isaiah 2:2-4; 27:13; 56:6-8; 66:20; Micah 4:1-2). To this site would then come worshippers from all the world to learn Torah at the Temple and to give allegiance to YHWH at His feasts (Zechariah 14:16-19; Isaiah 2:3; 60:6-9). A new Zadokite priesthood will be established and maintain the cultus to preserve a condition of holiness for Israel and the nations’ worship of YHWH (Ezekiel 44:1-46:24).
With this brief survey of the eschatological restoration Temple and cultus, we gain an understanding of the important place the Sanctuary held in restoration theology. If the people were to be regathered and re-united literally, if the Land was to be restored literally, then the restoration of the Temple must likewise be envisioned as a literal rebuilding. To be certain this motif encompasses the protological and eschatological realities paralleling the creation of the world and the Temple (Genesis 1-2; Exodus 25-31), but it does transform the reality of a physical structure in this world which embodies and points to the superior archetype. Nevertheless, our motifs of desecration and restoration function eschatologically as a single interdependent motif, on the one hand displaying the problem, and on the other depicting its resolution.

The Identification of the Desecration/Restoration Motif

We have seen that the dual motifs of desecration and restoration, that operate separately in the historical context, together form an eschatological motif. The identification of this motif will be through the recognition of key formulistic phrases that lead to both grammatical and literary correspondences between texts. For instance, we have seen in the Paradise story in Genesis a drama of an Edenic-Sanctuary with Adam as a priest performing cultic service for YHWH Who dwelt in the midst of the Garden. There we identified grammatical phrases that corresponded to cultic contexts elsewhere in the Pentateuch. At the conclusion of the narrative, after the ground has been declared defiled (Genesis 3:17-18), the man is “cast out, driven out” (שָׁאוּל) of the place of YHWH’s Presence (i.e., the Edenic-Sanctuary). The Pi’el imperfect of שָׁאוּל is used here, and in comparable cultic texts, as a technical expression of judgment for desecration.

For example, in 1 Kings 2:27 it is used for dismissal from the priesthood, while in Hosea 9:15 it is employed as a term for YHWH’s judgment in “casting” out Israel from the Temple. It is used to express both the desire of foreign oppressors to dispossess Israel from her Land (II Chronicles 20:11), and of YHWH’s dispossessing the Canaanites and others from Israel’s Land (Exodus 34:11; 23:29-30; Deuteronomy 33:27; Joshua 24:18; I Chronicles 17:21; Psalm
78:55). It is used of the Pharaoh’s “driving out” Israel (Exodus 6:1; 10:11; 11:1), however, this has an ironic tone, since in this case it was not a judgment, but a deliverance, and Israel was not “driven” from their Land, but to it. In Jeremiah 7:15, and in other cultic texts, the synonymous term הָשַׁלֶּם (Hiph’il imperfect of שלם) is used for expulsion from the Temple or cultic settings, cf. Ezekiel 28:17 of the “casting out” of the Edenic-archetypal Sanctuary.

Just as man was “cast out” of the Garden (Edenic-Sanctuary), so Israel was “cast out” from the Land (Jerusalem-Sanctuary). As Israel is returned (לשוב) to the Land (Tabernacle-Sanctuary) from their Egyptian exile, so Israel is returned (שוהה) to the Land (Temple-Sanctuary) from their Babylonian exile. Thus, eschatologically, any act of desecration which results in a “casting out,” (נשלה) will have a corresponding restoration in “bringing back” (לשוב), whether historically or eschatologically (as especially employed by the exilic and post-exilic prophets).

The Contribution of the Desecration/Restoration Motif to the Theology of the Tanach

The theme of reversal plays a significant role in the theology of the Tanach. Fortunes lost and fortunes restored is the theme dominating the prophetic discourses. Isaiah, in particular, whose theme of salvation through judgment is at the heart of this prophetic message, makes an analogy between the creation of the earth and the creation of Eretz-Israel (cf. Isaiah 45:18). The notion is eschatological, and parallels the original creation with a re-creation or restoration to the divine ideal. Even Isaiah’s presentation of the Temple embraces the eschatological dimension (Isaiah 66:1), seeking to put the visible symbol of YHWH’s presence in proper perspective to the restoration ideal.63

63 Some have seen here in Isaiah a protest against Temple building. For example, Paul Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 161-162, 228-229 believes that this represents evidence of an anti-temple group active in the restoration period. Apart from the controversies that still continue over the dating of its section of the book, it appears to me from the eschatological context of this passage that it would be interpreted in that light, rather than as a rejection of the continuation of the Temple as an outward symbol of the divine
When we begin to scan the horizon of the prophetic corpus, we find that the fulfillment of the prophetic hope, centered in this restoration, is obtainable only through a radical intervention of YHWH that brings a re-consecration to the people and the Land and a means to continue in holiness in this restoration period (also called the Age of Redemption). At the center of this concept of restored holiness was YHWH, Whose presence was linked by divine mandate to the cultic institution. If we remember from our above study that the people of Israel were joined to YHWH through the institution of the Sanctuary (whether Tabernacle, Temple, or eschatological Temple), then what renders them ritually impure thereby desecrates the Sanctuary and its sancta, and consequently forced the divine Presence to abandon the Nation and leave it in a common state, subject to foreign violation and destruction/exile.

The reversal of the condition of desanctification or desecration, is sanctification or restoration, and must be effected for the people by a return to holiness, i.e. through a rebuilt Temple. The divine ideal, as presented first in Eden, and then restored at Sinai, was that YHWH dwell permanently among His people, constituting them a holy and priestly Nation whose influence would ultimately subject the nations of the world to torah and restore the lost paradisal relationship between God and man. The heavenly Sanctuary served as the model for the earthly Sanctuary which communicated the divine design through the cultus and the laws of holiness. The earthly Sanctuary could be desecrated and destroyed, but because there continued the archetypal reality, neither its holiness nor its purpose in the sanctification of the Nation could be lost. It was destined to return with the return of Israel to the restored Land (Ezekiel 36:24, 28, 33-36; 37:1-14) and its cultic restoration (Ezekiel 36:25-27).

In addition, the eschatological David redivivus theology (Jeremiah 33:15; Ezekiel 37:24-25; Hosea 3:5; cf. Jeremiah 23:5-6; 30:9; 33:15) requires an eschatological Temple to complete the motif of David as the originator of the plan.

Presence. Isaiah is rather, like Haggai (cf. 2:1-9) anticipating a “greater glory” for the rebuilt Temple, and at the same time correcting a reductionist theology that had led to syncretism and outright idolatry, desecrating the First Temple.
to build the First Temple. It may have been the record of David’s well-known longing to construct the Temple (Psalm 132:3-5) that included in some of these references to his restoration the mention of YHWH’s Sanctuary being placed in Israel’s midst “forever” (Ezekiel 34:23-24; 37:26), and that the Levitical priests will never cease again in their service (Jeremiah 33:18). Indeed, Jeremiah connects the divine promise that David will not lack a man on the throne with the promise that the Levitical priest will never lack a man to fulfill their office (Jeremiah 33:17-18). The restoration of the Davidic dynasty is also mentioned in Amos 9:11, in a classic restoration context (ותבש, verses 14-15) of the restoration of both the people and the Land.64

In tracing through this motif in both Tanach, the apocalyptic literature, and the New Testament, we hope to show that within each eschatological schema of restoration presented in these texts, there is also included, or at least assumed, the restoration of the Temple and its cultus. The appearance of the Temple motif in analogous fashion in purification contexts in the New Testament, apart from the several eschatological/apocalyptic contexts in which the Temple plays a part in the drama of the eschaton, would argue for this conclusion.

---

64 This verse is understood as eschatological restoration by the New Testament in a citation from the LXX of both verse 11 and 12 in Acts 15:16-18. There, James specified that this prophecy would be fulfilled μετὰ ταῦτα (“after these things”), i.e., after the completion of the message of Messiah to the Gentile nations (cf. verses 12-14), and therefore, envisioned the fulfillment of the prophetic hope of a restored Davidic kingdom in which the Gentile nations as well as Israel would acknowledge YHWH’s sovereignty.
CHAPTER IV

THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION
MOTIF IN THE TANACH

Having surveyed the theological significance of the Temple and of the desecration/restoration motif associated with it eschatologically, in this chapter we will consider the protology of the Pentateuch, latent with possible cultic symbolism in the imagery of the Garden of Eden and its parallels in the Sinai traditions,\(^1\) that would later be combined with eschatology (the restoration to the divine ideal, i.e., Paradise and the Presence of YHWH) in the Prophets. We will then proceed to trace the foreshadowing of the motif through analogical correspondence in the Torah and the historical books. Here, beginning with the issuing of the divine command to Israel: הַעֲבוֹדָה לַפְּנֵי יְהוָה ("And let them make Me a Sanctuary"), Exodus 25:8a, the success of the fulfillment of the divine ideal: יֵשְׁתַּחַת בָּעָם ("that I may dwell among them"), Exodus 25:8b (cf. Exodus 29:45-46), has been demonstrated in the relationship of the elect Nation with respect to the Temple’s physical history. Our investigation of the desecration motif will consider the figure of the exodus Pharaoh as a type of pagan opposition to YHWH

---

\(^1\)Though scholarly investigation of the sanctuary motif in Genesis is recent, the view is at least as old as the Jewish midrashim. For example, Genesis Rabbah 16.5 commenting on the phrase Labour וה unleash "to work and keep [it]" noted that "another interpretation is an allusion to sacrifices." Apocryphal and Apocalyptic works (e.g. Wisdom of Ben Sira and Book of the Watchers) also saw connections between the Eden account and later eschatological narratives of the restored Temple in the Prophets (e.g. Ezekiel 40-48).
and His people, which casts the eschatological mold for the later figure of the Temple-Desecrator in Daniel, and the New Testament development as an Anti-Messiah.

Our procedure in the historical books\(^2\) will be to present a literary analysis of the relevant historical material from the perspective of our motif. Finally we will arrive at the prophetic period in which the motif will find its initial formal expression. A thematic analysis of the pre-exilic history as a literary drama will prepare us for the expectation of an eschatological Temple, arising from the consequence of desecration, and the need for restoration to the divine ideal. This expectation, as expressed by the restoration motif, will be examined in the exilic prophets by a study of Jeremiah’s Temple sermon and an exegetical analysis of Ezekiel 36, which lays the theological framework for the motif, and a brief analysis of Ezekiel 40-48, where the eschatological Temple is most fully presented.\(^3\) Finally, we will offer a survey of the use the desecration/restoration Temple motif in the post-exilic or Restoration prophets, whose formative concepts involving the motif prepare the way for the rise of apocalyptic in Israel.

**THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF IN THE PENTATEUCH**

In chapter 2 we discussed the heavenly or cosmic model (יָרָאֵת) of the Sanctuary as shown to Moses on Mount Sinai, and perhaps also to King David. Imagery of this celestial archetype of the Tabernacle/Temple, has also been suggested to have been identified in the early Pentateuchal narratives via an intertextual Paradisal allusion drawn from analogical or typological correspondence. Northrop Frye maintained that it was a literary device in

\(^2\)For the purposes of this analysis we will include primarily the periods of the monarchy (Samuel, Kings/Chronicles), and the return under Persian rule (Ezra-Nehemiah).

\(^3\)While it would be desirable to conduct a thorough exegetical analysis of significant portions of Isaiah and Hosea as well, our scope must of necessity be limited to selective examples from a field of related texts. We have, however, sought to include aspects of their contributions in other parts of this work.
prophecy intended to communicate on two levels: the level of the present moment and a level above it. He contended that the gospel (of the New Testament) is a further intensifying of the prophetic vision, whose latter level is "both that of the original identity symbolized by the garden of Eden (along with, as we shall see, the Promised Land and the Temple), and the ultimate identity symbolized by the return to these things after the "Day of the Lord" and the restoring of Israel."

While the notion of a pre-prophetic tradition containing such imagery is controversial, we present the possibility raised by Frye and other literary analysts that protology contains structured imagery which could later be used eschatologically. Warren Gage has stated the matter succinctly: "It seems only reasonable, however, that any accurate formulation of biblical eschatology should be squarely based upon biblical protology, that the ending of history could only be comprehensible within the categories by which the beginning of history is described."

---


5Ibid., p. 129.

6Warren A. Gage, The Gospel in Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology (Winona Lake: Carpenter Books, 1984) pp. 7-8. An early direction toward studies in the relationship between biblical protology and eschatology was Hermann Gunkel's Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895). The lack of significant follow-up study in this past century has perhaps been due to the presupposition of literary unity necessary for such research, which higher criticism has denied. The revival of such study has been largely due to the advent of literary criticism, which assumes literary unity for a composition.
The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Genesis

While it may appear paradoxical to suggest that one could derive an eschatological structure under girding the narrative in Genesis, several arguments have been advanced to substantiate this possibility:

1. A Comprehension of universal time is within the self-consciousness of the book. Walther Eichrodt has suggested that this awareness of diachronology is implied by the introductory הָרָאָה ("in the beginning." Genesis 1:1a), which sets forth the beginning of history while suggesting a historical eventuation in an eschatological "ending of days" (אמות אביה). This may also be implied by the promise of perpetual seasons in Genesis 8:22: לֹא אִם הָדוֹר אֶלְבָּלֵהָתָהוּ יָמָיו שָׁבֶנֶה גֵרָם נְחָלָתָהוּ הָיֶהוּ פָּרָתָהוּ ("while the earth remains, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease"), which serves as the basis of the eschatological promise of restoration to national Israel (Jeremiah 31:34-37), and the guarantee of permanent inviolability for the Temple (Jeremiah 31:38-40).

2. A divine teleology is presupposed in the Creation narrative which invites a projection of eschatological structure towards a terminus. The Genesis cosmology has a climactic conclusion on day six (Genesis 1:31) with the creation of God's representative ruler, man (Genesis 1:28), and the verdict: כִּי שָׁבֶנֶה כָּל ָמָה הָאָדָם ("[it was] very good"). The eschatological goal to once again bring man and the creation to this state is reaffirmed throughout scripture (cf. Psalm 104:31 [Eng. vs. 30]; Isaiah 43:18; 46:9-10), with the restoration returning the earth (Israel) to a paradisal condition (Isaiah 11:6-9; 51:3; 55:20-25; cf. Ezekiel 36:35), with the divine pronouncement: לָיָם אֲנַמְּלֵא הָאָדָם ("My delight is in her"), Isaiah 62:4. In the New Testament the eschaton envisions a re-creation of both a new heaven and earth where righteousness dwells (II Peter 3:10-13; Revelation 21-22).

(3) The beginnings of Israel's national history are embedded in a matrix of universal history. The chronicle of Israel's origin and history (Genesis 12-50) follows that of universal history (Genesis 1-11). It is the universal context, with its designed teleology, that affords a historiographical perspective to the interpretation of Israel's destiny. In other words, all of universal history is a prepared stage upon which Israel plays out the grand theme. Gage in his work seeks to demonstrate that the chronicle of prediluvian history finds consecutive, synthetic parallels in postdiluvian history (and prophecy). He argues from the well-accepted Semitic notions of literary parallelism in Hebrew poetry, and of the interrelationship between the creative Word and history, for a similar parallelism of history in Hebrew prose.

Recognizing the possibility of structural and grammatical parallels in the Pentateuch, which is a mix of literary genres (narrative, poetry, legal, and cultic), which may convey a design from proto-history for Israelite history, we will take as our point of comparison the question of cultic symbolism in Genesis 1-3, which has been proposed as a paradigm for the establishment of the cultic institutions in Exodus and Leviticus. In this regard, Phenomenologist Mircea Eliade has submitted that every earthly sanctuary must be considered in some regard a replica of the heavenly abode, and that in worship man seeks to reenact creation. Such a proposal echoes the literary order and arrangement of the narrative structure in Genesis 1-11 in relation to the subsequent legal sections of the Pentateuch containing the instructions for building the earthly sanctuary.

---


11Our method will be to analyze repetitive techniques contained within the Pentateuchal narratives. Robert Alter in his work The Art of Biblical Narrative
the Pentateuch is about the Sinai Covenant, and as a literary theological document seeks to evaluate that covenant, it might not be surprising to find an etiology for the sanctuary symbolically presented in the first book of that collection. Examples of such typological narrative has been offered on the base of literary parallels between Genesis 1-11 and the cultic purity laws in Leviticus 11-16.\textsuperscript{12}

In the same manner, it has been suggested that sanctuary symbol may be present in Genesis 1-3,\textsuperscript{13} which parallels the Exodus account at Sinai in terms

\textsuperscript{12} Cf., Rashi as one of the Jewish commentators to point out that the order of the purity laws in Leviticus 11 follow that of the creation of animal life in Genesis 1.

\textsuperscript{13} It is not within our purpose to establish whether the structure of the Exodus narrative occasioned the etiology as an explanation for the Tabernacle and its cultus, or the Tabernacle and cultus was shaped to represent the Genesis ideal. However, unlike other passages where it appears clear that Theologically, the narrative structure argues for the Tabernacle and cultus at Sinai as the means to restore the Presence of YHWH lost in Eden, thus potentially reversing the curse through the Covenant.
of desecration (expulsion/exile) and restoration (return to cultus/Land) Weinfeld\footnote{Moshe Weinfeld, “Sabbath, Temple and Enthronement of the Lord - The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3,” Mêlanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Cazelles. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Delcor (Buiton & Bercker Kevelac, 1981), pp. 501-506, 510. Cf. also his further insights into redemptive terminology in “Creation, Exodus and the Eschaton,” Recontre Asstriologique Internationale XXV (Berlin, July 3-7, 1978).} has argued that the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1-3 is cultic-liturgical. He offers as evidence the recurring formulas: אָלָה הָיָה לְהָדוֹם וְרֵאשָׁת (“And God saw that it was good”), and יָהַוֶּה-שָׁבָח יָהַוֶּה-שָׁבָח (“and it was evening and morning”) as a type of refrain that imparts to Genesis 1:1-2:3 a liturgical character, as well as the common expressions of השָׁבָח (“rest”) of YHWH on the Sabbath day and at the event of His השָׁבָח (“dwelling”) at the sanctuary (cf. Genesis 2:2 with Exodus 20:11; Psalm 132:14)\footnote{The word pair השָׁבָח is common in ancient Near Eastern texts, cf. Akkadian (subat nehtim), Phoenician (Azittawada inscription: sht nht [KAI I:7-8, 13]. Ugarit (CTA 6 III:18). The Israelite concept of “rest” connected YHWH’s “dwelling” in His Temple with the “rest” of the people who were unable to build a Temple without first attaining a state of “rest” (cf. Deuteronomy 12:9; II Samuel 7:1; I Kings 5:18-19). This connection was made by Solomon in his the dedicatory prayer (I Kings 8:56).}. Following this pattern of correspondence, Genesis 1-3 is claimed to further exhibited a number of literary and grammatical parallels between the Creation and Tabernacle narratives. A brief descriptive listing of the most prominent literary structural and grammatical parallels follows, and will serve as the basis for an interpretive summation of these features for the possible theological contribution of the Pentateuch, as a protological pre-prophetic literary imagery behind our eschatological motif.

Parallels in the Literary Structure of the Narrative Accounts

Several literary parallels in the Genesis and Exodus accounts of Creation and Tabernacle construction may lend themselves as symbolic imagery toward a Temple motif in the Pentateuch. Each of these will be briefly demonstrated:
The Fiat-Fulfillment Parallel

The fiat-fulfillment structure in the day-stanzas of Genesis 1 are used as a format for the account of the erection of the Tabernacle in Exodus 25-40. In Exodus 25-31 the divine fiat-commands of Genesis 1 are given, with Exodus 35-40 presenting the corresponding account of fulfillment. Exodus 40 repeats this pattern within the narrative describing the setting up of the Tabernacle, with divine fiat commands given in verses 1-15, and the fulfillment of each described in verses 16-33. In each account of the assembling of the various parts of the Tabernacle into a completed unit in Exodus 35-40 (and especially chapters 39-40), the connection between the divine word and the performance dictated by it is underscored by the reminder that all is to be done according to YHWH's command.16

The Sabbath Motif Parallel

This motif has been noted by Jewish interpreters17, and Kearney, in particular, argued that the six commands in the instructions for the building of the Tabernacle corresponded to the six days' Creation.18 This Sabbath motif informs Genesis 1:1-2:3 and is repeated in the account of the building of the Tabernacle. Weinfield has observed that this motif is apparent in the summary statements of the Tabernacle's completion in Exodus 39:43; 40:33 (וַיִּקָּחֶם אֶת הַמַּלְאָךְ) which are similar to the conclusion day of Creation in Genesis 2:2-3 (וַיִּקָּחָה אֶת הַמַּלְאָךְ אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּקָּחֶם אֶת הַמַּלְאָךְ) which are similar to the conclusion day of Creation in Genesis 2:2-3. Here it may be observed that YHWH's rest on the first Sabbath (Genesis 2:2-3) included an inspection of His work and a blessing of it, which

16 Cf., 39:1, 5, 7, 26, 29, 31-32, 42-43; 40:16, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29, 32


corresponds to the Shekinah's resting or dwelling (literally "filling") in the Tabernacle (Exodus 40:34-35, 38) with a corresponding action being performed on His behalf by His representative, Moses. In addition, this Sabbath ordinance also marks both the close of the fiat-command section (Exodus 31:12-17) and the beginning of the fulfillment section (Exodus 35:2,3). It is also interesting that the consecration ceremony in the cultus was appointed for seven days (cf. Exodus 29:37; 34:18).

The Covenant Parallel

The creation/construction is structured as part of a covenantal process. In Exodus 25-40, the construction of the Tabernacle follows the covenant made at Sinai (Exodus 19-24), which was initiated by the Shekinah appearing as covenant witness. In like manner, the Genesis creation may also be considered a covenantal event by virtue of the מִדְרָע in Genesis 1:2 appearing over the waters. Whereas the consequence of the covenantal event in Genesis 1 is the forming of the unformed world, the consequence of the covenantal event in Exodus 25-40 is the formation of an unformed Nation.

The Land of Israel Parallel

Literary connections between the narrative accounts of Creation in Genesis and the establishment of the cultus at Sinai in Exodus, which afford a parallel cultic-orientation context for the uses of רָעָן אלָדוֹן, may be strengthened if רָעָן in Genesis 1:2a (and consequently 1:2-31 and 2:1-4) is specifically referring to the Land of Israel, rather than to the world in general.19 A number of other points are also put forward in support for this conclusion.20

---

19 The common understanding of רָעָן in Genesis 1:2a is of "inhabitable land," however, later biblical writers reusing the terminology and motifs of Genesis 1 understood רָעָן with reference to the "Land" promised to the Patriarchs and Israel. Jeremiah 27:5 is an instance of such usage. As the prophet records YHWH's recital of Creation יִצְבָּא אֶלֶ֑והִים יְסֹדָ֖ה יְסֹדָ֑ה עלָ֣ו בֵּ֛לָד (וְזָרְעִ֥ים יַעֲשֶׂ֖ה יְשַׂרְאֵֽל).
(1) the orientation of land to water in Genesis 1,\textsuperscript{21}

(2) the locational link of sites,\textsuperscript{22}

(3) the comparative language of the Flood narrative,\textsuperscript{23} and

\textsuperscript{21}I am indebted for these insights to the excellent discussions by John H. Sailhamer, \textit{The Pentateuch as Narrative} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), p. 86 and \textit{Genesis. EBC} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990), pp. 24-25.

\textsuperscript{22}The sense of יָדָה throughout Genesis 1 is that of "dry land" as opposed to a body of water (1:10), and nowhere in the text is the notion of "earth" as opposed to other celestial bodies a feature of יִדְעָה. Given this limitation, יִדְעָה cannot have reference to the whole created world.

\textsuperscript{23}The compositional links between Genesis 1 and 2 suggest that the location of the events of Genesis 2 are the same as those of Genesis 1. For instance, the boundaries for the location of the Garden of Eden in Genesis 2: the Tigris, Euphrates, and the river that flows through the land of Kush (Egypt), are the same boundaries given for the Promised Land in Genesis 15:18-19. The Sages seemed to have made this connection, for it is clear that some believed that the Garden of Eden was not in Mesopotamia (i.e., at traditional Eridu [Abu Shemsi] south of Ur), but within the actual boundaries of Israel. Thus we read in the Mishnah that R. Eliczer contended that "the gate of the Garden of Eden is nigh unto Mount Moriah," however in the \textit{TB} it is written that "... the Garden of Eden is located in the land of Israel [and] its entrance is at the gates of Beth Shean," cf. "Paradise on the Jordan River?: Where was the Garden of Eden?," \textit{Jerusalem Christian Review} 7:9 (June, 1992), p. 8.

\textsuperscript{23}Though the language of the Flood narrative indicates a universal deluge over all the inhabited יִדְעָה, the יִדְעָה in focus in the Flood narrative of Genesis 11 is also the Promised Land, since it is from this "land" that mankind migrates "eastward" (Genesis 12:2) and settles in the "land of Babylon."
(4) the description of return to existent state.²⁴

The Imagery of the Sanctuary-Canopy

In Isaiah 4:2-6 there appears, in Kline's words, a "backward illumination of the Edenic prototype" ... in the "picture of the eschatological kingdom as a paradise created anew under the heavenly tent-covering of divine Glory..."²⁵ Kline also argues for this sukkah imagery from the prophetic descriptions of the eschatological Tabernacle/Temple, which comment on the Exodus account and which are based on the theophanic phenomena of Mount Sinai and Mount Zion. One of these prophetic descriptions is Ezekiel 28:14,16, in which the Prince of Tyre is compared to a figure in the original Paradise scene.²⁶

²⁴When Israel is disobedient in the Land of Promise, the אָרֶץ is said to have become once again שָׁאָרַה ("uninhabitable"), as with the parallel to Deuteronomy 32:10 (םָרַר), which described Israel's waiting in the wilderness before entry into the Land (ארץ). In Jeremiah 4:23-26, the "land" after the Exile is likewise depicted as existing in a state (שם) comparable to that which existed prior to the activity of the הרוֹזָה אֲלֵיהַ in Genesis 1:2.

²⁵op.cit., p. 36. Kline’s argument here is based on his observation that the distinctive verb of creation, בָּרָא (Genesis 1:1), is used in Isaiah 4:5 with its object as the cloudy-fiery pillar. In addition, he notes that this "Glory-cloud" is identified with the Spirit in the previous verse (Isaiah 4:4), where it is referred to as the fiery instrument of judgment (רְאוֹז מַסְפִּים וֹז קְבַר), which will purge Jerusalem/Zion of cultic impurity (וְאוּלַמְלָא). Since the same agent is active in both the judgment (verse 4) and the restoration (verse 5), and then in verse 6 is called a הָהּ סָמִך ("pavilion, covering"), the cultic imagery relates the Exodus/Sinai event back to the Genesis/Creation event and ties the two together as an eschatological motif.

²⁶Ezekiel describes this entity as a כַּרְו כְּפֵהוֹת חַצְצָה ("an anointed covering cherub"), resident on the holy mountain of God. The same word (סְמִיך, used here for the guardian-covering function of the cherub, is also used in Psalm 91:4 for the theophany which winged cherubim are associated, and again in Exodus 25:20 for the covering of the ark by the overarched wings of the golden cherubim.
The Imagery of the Cloudy-Fiery Pillar:

Scholars have also argued for an identification of the רוח אלוהים with the pillar of cloud/fire (assumed as a theophanic manifestation, or the Shekinah itself).\(^{27}\) While not finding explicit identification in the Exodus account itself, the correspondence was drawn from other passages in Tanach (and Targumim) which comment on the event such as Nehemiah 9:19-20; Isaiah 63:11-14; Haggai 2:5. In each of these texts, the reference to רוח כָּפַר (Neh. 9:20), רוח (Isa. 63:11), and רוחי (Hag. 2:5) all are related to the presence of the pillar of cloud/fire in the safe direction of the Israelites through the wilderness, with the last reference in Haggai connecting the event with the rebuilding of the Temple under Zerubbabel.\(^{28}\)

\(^{27}\)One of these was Kline's son, whose unpublished work nevertheless credited his father's seminal thinking on these points, cf., Meredith M. Kline, "The Holy Spirit as Covenant Witness," Th.M. dissertation (Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1972), especially pp. 23-26. Two published dissertations in Spanish which also argue for this identification and contain comprehensive documentation are Léon Muñoz Domingo, Gloria de la Shekinah en los Targumim del Pentateuco (Madrid, 1977), see pp. 167-211 for a classification of texts, and J. Luzarraga, Las Tradiciones de la Nube en la Biblia y en el Judaísmo Primitivo (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973) where see pp. 234-45 for evidence from the early Christian fathers who connected the cloud with the Holy Spirit. An earlier work, written originally at the turn of the century was Joshua Abelson's The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature (reprinted 1969). Abelson included among his identifications of the concept of the Shekinah a personal sense. Criticized by Ephraim Urbach, The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1975) 1:41 for stepping beyond the mark of traditional Jewish interpretation of the Shekinah as simply an inseparable immanence of God, he nevertheless impartially noted the passages which tend toward a separate (or distinct) personality for the Shekinah.

\(^{28}\)In Haggai 2:5 the use of the verb יָדַע for the מַרְאֵה strengthens this association, since this is the verb typically used of the cloudy-fiery pillar in the midst of the camp of Israel (Ex. 14:19; Num. 12:5; 14:14; Deut. 31:15).
Imagery of the Spirit and the Shekinah

Along the same lines of correspondence argued for cloudy-fiery pillar, several writers have identified a parallel between the סֵיכָנָה ("Shekinah" or "Glory-cloud") of Exodus and the וּרְדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם of Genesis 1:2. This identification is tendentious and depends upon both the translation of Genesis 1:2c and theological interpretation in Exodus (i.e., whether the Shekinah has a personal aspect or is merely a divine immance or extension of God), since the event of creation by the Shekinah would be deemed in context as an act involving personality. The arguments below seek to present the research that would argue favorably for this correspondence.

(1) The Translation of וּרְדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם in Genesis 1:2c. The last clause of Genesis 1:2 (ורדו האדות המורד) may be variously translated depending on whether it belongs with the first two clauses (ורדו וה bilder), and thus describes the state of the uninhabitable land, or to the following verse (ויאמר האדות והי אזור וייתא), and describes the work of God (i.e., אדות) in the initial stages of Creation.29 The matter of translation here is

---

29 In the first instance the phrase וּרְדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם would be translated "a mighty wind," while in the second instance as "the Spirit or spirit of God." The first translation was adopted by the Jewish Publication Society in their new translation of The Torah. In defending this translation, Harry M. Orlinsky, Notes on the New Translation of the Torah (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1969), pp. 52-56, and "The Plain Meaning of Ruah in Gen. 1.2." JQR 48 (1957/58): 174-182, argues on the basis of the ancient versions of the LXX and Targum Onkelos, and an Akkadian parallel in the Enuma Elish which speaks of the sky god Anu begetting "four winds," and the inclusion of Tiamat (which may = אדות). The argument for the second translation, generally adopted by Christian interpreters, rest on the verb מרדת, a verb not suited to describing the blowing of a wind (as in LXX and Targum Onkelos "sweep over, blow"), as Orlinsky himself noted (p. 56), but the actions of birds; cf. T. Friedman, וּרְדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם מרדת על פיו הים,Num 25 (Hebrew). Several factors argue against the first translation: (1) While Targum Onkelos does support the rendering with its מְרַדְּדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם וּרְדוּ הַאֲדֹתָם ("and a wind from before the Lord was blowing over the face of the waters"), Targum Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum both retain the verb "blowing," but qualify its subject as a "רוּחַ of mercy from before the Lord." (2) The LXX with its καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ
not settled by the meaning of מירא, which may be translated either as "spirit" or "wind" (depending on context) in its some 380 appearances in Tanach, but by the verb מיראת which describes the action of מירא. The verb מיראת, appearing elsewhere in Tanach only in Deut. 32:1, is used in this passage to describe the imagery of the Shekinah as an eagle in its function of preparing the nest (יעור כל) for its young and of protecting its young (משך חפצים יפרו לאותו על נחלתו רוחה). The fact that these phrases appear in similar imagery at both the beginning and the end of the Pentateuch suggests a structural parallel and seems to require a translation of "S/spirit of God" in Genesis 1:2c to agree with the Presence [Shekinah] of YHWH described in Deuteronomy 32:11.31

υδατος does not clearly support Orlinsky's translation "and the wind of God was sweeping over the water." The verb ἑπεφέρετο (followed by the Vulgate's ferebatur) is passive, and thus a literal translation would be "was brought" or "was carried," reducing the necessity of rendering μεγεμα as "wind." (3) In the Enuma Elish, Anu creates the four compass winds as part of his arsenal against Tiamat in order to carry her away to a remote place. It is difficult to see any relationship between these "storms" or "winds" (called abdud and imhullu) which serve as Marduk's weapons, and the of Genesis 1. Furthermore, it is questionable on linguistic grounds to assume as does Orlinsky, that מירא is etymologically equivalent to Tiamat. R. L. Harris, "thm," TWOT, 2:966 has argued that a more likely correspondence is with Ugaritic thm (dual thhtm, plural thmt), "deep, depth(s)," or as suggested by G. Pettinato, "The Royal Archives of Tell-Mardikh-Ebla," BA 39 (1976):50 and M. J. Dahood, Psalms, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1973) 2:231, the even earlier Eblaite it'-a-matum, "ocean abyss."

30 A Ugaritic parallel exist in the 15th-century B.C.E. text the Epic of Aqhat (3 Aqhat, obverse, lines 20, 31-32), e.g., "Over him [Aqhat] egales will soar, there will hover a [flight of bjirds" (line 20). Here, Ugaritic rahap ("hovers, soars") is associated with the subject nshrm (eagles"), just as in Deuteronomy 32:11, and argues for Hebrew מירא describing the actions of birds, not winds.

31 One of the problems with adopting the translation "wind" for מירא, is that in the context of Genesis 1 it must be given a negative or destructive connotation, as R. Luyster, "Wind and Water: Cosmogonic Symbolism in the Old Testament," ZAW 93 (1981): 1-10. But in light of its parallel with both Exodus 31:3 and Deuteronomy 32:11, containing positive connotations (a beneficial force to מירא in
The use of the phrase רוח אלוהים, especially in its parallel usage in the legal narratives. In none of the other 18 occurrences of the phrase רוח אלוהים mean anything like "mighty or tempestuous wind," a translation suggested by some translators to accommodate the connection of verse 2c with 2a-b which describe a chaotic state. The next appearance of the phrase is Exodus 31:3 where Bezalel is filled with the in order to have the sufficient skill (תָּמִיס) to build the Tabernacle. Here, again, a key phrase unites, via the intertextual allusion, the creation of the world and the creation of a shrine (the Tabernacle).³² Meredith G. Kline has identified a number of other features between the Genesis and Exodus narratives that suggest that the רוח אלוהים, concomitant in both the establishment of the world and the erection of the Tabernacle/Temple, was functioning as a creative paradigm.³³ The use of the verb מרהיב and the term תוהו in Deuteronomy 32:10-11 offer parallels to the Sinai theophany. תוהו is used in Deuteronomy 32:10 for the "wilderness," and institutes a comparison between Israel’s divine aegis in the desert and the Divine Presence (Genesis 1:2c) over the unformed and unfilled רוח היברה (earth) of Genesis 1:2a-b. In the Mosaic historiography the event of the Shekinah’s presence in and through the wilderness תוהו reenacts the presence of the רוח אלוהים over the world תוהו. The history of the exodus appears to

Exodus 31:3, and a protecting force in תוהו, it is unlikely that such an opposite reading could be sustained.

³²This particular allusion was noted by Michael Fishbane, Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), p. 12.


culminate in the construction of the Tabernacle so as to bring out its nature as a redemptive reenactment of creation. In this re-creation event, the Presence of God is viewed as a "sanctuary-canopy", hovering (מִרְחָם) at the top of Mount Sinai, over the wilderness and wilderness, in order to reproduce its likeness below at the foot of Sinai in the Tabernacle.

(2) The Interpretation of רוח אֲדֹנָי in Genesis 1:2c... Support for the interpretation of רוח אֲדֹנָי as "S/spirit" in Genesis, in addition to the arguments for translation, involve the establishment of the writer's intention to produce a thematic identity between the Genesis and Exodus accounts. In both accounts (Genesis 2:2; Exodus 31:5) the work of God is to be accomplished by the מִרְחָם, implying that as God performed the work of creation by "the Spirit of God," so Israel was to do their holy task by means of "the Spirit of God." Several comparative studies of the literary narratives have furnished grammatical parallels in the structure between these accounts to establish this thematic identity, and in the comments below the attempt will be to summarize the evidence these researchers.

35Kline's argument for this is based on a broader analogy which includes the theophanic Glory (i.e., the Spirit) as the divine model or referent for the imago Dei in man, and the Sinai accounts of man as priest and later prophet (or in Genesis as a "man-priest" in the "temple-garden of God"), which fulfills representatively the redemptive function portrayed by the Spirit as creator of the Garden as the archetypal temple in Genesis 1-3, see pages 13-34.

36Kline borrowed this imagery from the prophetic descriptions of the eschatological Tabernacle/Temple which are based on the theophanic phenomena of Mount Sinai and Mount Zion for their typological picture in such texts as Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 4.

37This is also true eschatologically, for Ezekiel 36:26-27 speaks of YHWH's "S/spirit" as the means by which the purified Nation will unfailingly obey the Torah.
Parallels in the Grammatical Structure of the Narrative Accounts

In Genesis 2-3 a number of grammatical features appear to find interpretive relevance when viewed within a cultic imagery. These features include grammatical parallels unique to the accounts of the Creation and the Tabernacle.

The Cultic East/West Orientation of the Garden

The grammatical parallel here is based on taking the direction דֶּרֶךְ ("eastward") as not a mere geographical detail, but a narrative clue to the meaning of the events he is recounting. The intention of this clue is to express by יָדַע movement or direction away from God (or the Holy Land). Support for this has been suggested from the expression "in the east," which may well evoke the same idea as that of "in Eden." The simplest explanation of the term דָּרֶךְ ("Eden") has been to associate it with its homonym "pleasure, delight," seen also in the cognate Aramaic root דִּינָה ("enrich"). Gordan Wenham, taking his lead from E. Haag's work (Mensch am Anfang, pp. 26-27), has explained that since the sun

---

38 The locative use of the preposition ב with דָּרֶךְ (the only occurrence of this phrase) indicates that Eden must be understood as the name of the area in which the Garden was located. The modifier יָדַע then defines this situation more precisely by reference to the author's position "in the east," i.e., east of Eretz-Yisrael. While some interpreters have taken יָדַע to mean "in ancient times," (e.g. Isaiah 45:21; 46:10), following several of the ancient versions (α', σ', θ', Vg. S) and Targum Onkelos (reading דִּינָה מְלָכָהָי "from long ago"); however, the context and its use in Genesis 11:2 make such a meaning improbable here.

39 Psalm 36:9 uses the term in this way in relation to the Temple, with a probable allusion to Eden itself, since דָּרֶךְ ("your delights") is simply the plural of דָּרֶךְ ("Eden").

40 דָּרֶךְ appears to be a specific geographical place, however, the name itself must convey the thought that this place was to be one of idyllic delight and rest. For the association of the Hebrew with the Aramaic root cf. Alan R. Millard, "The Etymology of Eden," VT 34 (1984): 103-106.
rises in the east, and light is a favorite metaphor for divine revelation (Isaiah 2:2-4; Psalm 36:10), that it seems likely that this description of "the Garden of Eden in the east" is symbolic of a place where God dwells.\textsuperscript{41} James Miller has also uncovered additional examples where a move eastward is implicitly presented as a move away from God.\textsuperscript{42} In terms of sanctuary imagery, this east-west dichotomy

\textsuperscript{41} Gordon Wenham, \textit{Genesis 1-15. WBC Vol. 1} (Waco: Word Books, 1987), p. 61. Further verification of the use of \textit{םֶזֶּק} as a narrative clue may be derived from the significance the author gives to this expression in his developing narrative. Both the terms \textit{בָּר} and \textit{םֶזֶּק} are used in Genesis for the cardinal points west and east, in most cases evidencing a dichotomy. \textit{בָּר} is the least frequent of these terms, occurring in Genesis only three times. In all occurrences it is used in opposition to \textit{םֶזֶּק} (and in two cases to the other two cardinal points; Genesis 13:14; 28:14). When Cain is driven from the presence of YHWH in Genesis 4:16, it is to dwell in a land \textit{רָאִי} \textit{עַרְיָמָה} \textit{בָּר} ("east of Eden"); \textit{יִאֶשֶׁר מְלִית הַיָּמִים הָעָם} \textit{עִרְיָמָה} \textit{בָּר} ("Cain went out from the presence of YHWH ... east of Eden"). It appears that the text is equating the eastward-located Eden with the Presence of YHWH as His dwelling place. As with the placement of the cherubim in Genesis 3:24, a clear east-west dichotomy separates the dwelling of man who has violated the commandment of Torah, from God Who in holiness preserves it. Therefore the cherubim are placed as guardians at the east entrance of the Garden, and the rest of Eden and man's abode would be henceforth to the west.

\textsuperscript{42} James E. Miller, "The Actiology of the Tabernacle /Temple in Genesis," \textit{Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Bible Societies 4} (1986): 153-154. His examples include: (1) Genesis 13:8-13 uses Edenic imagery ironically to parallel the choice of Lot to live, not only away from Abraham (with whom God had made covenant), but in \textit{םֶזֶּק} ("Sodom"), a land of sinners that lay to the east of the mountains where he stood with Abraham. To reach this place, described as \textit{רָאִי} \textit{עַרְיָמָה} \textit{בָּר} ("like the garden of YHWH"), Lot had to travel "east" (\textit{םֶזֶּק}, verse 11). This same terminology had been applied earlier in Genesis 11:2 to the eastward movement of the founders of tower and city of Babel, which as the later "Babylon" becomes in literary imagery the antithesis and opponent of Zion (the center of covenantal dynasty). Thus, as the builders were driven from their desecrating project, so Lot was driven away from the desecrating valley. That the direction of his choice indicated a direction away from God appears to be indicated by God's nullification of his division, giving instead all of the four cardinal points to Abraham (Genesis 13:14); (2) Genesis 12:8 (cf. 13:3-4) contains the only cultic description in Genesis defined by cardinal points, the narrative presents Abraham establishing a worship center at Bethel. It is
which finds its origin in the Paradise narrative which parallels the Exodus Tabernacle narrative, has been considered a probable source for the layout of the Tabernacle/Temple on an east-west axis.\textsuperscript{43}

It is important to note for our desecration/restoration motif, that desecration in the west (in God’s Presence) meant expulsion to the east (outside God’s Presence). In this regard, Jon Levenson has pointed out that in the Temple and its rites, especially those of a purgative character, served as the means for spiritual ascent from the lower to the higher realms, from a position distant from God to one in His very presence.\textsuperscript{44} This spacial movement, as we demonstrated in chapter 3, is also a sacred movement, from a position “outside the camp” (the place of defilement) to the very center of holiness within the Tabernacle/Temple precincts - moving eastward from one grade of holiness to the next. Therefore,

significant, however, that the altar Abraham erects is not in Bethel, but between Bethel and Ai, which etymologically as “heap, ruins, tell,” and lying to the east, gives it a negative connotation. Moreover, Bethel as “house of God,” and lying to the west, bears a positive connotation. By contrast, Cain and Abel’s altars were on the east of Eden. At this point, a comparison can be drawn to the Tabernacle/Temple situated west of the altar, and to the east-west orientation of the Tabernacle/Temple in general; (3) Genesis 29:1 which describes Jacob’s being sent away (perhaps in the drama of the event driven away) to the land of his uncle Laban. Here the place where Laban dwells is called לארז יבנ (the land of the sons of the east”). Since the journey was directionally away from the Promised Land and to the land originally abandoned by Abraham, לארז is employed to give this negative character to the event. When the negative direction is reversed, and restoration takes place, the return to God or to Eretz-Yisrael is described as a return from the east (Genesis 12:1 of Abraham’s call; 14:17-20 of Lot’s rescue and the return to the city of Salem = Jerusalem; 31:21 of Jacob’s return from Laban).

\textsuperscript{43}Cf. the Book of Numbers, where this orientation is the basis for the arrangement of the tribes, and especially the tribe of Levi, around the Tabernacle. As the altar in the Tabernacle/Temple lay to the east of the edifice, and all entrances to the Holy of Holies (in the most western position) opened eastward in a straight line, the proper approach to God was from east to west.

this imagery suggests the theological construct that whether an Adam (as the original divine representative) or the Nation (as the new covenantal representatives), each act of cultic desecration is met by a corresponding removal from God’s Presence or Land, and each act of cultic consecration is met by a return or restoration to the same.

The Cultic Use of the Verb נַעֲלָה

The verb נַעֲלָה appears in Genesis 3:8 as מַעֲלָה, the Hithpael participle, describing the approach of YHWH in the Garden. The term is used in this same form to describe the presence of YHWH in relation to the Tabernacle in Leviticus 26:11-12 (נָעֲלוּ מַשֵּׁלִים וּמַעֲלָהּ, and Deuteronomy 23:15 (כִּי יִזְרֵא אֱלֹהֵינוֹ מַעֲלָהּ בְּפִירֵב). In this regard II Samuel 7:6-7, one of the crucial theological texts dealing with the decision to build the Temple, also employs this term to describe the usual appearance of YHWH (עִיּוֹן הָוָה) in the portable sanctuaries: מַעֲלָה בֵּיהַל אֶחָד מַעֲלָה בֵּיהַל כָּל בֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל. ִויִזְרֵא

45Cf. M. Kline, “Primal Parousia,” WTJ 40 (1978): 249-250, who argues here for an association with the Glory-Spirit of Genesis 1:2c here, since מַעֲלָה is often used for the activities of the Shekinah among the Israelites. In Genesis 18:33 and Judges 6:21 the verb נַעֲלָה is used in the Qal for the “Angel/messenger of the Lord”, (מַעֲלָה אָנָן), and in Ezekiel 1:19-20 and 10:16 for the “S/spirit” (רוֹקֵד) and “the living creatures” (רְאוּחַ). The Qal is frequently used with לֵבי for the divine vanguard on the way from Egypt to Canaan, and is variously identified as the “Lord” (יהוה), the “Angel of the Lord” (מַעֲלָה אָנָן), and the “Glory-cloud” (ךָּל כִּיצְוַת) in Exodus 13:21; 14:19; 23:23; Numbers 14:14; Deuteronomy 1:30, 33; 20:4; 31:8 (cf. Isaiah 45:2; 52:12; 58:8). In Psalm 104:3, in a context which includes a reference (verse 7) to the “sound” of YHWH (ךָּל כִּיצְוַת) in similar fashion to Genesis 3:8, the verb is used in the Pi’el (נַעֲלוּ) to depict the procession of God mounted on His wind-driven cloud-chariot (כָּל כִּיצְוַת), and numerous other passages use the Hithpael to describe the movement of agents of the divine council (apparently within the Glory-cloud) when on missions of reconnoiter and judgment. However, Kline goes further to translate the phrase לֵבי, usually translated as “in the cool of the day,” or “at the breezy [time] of the day,” or “in the time of the evening,” as the “Spirit of the day.” His argument
The repetition of this expression alone in cultic contexts is not sufficient to warrant an identification of it in Genesis 3:8 as cultic, however, if so, we may have here a preview of the later-developed desecration motif. This possibility may be heightened if we can further interpret this context as a retributive judicial setting. To validate this interpretation, we must understand דַּע in a negative, rather than a positive sense. The drama in Genesis 3:8 opens with the "sound" (ָּל) of YHWH's coming. If ל here can mean the sound of judgment,\(^{46}\) then

for this rendering is complex, yet persuasive, for he brings forth evidence that seeks to justify the use of "Spirit of the day" (רוּחַ יָהֹוהַ) as equivalent of "Spirit of judgment" (רוּחַ מֶשֶׁךְ רָוֹא), and proleptic of "the day of the Lord" (יוֹם יְהֹוהַ) terminology in later eschatological passages, which agrees well with the judicial intent of the verse. He likewise puts forth the suggestion that דַּע here has the sense of "day-light," which he associates with the visual luminosity of the radiant Shekinah and the imagery of the day of judgment at times being described as the sunrise bringing the light of God's Glory from the east (e.g., Psalm 19:4ff; Ezekiel 43:2; Zechariah 14:7; Malachi 4:1.2 (3:19, 20). Cf. M. G. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," \(WTJ\) 20 (1958): 146-157, where he has contends that this judicial connotation began in the Genesis Prologue, as the "Spirit" of Genesis 1:2c was connected with the seven-day pattern of the creation record, and especially the sabbatical structuring of the creation history, to serve as a seven-paneled portrait-panl of the day of the Lord. If Kline is correct in this elaborate interpretation of the context, it accords well with the imagery of YHWH's enthronement in His microcosmic sanctuary as a Sabbath-rest.

\(^{46}\) ל here cannot refer to YHWH "speaking" or "calling," but to the "sound" of His approach. ל is used elsewhere of the sound of approaching feet (cf. I Kings 14:6 and II Kings 6:32). The expression ל יִתְדַּעְלִיתָא אָלָמִים ("the voice of YHWH God") is common in the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy (5:25; 8:20; 13:19; 15:5; 18:16; 26:14; 27:10; 28:1-2, 15, 45, 62; 30:8, 10), where the verb ל plus the preposition ב denote YHWH's "call to obedience." The suggestion here, however, is not that the call to obedience is made to the man and woman in the Garden, but that the "sound" of YHWH's approach was a reminder of their failure to obey. The subject of the participle מִלָּה is YHWH, not ל, therefore the "sound" is not the call of a "voice," but the sound of the motion of YHWH's coming in judgment, cf. verse 10 ל ("Your sound").
YHWH’s approach, described by דָּוָד, must also be understood in this light.\(^{47}\)
In this case, YHWH is approaching the Garden in a similar fashion to His subsequent approaches to the Tent of Meeting (via the Glory-cloud) - for an audience with His representative concerning questions of conduct (Exodus 33:9; 34:5; Numbers 11:25, 12: 5, 10; Deuteronomy 31:15).\(^{48}\) If the connection is proper, it may imply a relationship between the Garden and later shrines.

**The Description of the Garden of Eden**

If the primary reference of קַיָּם הָאָדָם in Genesis is to “the Land of Israel,” even though the Garden of Eden was not located there\(^{49}\), it is later associated

---

\(^{47}\) Cf. Rambam’s interpretation of the הָיְתָה רְחֵם מְנַעֲרָתָם as a “great and powerful wind” with the same sense of God coming in judgment and power as in Job 38:1, where the Lord answered Job “from the whirlwind” דְּסָם מַעֲרָתָה, דְּסָם מַעֲרָתָה. Edited by H. D. Shual (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1984), p. 40.

\(^{48}\) While the קָלִיל יַדָּוָד may indicate an awesome or judgmental advent of YHWH, this “coming,” though first mentioned here in the Eden narrative, it gives the impression that it was not what was unusual, but rather the reaction of the man and his wife. What accounts for the dramatic contrast between זָמַל בִּרְשֵׁת הָרְשֵׁמוֹ (‘they were naked and they were not ashamed”), Genesis 2:25, and now כל יד דֵּד אִישׁ (‘I was afraid because I was naked”), Genesces 3:10; (יִנְסָה יַד הָאָדָם בּוֹרַד עַד, יִנְסָה יַד הָאָדָם בּוֹרַד עַד) Genesis 2:9, and now רֶבֶנְתָּא הָאָדָם אָמְלָת מִפֶּרֶס הָאָדָם בּוֹרַד עַד. Such an abrupt transformation in the couple’s perception of YHWH could be the result of a perceived change in the temper of YHWH’s voice so that it drove the pair into hiding, but it could as easily be explained by their own change from innocence to guilt. If the couple had beheld YHWH’s theophany on previous occasions, and had been unfaithful despite that revelation, this incident would parallel that of the exodus community, whose punishment for disobedience was qualified by the fact that they had been witnesses to YHWH’s Glory (cf. Exodus 40:38; Numbers 14:14, 22-23, 27-29, 33).

\(^{49}\) However, in aggadatic legend, the Garden of Eden was connected with Jerusalem, where at the Creation God erected a tabernacle on Mount Moriah and prayed: “May My children do My will that I shall not destroy My house and My sanctuary” (Midrash Psalms to 76:3), and upon the site of the "foundation stone"
eschatologically with Eretz-Israel in the restoration motif. We find examples of this usage in the Prophets who employed Garden similes or Edenic terminology, e.g., Ezekiel 36:35: "This Land that was made desolate has become like the Garden of Eden"), and Zechariah 14:8: מִרְיָשְׁלָם בִּכֵּיתוֹ הַשָּׁלוֹחַ הַיַּעֲשֵׂה מִסְרֵיהָ ("On that day living water will flow out from Jerusalem").

One reason for this association is that Zion, like Eden, was the place where YHWH manifested His presence and called men to worship. We see this reflected in Genesis 3:8 and 4:16 in the use of מַלְכוּת הָיָה ("from before the presence of YHWH"), which serves as a technical term for the official center of the cultus in Tanach. Another reason is the specific geographical description of the garden as being watered by a single river which flowed from the land of Eden to divide after that point into four rivers: the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Pishon, and the Gihon (Genesis 2:10-14). Apart from the literal geographic designation provided by the rivers and the lands contained within them (i.e., the boundaries of the Promised Land) is the concept of a flow in an eastward direction, the direction of

Adam (Genesis Rabbah 14:8; TJ, Naz. 7:2, 56b) and from which all the world was created (Yoma 54b). Too, upon this site Adam later offered a sacrifice on the "great altar" (Genesis Rabbah 34:9). Apart from legendary tradition, the Promised Land is geographically linked to the territory of ancient Eden in that at least three of these rivers (the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Gihon = to the River of Egypt) mark the boundaries of the land promised to Abraham (Genesis 15:18).

50Cf. also Joel 2:3: מִרְיָשְׁלָם בִּכֵּיתוֹ הַשָּׁלוֹחַ הַיַּעֲשֵׂה מִסְרֵיהָ ("Before them the Land is like the Garden of Eden; behind them, a desert waste"), and Isaiah 51:3: מִרְיָשְׁלָם בִּכֵּיתוֹ הַשָּׁלוֹחַ הַיַּעֲשֵׂה מִסְרֵיהָ ("YHWH will surely comfort Zion and look with compassion on all her ruins; He will make her deserts like Eden, her wastelands like the garden of YHWH").

51Cf. Leviticus 10:2; Numbers 17:9; 20:6; I Samuel 21:6; 26:20 where it is used of the Tabernacle; II Kings 24:20; Jeremiah 5:23 where it refers to the Temple (and the judgment of exile from the cultus); Job 2:7 where it is used of the heavenly court (הַשָּׁלוֹחַ); Jonah 1:3, 10 where it refers generally to the place of YHWH’s presence.
blessing.\textsuperscript{52} The eschatological use of this concept is seen in Zechariah 14:8 (cf. Revelation 22:1-2) where the river appears in the restoration motif of Jerusalem as the center of world blessing, and also in Ezekiel 47:1 of the new Temple with the river flowing from under the altar in the Sanctuary and restoring the Arabah and Dead Sea through which it will flow (verses 8-11).\textsuperscript{53}

The most graphic reason for the later connection with the Israelite sanctuaries is the mineralogical description given in Genesis 2:12 of three types of stones: אבב הַשָּׁאֲמָה, אֲבָב הַשָּׁאֲמָה (“good gold”), וְֻבָּדִיל (“bdellium”) and אבב קָנָה (“onyx”).\textsuperscript{56} These precious stones were particularly used with respect to the

\textsuperscript{52}Since the garden itself was oriented in this direction, the flow of the river from this point to all other points positioned the garden as the center of blessing, bringing fructification for all the earth.

\textsuperscript{53}Beyond this, the very association of “water” with cultic activity in purification may provide a link between the purpose of the river נֵכֶר הַגֶּרֶד (“to water the garden”) Genesis 2:10, and the sanctification of the Sanctuary (Numbers 19:17-19; Psalm 51:7), and eschatologically of the ritual restoration desecrated Israelite (cf. Ezekiel 36:25). It is not necessary to spiritualize “water” as a “life-giving substance,” hence, “salvation,” in order to make this eschatological analogy. “Water” does carry a symbolic connotation with the cultic center in Tanach (cf. Psalm 46:5), but this does not justify, as David Chilton, \textit{Paradise Restored: A Biblical Theology of Dominion} (Tyler, Texas: Reconstruction Press, 1985), p. 30, removing these restoration passages from the literal context of the Land and city (which accompanying geographical and topographical terms all signify) and applying them to describe “living water flowing out from the Church to the world.”

\textsuperscript{54}Apparently the reason for the addition of the adjective קָנָה (“good”) is to describe the quality of this gold as the purest, and therefore, the most valuable.

\textsuperscript{55}The English “bdellium” is a transliteration of the Greek (LXX) βδέλλιον. It may be compared with the Akkadian बुद्व्ल, which was a translucent aromatic resin. In the only other reference to Bdellium in the Tanach, it is connected with manna (as to its color, Numbers 11:17; cf. Exodus 16:31), a sample of which was deposited within the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies (Exodus 16:32-34; cf. Hebrews 9:4).

\textsuperscript{56}The English rendering follows the uncertain identification of the Greek LXX and Latin Vulgate. The Akkadian samtu has been suggested as a cognate with
adornment of the Tabernacle and Temple. An eschatological connection with the Temple is made in Ezekiel and carried over in the description of the "New [heavenly] Jerusalem" in the New Testament. John Sailhamer provides the significance of this analogy between the garden and the sanctuary when he notes: "In describing the garden the author's primary interest lay in stressing the beauty of the gold and the precious stones throughout the lands encompassed by the garden. If the purpose of such descriptions in the later literature is taken as a

םדש, but also has problems. Other English translations have included identifications with "carnelian," "lapis lazuli," and "chrysoprase."

57The בָּדִית ("gold")- in the overlays of the wooden furniture (Exodus 36:34, 38; 37:11-7, 22-28; cf. 38:24) and in the Holy of Holies (I Kings 6:21-22, 28-32) and סַלְדְּן ("onyx") - also in the buildings (Exodus 25:7; I Chronicles 29:2), and especially as engraved "memorial stones," זְכָּרִים (lit., "set stones") on the breastplate and shoulders of the High Priest's ephod (Exodus 25:7; 28:9-12). In addition, I Chronicles 29:2 which list David's collection of donations for the Temple. Among the items are "gold, onyx stones, inlaid stones, stones of antimony, stones of various colors, and all kinds of precious stones." Other than those specifically catalogued, it is uncertain what specific stones are in view, however, the "costly stones" were probably large pre-cut imported stones for the outer construction of the building, not gemstones.

58E.g., in Ezekiel 28:14 the cosmography of heaven's archetypal Sanctuary is given as רֵעֵי הָאָדָמִים ("upon the holy mountain of God") and in verse 13 identified with אשֶר נָלֻּט ("Eden, the garden of God"). There an angelic/kingly creature is supernaturally portrayed as: לֵךְ הָעָנָב עֲקֹבָּה (every precious stone was your covering: the sardis, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold...").

59The New Testament Apocalypse list almost identical items as part of the construction of the heavenly Jerusalem that descends earthward (Revelation 21:16-21). The "heavenly" Jerusalem should not be confused with the eschatological earthly Jerusalem, for in the former there exist "no Temple" (Revelation 21:22), while in the latter a Temple is prominent (Ezekiel 40-48).
guide, the point of the description of the garden is to show the glory of God’s presence through the beauty of the physical surroundings.  

A connection that adds weight to this suggestion is that of the prophet Haggai, who in describing the new Temple says: "I will fill this house with glory", says the Almighty YHWH. ‘The silver is mine and the gold is mine,’ declares Almighty YHWH’.

Both אכֹּֽם and כֹּֽכֶּֽב are precious metals used to describe the glory of YHWH Whose presence will fill the Temple. Perhaps this was also the reason these stones were listed in the Garden of Eden narrative; because the Garden housed the glory of YHWH as a proto-sanctuary, just as later sanctuaries would emulate its geographical splendor by outer and inner adornment.

The Presence and Position of the cherubim

An Israelite reader of Torah would be impressed by the mention of the סֵֽכִּיָּֽה ("cherubim") positioned guarding the entrance to the שֶֽׁקַּֽנִי ("tree of life), Genesis 4:24. Whether or not we accept the possibility of other sanctuary symbolism, here the most probable purpose of the reference is to represent YHWH’s presence in the garden. While cherubim were traditionally regarded as guardians of holy places in the ancient Near East (cf. Akkadian kuribu), the coincidence of the mention of their position at the "east" of Eden (i.e., at the entrance to YHWH’s Presence ) and as guardians of holiness (i.e., as defenders of desecration) most likely was meant to draw the readers attention to their later role in the Tabernacle and Temple. 

There, an apparent connection is made between YHWH’s presence and the cherubim which guarded the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus 25:18-22) and the footstool of YHWH, as guardians of the Shekinah which was stationed above the מֵֽכַֽה ("Mercy Seat") in the form of a fiery- cloud. In Solomons Temple, two 15-foot cherubim were also placed as guardians of the Ark within the inner sanctuary (I Kings 6:23-28). In addition, images of the cherubim decorated the curtains of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:31), and the walls of the Temple (I Kings 6:29).

60 John Sailhamer, Genesis, EBC, p. 43; The Pentateuch as Narrative, p. 100.

61 Both the Tabernacle and the Temple were entered from the east, and the cherubim were placed over the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus 25:18-22), the footstool of YHWH, as guardians of the Shekinah which was stationed above the מֵֽכַֽה ("Mercy Seat") in the form of a fiery- cloud. In Solomons Temple, two 15-foot cherubim were also placed as guardians of the Ark within the inner sanctuary (I Kings 6:23-28). In addition, images of the cherubim decorated the curtains of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:31), and the walls of the Temple (I Kings 6:29).
the expulsion from YHWH in the garden and the return to YHWH at Sinai through the construction of the inner sanctuary permitting access to YHWH’s presence between the cherubim (Exodus 25:8, 22). The forbidden garden guarded by cherubim with flaming sword, turning every direction, has been replaced by the Sanctuary, whose cherubim have their faces turned only toward the כְּפָרָה, representing an opportunity of sacred approach through the cultus.

The Cultic Symbolism of the Edenic Trees:

Considerable attention has been focused on מֵשְׁקֵפָה ("the tree of life") motif in the ancient Near East.62 While the interpretation of the Menorah as a demythologized tree of life symbol may not be warranted63, its botanical

---


63The tree of life as depicted in Genesis has no explicit parallel in other ancient Near Eastern literature, although magical plants, food, and water are often seen as conveying immortality or at least eternal youthful vitality. Sacred trees and sacred groves representing the fertility-granting and life-giving powers of various deities are common mythological symbols in Sumerian and Akkadian texts (cf. Epic of Gilgamesh 11.279-89 [ANET, p. 96]; Adapa 67-68 [ANET, pp. 101-103]; Descent of Ishtar 34, 38 [ANET, pp. 107-109]), however, these do not bear the same ethical qualities as the Edenic tree of life (cf. the uses of the tree of life in biblical Wisdom Literature as a metaphor for life-giving wisdom bear this distinction, Proverbs 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; 15:4), cf. R. Marcus, “The Tree of Life in Proverbs,” JBL 62 (1943): 117-120. Although Meyers believes that “the presence of such a [pagan] form in the aniconographic Israelite cult [i.e. the Menorah] can be construed as the use of a powerful religious symbol to represent the presence of the unseen God of Israel,” the biblical tree of life is fundamentally distinct from the pagan tree symbols. The tree of life in Genesis is not said to contain magical or regenerative powers in itself, as do the mythical trees. Read out of context, Genesis 3:22 might be interpreted to teach that the loss of the tree of life meant death, while access to it meant life. However, Hamilton, Genesis 1-17. NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990), P. 163, argues that access to the tree was removed after man’s disobedience, not before it, a fact reinforced by B. S. Childs, “Tree of Knowledge, Tree of Life,” IDB IV (Nashville: Abington, 1962),
stylization as well as its placement within the Tabernacle in proximity to the cherubim may have influenced an analogous parallel. Some have suggested a connection with the description of the inexhaustible thorn bush (םְטָרָה בֵּעַ בֵּאֵשׁ), which once manifested the Shekinah on Mount Sinai. The basic idea that this tree represented life is analogous to the concept that fullness of life is to be found in YHWH’s presence in the Sanctuary. More in keeping with cultic connections is הַעֲשֵׂר נֶפֶשׁ הַלֵּוֶת מָלֹא בָּרֶם (“the tree of the knowledge

p. 697, who notes that it was the sin of the first couple, not the loss of the tree, which is given as the cause of death. It is also important to observe that in Genesis 2:9 the emphasis of the text is on God as the One Who caused the tree to grow, implying that the life it representatively conveys comes from God, not from the tree itself. Therefore, the purpose for the biblical tree of life, as Eugene Merrill, “A Theology of the Pentateuch,” A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Edited by Roy B. Zuck (Chicago: Moody Press, 1991), p. 19, points out is “as a testing point of man’s covenant fidelity. To partake of it is to demonstrate false dominion, a hubris in which man has become in some mysterious sense like God.” The origin of the Menorah is obscure (although it may possibly have had Egyptian stylistic motifs in its design), and it is instructive that Howard Wallace in his recent article on the subject does not attempt any connection with the Menorah, cf. “Tree of Life,” ABD VI (New York: Double day, 1990), pp. 658-660.

The word הַעֲשֵׂר אָסֵף occurs five times in Exodus 3:2-4 and also outside the “burning bush” narrative (cf. Deuteronomy 33:16). The LXX translated הַעֲשֵׂר by βατός, suggesting that it belongs to the thorn family, as Jewish interpreters have long assumed, cf. R. Tournay, “Le Nom Du Buisson Ardent,” VT 7 (1957): 410-413. Fredrick Holmgren, “Before the Temple, the Thornbush: An Exposition of Exodus 2:11-3:12,” Reformed Journal 33:3 (March, 1983): 9-11, takes the thornbush as a symbol of the pre-Temple security of Israel in YHWH’s presence. The rabbinc idea of the divine presence dwelling even in a thornbush in order to express to Israel His willingness to dwell with the weak and lowly, Midrash Rabbah: Exodus (London: Soncino Press, 1939), p. 53, accords well with the Tabernacle as a simple tent (representing the brevity of man, cf. Psalm 52:5).

E.g., Psalms 16:11; 21:6; 27:4-5; 43:4; 48:9; 73:17, 28; 84:1-4; 92:12-14; 138:2 et al.). This association was especially developed in later apocalyptic works (cf. 1 Enoch 24:2; 2 Enoch 8:3, 5, 8; 9:1; 2 Esdras 8:52) and in the New Testament (Revelation 2:7; 22:2, 14, 19), all of which involve an eschatological re-creation of the Edenic paradise at the eschaton.
of good and evil”), which evokes parallels with the Tabernacle. Clarke has argued that this tree represented moral autonomy in the garden; the independent self-assertion of the will of the creature without reference to the sovereign Will of the Creator. If so, the command to not eat of this tree was a command to not disobey the law of God, which is a codified reflection of His Divine Will, and was placed in a similar central position in the Tabernacle. Wenham makes an additional observation that just as in Israel touching the Ark, or seeing it uncovered brought death (Numbers 4:20; II Samuel 6:7), so eating from the tree of knowledge (or as the woman thought - touching it, Genesis 3:3) brought death.

The Description of Adam’s Duty

Genesis 2:15 gives a description of Adam’s responsibility in the Garden of Eden: נִקַּח יְהוָה אֱלֹאָה אֲדֹנִי אֶלֶם אַבָּרָם לֶמֶנֶיה הַבָּרָא ("YHWH God

---


68Cf., the description of this tree in Genesis 2:9; 3:6, where it is described as: נַחֲמָה לְאָדָם וּלְיָדָה לֶמֶנֶיה ("pleasant to the sight and good for food, and a tree to make one wise"). This compares favorably with the psalmist description of מִשָּׁרֵי יְהוָה ("the Law of YHWH") as: מַמְסִירָא לְאָדָם ("making wise the simple, rejoicing the heart, and enlightening the eyes"). Psalm 19:8-9.

69The tablets of the Law were housed within the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus 25:16), and the Sefer Torah was set beside it (Deuteronomy 31:26). This is almost parallel in position to the tree of knowledge in the center of the garden and the cherubim placed to guard specifically the entrance to this tree.

took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to serve it [the ground] and to guard it. According to the cultic symbol view, Adam would have been commissioned to act as a kind of servant of YHWH, to guard the ground from desecration. This task in itself is not a cultic or priestly performance, however, the only other use of these verbs as a pair is found in Numbers 3:7-8; 8:26; 18:5-6, where they are used to express the duties of the Levites in ministering and guarding in the Sanctuary. Wenham observes that the narrative remark of God making “tunics” (הָדַלְמָה) for the man and woman from animal skins and “clothing them” (יִגְדַּלְמֶנָה) Genesis 3:21, is analogous to the several accounts of Moses “clothing” (הָדַלְמִים) the priests in their “tunics” (כְּתוֹנָה).

71 The pronominal suffix נֶ, on both עֵבֶר and אֵרֶן is feminine, while נַ is masculine. This may simply be a case of variable gender in nouns denoting place (cf. GKC, par. 1221) or, as I have opted, a reference to ארָן or אֵרֶן, both of which feminine. This seems the best option since nowhere else is נַ treated as feminine.

72 This is supported by the fact that the poetic synonym of נֶסֶר is נֶסֶר (“to protect”), and that the same root is used in Genesis 3:24 of the action of the guardian cherubim: נֶסֶרָמֶל שֵׁלֶחֶם אֵת נֶסֶרָמָה אֵית נֶסֶרָמָה ("... and stationed at the east of the garden of Eden the cherubim ...to guard the way to the tree of life"). Cf. this parallelism in Deuteronomy 33:9; Psalm 12:8 [English, verse 7]; 105:45; 119:34, 55-56, 145-146; 140:5 [English, verse 4]; 141:3; Proverbs 2:8, 11; 4:6; 5:2; 27:18.

73 This translation has deliberately emphasized the more literal rendering of עֵבֶר and אֵרֶן in order to convey their cultic overtones. The normal meaning of עֵבֶר is “to serve”, while that of אֵרֶן is “to exercise great care over,” or “to guard.” A more stylized translation might be “to till and to tend,” or the traditional “to dress and keep.”

74 The desecration here would be the intrusion of sin which would bring a curse on it, cf. Genesis 3:17: "אָרָן נֶסֶרָמֶל אֵית נֶסֶרָמָה ("cursed is the ground because of you ..."). Various views for the source of this sin include either men themselves (i.e., the extended family of Adam, cf. Genesis 5:4), Genesis 4:7: יִקְרָבָה אֲדֻלָּה ("sin is crouching at the door and its desire is for you"), or evil powers, such as embodied by the serpent (Genesis 3:1-5, 13-15).
at their ordination (Exodus 28:41; 29:8; 40:14; Leviticus 8:13).\textsuperscript{75} If by this association, Adam is here depicted as an archetypal Levite priest, then the possibility is strengthened that the Garden of Eden may also be viewed as an archetypal Sanctuary.

\textbf{Summary of Cultic Motif Imagery in Genesis}

While not denying that Genesis 1-3 are real events of primeval history, as literature it also functions paradigmatically. Repeated refrains, Creation-Sabbath day and Spirit-\textit{Shekinah} parallels in Genesis 1:1-2:3, the use of Genesis 1-3 as a

\textsuperscript{75}Wenham, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 21-22. Another inference from this "clothing" is that with the desecration of the "garden-sanctuary," it was now necessary to preserve the sanctity of divine worship by the exercise of human decency. The later requirement for priests approaching the altar was that they have their private parts decently covered: יָשָׁב בֵּית הַבְּרָכָה יַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ אֶת מֶשֶׁת הָלוֹם אֵלֶּה יָשָׁב בֵּית הַבְּרָכָה יַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ אֶת מֶשֶׁת הָלוֹם ("And you shall not go up by steps to My altar, that your nakedness may not be exposed on it"), Exodus 20:23 [English, verse 26]; cf. 28:42. This was in contrast to the practice of Canaanite priests who ascended the steps of their altars in order to expose their genitals to worshippers as a fertility rite. In this case, the prohibition may also have been to avoid association with pagan deities and a foreign cultus as well as to promote cultic and social purity. Common decency and modesty was also commanded of the average Israelite in Deuteronomy 23:13-14: רָאָשָׁב הַיָּד הַיְּדֵי הַיְּדֵי וְאָהָבַת הַיָּד הַיְּדֵי הַיְּדֵי ("you shall have a place outside the camp, and go out there, and you shall have a spade among your tools and it shall be when you sit down outside [to relieve yourself], you shall turn to cover up your excrement"). This command to relieve oneself outside the camp was based on the presence of the holy God: כִּי שׁוֹאֵל בָּנָי אַלֶּה קְרָאָם וְאֵשׁ בָּנָי אַלֶּה קְרָאָם וְאֵשׁ ("because YHWH your God walks in the midst of your camp ..."), Deuteronomy 23:15a. Therefore, the general purpose expressed by the command is ritual purity to keep (or restore) the presence of YHWH, or ritual impurity to alienate His presence: בִּלְּפָד בְּשָׁאֵלָה בָּנָי אַלֶּה מַעַרֵד לֹא יְרָא הַיָּדָה אֱלֹהֵי רַע הַיָּדָה ("...therefore your camp must be holy; and He must not see anything indecent among you lest He turn away from you"), Deuteronomy 23:15c. This latter concept of cultic activity in relation to the presence of God in the Sanctuary/ Temple carries an implicit expression of the desecration/restoration motif. If this act preservation of cultic purity is also in Genesis, then the Eden narrative may also bear examples of our desecration/restoration motif.
model for expressions in Exodus 25-31, the use of cultic terminology such as נֵגַר (“walk”), מָלַך תָו ("from before YHWH’s presence"), שָׁמַר ("keep, guard"), שָׁלַח בַּכָּתוֹת ("cloth with tunics") and features such as geographical orientation, water/rivers, precious stones, cherubim, and the tree of life, all link the garden of Eden with Mount Sinai and beyond to Zion and the eschatological Jerusalem and Temple. If these associations/parallels do imply a cultic character in Genesis, then elements common to the desecration/restoration motif may also be seen to be present. For instance, the hovering “Spirit” to restore the newly created world (Genesis 1:2), the purpose of the river to water the garden (Genesis 2:10), the quasi-priestly role of Adam serving and guarding the ground (from desecration), Genesis 2:15, and the couple’s later being clothed in tunics (to restore and preserve purity), using the vocabulary of later levitical ordination (Genesis 2:21), all perhaps echo aspects of the restoration motif.

The desecration motif may appear in the expulsion from the garden (Genesis 3:24), which then might be compared with later banishment from the camp of Israel, or exile from the Holy Land, each of which meant the suffering of a state of perpetual defilement, and a sort of “living death” (until some form of restoration could be effected). In both the expulsion from the garden, and the exile from Eretz-Israel, the land was considered “desecrated” (Genesis 3:17-18; Jeremiah 2:7; 16:18; Psalm 106:38; Ezekiel 36:17) and gestures of lamentation were appropriate (Leviticus 13:45-46; Numbers 5:2-4; 1 Samuel 15:35 with Lamentations [e.g. 1:3-4] with Genesis 3:18-19). The only way of return was a restoration through which cultic desecration could be removed. This was possibly alluded to in Eden by the purification ceremony in which the blood of an animal was shed when the couple were clothed in its skins (Genesis 3:21)\(^7\), as later it would be by the purification with the ashes of the red heifer (Numbers 19), and

\(^7\)In Genesis 3, however, there is no return to the garden and the tree of life through this act, because of mans’ new dual knowledge of “good and evil” (Genesis 3:22). Such a return could only come after the world itself had been purified by the Flood and the disruption at Babel (cf. parallels between Genesis 6-9, 11 and Leviticus below).
the water purification ceremony (Leviticus 14), an act with eschatological fulfillment in the restoration of Israel (cf. Ezekiel 36:25-27; 37:23, 26-28). This might fit with the rite of priestly ordination, for the priest would have to be ritually clean in order to officiate in the Sanctuary, just as the man and woman in leaving Eden to live in a cursed world would have to be sanctified in order to continue serving YHWH as His representatives. In each case, too, some word of the hope of restoration was given (Genesis 3:15 of a reversal or respite from the curse; Jeremiah 25:10-11 of a determined length of exile before return).

Therefore, the proposed literary and theological progression is from Genesis to Exodus, from proto-history to covenantal history. The drama which unfolds is a parallel schema: desecration, which brought a removal of man from the Divine Presence in an archetypal garden-sanctuary, will meet restoration, to be effected by the obedient move to Sinai and the establishment of another Sanctuary to re-admit man to the Divine Presence, there to renew his priestly role as designated for his original descendant in the garden.

**The Desecration/Restoration Motif in the Book of Exodus**

Our subsequent parallels between the Genesis and Exodus accounts have revealed that the Edenic desecration saw a resolution in the restoration at Sinai. While the Book of Exodus focuses on this restoration motif, it is prepared for by a statement of their condition in the Egyptian “exile,” with its attendant persecution from foreign elements, e.g., idolatry, bondage. This desecration, which sets the stage for the divine deliverance, may be seen as the theological consequence of the desecration in the Garden. The degenerate state of life without reference to YHWH through the Sanctuary is seen in the sons of Jacob in Canaan, whose foreign contamination and failure to separate from it, threatened the covenantal People before their formation as a Nation and the union of the covenantal triad of People-Land- and -Nation. The People had to leave the Promised Land in order to remain a Chosen People, since intermarriage with pagans was reducing the possibility of a distinct and holy Nation.
The literary irony of Exodus is that the Nation was actually formed within the womb of Egypt, and with their separation from the Egyptians (a mark of holiness), came the problem of desecration. In Exodus this is portrayed in an antagonist - the Pharaoh - who may stand in the line of the Edenic serpent within our parallel structure. We will consider the use of this figure as a form of the desecration motif, upon which later figures will build in the development of the motif.

**The Pharaoh as a Type of Desecrator**

No negative figure is more memorable in Exodus than the arch rival of YHWH and nemesis of Israel, the Pharaoh. While Egypt on the whole retains a quasi-positive position, as a refuge for Jews in times of famine or distress (cf. Genesis 12:10; 45:6-11, 18-20; 50:20; Jeremiah 26:22; 43:7; 44:1; Matthew 2:13-14), as a potential political ally with Israel against Mesopotamian invaders (Isaiah 30:2, 5-7; 31:3; 36:9), and is accorded a future with eschatologically restored Israel (Isaiah 19:24-25; Zechariah 14:18-19), the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Exodus has received only a place of infamy.

The method we are employing in our treatment of the Paranoiac imagery is analogical correspondence or typology. The term itself is derived from the

---

77The positive notices about Egypt are generally pre-exodus; after the exodus Egypt became the place of bondage and idolatry to which only the rebellious would return (Numbers 11:18-20; 14:3-4). It also served as an ensign of YHWH's power to the nations, with the phrases "remember all the wonders I did in Egypt" (Deuteronomy 4:34, 37; Psalm 78:43) or "how I brought them up from Egypt" (Leviticus 11:45; Joshua 24:6; I Samuel 8:8; etc.) serving to bring to recall YHWH's historical intervention. Egypt will be judged in the future (Isaiah 19:1-17), and its past judgments serve as eschatological forerunners (especially the plagues) of future retributive judgment on the nations. The references to Israelites fleeing to Egypt or living in Egypt after the exodus all are considered as acts of disobedience (Jeremiah 43:2; 44:8). Nevertheless, because of Egypt's episodes of fair treatment to the Jews (e.g., the time of Joseph), the prophets see them included as YHWH's vassals alongside Israel in the Messianic Age.

78The use of this term to convey analogical correspondence was revived and popularized by Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 2:363-387. For older works cf. e.g., Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology*
Greek τύπος ("example, pattern"), which is an adumbration or "figure" (which term itself comes from the Latin figura [for τύπος, although the Vulgate uses forma]). In typology, we have both a "type" and an "antitype" (ἀντίτυπος, "correspondence, representation"), which is a realized form of something previously foreshadowed as a type. We should underscore with Northrop Frye that typology is not allegory. Allegory is a story-myth that finds its "true meaning in a conceptual or argumentative translation, while typology deals with real people and events in a continuation of history, moving from the earliest past into the future and eternal world.

Pharaoh's status as a representative of opposition to the divine order is a prime example of typology. That he appears as a type, corresponding to future antitypes, rather than as an isolated figure in history, is seen in the fact that his name is never mentioned. This serves as a literary device to focus the attention of Scripture. Reprint of 1900 edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1975), 2 vols., see especially 1:106-139; 2:416-445. House von Rad's discussion is in terms of "structural analogy" between the use of the Tanach and the New Testament, however, it is equally applicable in the analogous correspondences made within Tanach by writers in various genre and in different historical situations. von Rad thought of both a theological correspondence that consisted of "peculiar interconnection of revelation by word and revelation by event," and a sacral correspondence, in which "this world ... full of symbols ... is related to something higher, an ultimate fixed order in the spiritual world." This, he saw, as being related in ancient Near Eastern thought through the correspondence between macrocosm and microcosm, the heavenly prototypes of all lands, rivers, cities and temples, which had a mythological basis, but in Israel, by an historical and eschatological correspondence between original and copy projected into the temporal realm by historical succession. Distinct from allegorical exegesis, typological exegesis attempted to stay within the context of the passage, and interpret the symbolic correspondence within the guidelines permitted by the author.


80The Egyptian expression pera'ō ("the Great House") is transcribed and vocalized as פֶּרֶאָו in Hebrew. It did not originally serve as part of the official titulary of the king, but instead referred to his palace (at least until the middle of the 18th dynasty, c. 1575-1308 B.C.E.). In the Tanach, however, "Pharaoh"
on his larger-than-life or cosmic role as the antagonist of YHWH and His prophet Moses. Moshe Greenberg has observed that Pharaoh's place in the Tanach may serve as a paradigm for organized human power in defiance of divine sovereignty:

Pharaoh does not recognize God (i.e., his authority) or his right over Israel. The king epitomizes human pride, refusing to acknowledge a power superior to itself, a recurrent topic of biblical thought. Sennacherib echoes Pharaoh: “Which of all the gods of these lands saved from my power, that the Lord should save Jerusalem from my power?” (Isa. 36:20). The Mesopotamian tyrant of Isa. 14:14f. thinks: “I will ascend heaven, set my throne above God’s stars ... mount the back of clouds, be like the Most High”; Nebuchadnezzar boasts as he threatens the three Hebrew youths, “Which god will be able to rescue you from my power?” (Dan. 3:15). And the wicked, as Job tells us, say “Who is Shadday that we should serve him?” (Job 21:14 f., ST).81

In this sense the Pharaoh transcends his historical time frame to take on an eschatological dimension typifying the ultimate opposition to the divine will, namely the End-time Desecrator, known from Daniel 11 as the “Little Horn,” in the Jewish apocalyptic literature as “Belial” or the “son of Belial,” and in the New Testament as the “Antichrist.” However, we need to examine historical traits of the Pharaoh, especially in the Egyptian theological context, as this has in part served as the basis for the polemical presentation of the plague narrative in Exodus, and further casts the image of the Pharaoh as a model for later development.

The Concept of the Paranoiac Divine Kingship

The concept of the Pharaoh in Egyptian history provides some background into why this figure assumed the dimension of divine opponent in the Tanach. From the time of the earliest Egyptian dynasties and throughout Egyptian history always designates the Egyptian king, often following the earlier usage without the addition of a personal name.

the Pharaoh was viewed as the primary god of the world. This divinity came by virtue of the Pharaoh’s identification with the sun god Re, Horus, and Osiris, the three principal deities in the Egyptian pantheon.

In addition to this identification with the gods, the attributes and functions of the Pharaoh reveal his divine status. Accordingly, he was the “high priest” of the Egyptian cult, the source and maintainer of ma’at (“divine order = truth, justice, wisdom, life”), the omnipotent “war god.” hence, “the savior of

---


83 The Pharaoh was considered an incarnation of Re, and thus was called “son of Re.” He was considered “the god of heaven” since this was Re’s popular nomen, cf. E. L. A. Meyerowitz, *Divine Kingship in Gana and Ancient Egypt* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 396. Although Horus and Osiris were considered father and son, their relationship with the Pharaoh reveals that they were actually dual manifestations of a single deity (Horus-Osiris), since the Pharaoh was the incarnation of Horus while alive, and the incarnation of Osiris in the afterlife, cf. A. B. Samuel Mercer, *Horus, Royal God of Egypt* (Grafton: Society of Oriental Research, 1942), pp. 145-147; E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life. Books on Egypt and Chaldea* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1899), pp. 73-74.


Egypt."\(^87\) It is in these last epithets that we find the Pharaoh’s chief function as the sole agent in Egypt responsible for subduing all foreign powers, and perhaps the reason he was worshipped as a god both before and after death.\(^88\) Both the Pharaoh’s status as principal divinity and omnipotent warrior set the stage for a polemical confrontation with YHWH, Who as the sovereign of the universe was challenged with respect to the Pharaoh’s domination over Israel, whom He was sworn to protect and defend (cf. Genesis 12:3; 17:7; 22:17; Exodus 3:8), and to Whom alone belongs worship (cf. Exodus 3:12).

**The Concept of the Pharaoh as a Cosmic Contender**

We find the polemical nature of the contest with Pharaoh enhanced by the plague narratives (Exodus 7:14-12:36), which serve to focus attention on the religious system of Egypt, which the Pharaoh represented. G. K. Beale has demonstrated that the *Verstockungsmotiv* ("hardening motif") in Exodus was also polemical in nature, having as its purpose (1) a demonstration of YHWH’s uniqueness to the Egyptians (Exodus 7:17; 8:6 [10], 18 [22]; 9:16; 10:1-2; 14:4, 17-18, (2) to create a memorial in Israel for future generations (Exodus 10:1-2; 13:14-16), and (3) to magnify YHWH’s Name (Exodus 14:4, 17-18).\(^89\) This was the positive side, but the negative side was the restriction of Pharaoh’s will in

---


order to showcase his rebellion against the divine purpose, and especially against YHWH Himself. Greenberg notes this when he remarks:

The hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (verse 3) is to make him an example for all time of the consequences of prideful defiance of God (cf. 10:1). The narrative has established the heinousness of his crimes and their root in a heathen usurpation of divine authority.\(^{90}\)

As Pharaoh’s defiance of YHWH is a paradigm for later such displays of arrogance by rulers oppressing Israel, especially those who attack and desecrate the Sanctuary, which represents an attack upon YHWH Himself (e.g. Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus IV, Titus), so in Exodus the plagues in connection with this image of Pharaoh, serve as eschatological forerunners of a future cosmic conflict.\(^ {91}\) Indeed, the New Testament apocalypse in its presentation of the eschaton has employed not only positive Exodus typology (redemption, song of Moses, etc.), but also negative, in the repetition of the plagues as judgments of YHWH on both an abominable world system (Babylon redidus) and an eschatological Pharaoh *par excellence*, the Antichrist (cf. Revelation 16-18).

**The Concept of the Pharaoh as a Universal Antagonist**

The characterization of Pharaoh as the epitome of all evil and opposition to God and the Jews is developed vividly in the Aggadah. There all references to the Pharaoh are invariably hostile. The rabbis depicted the ancient Egyptians as uniformly evil and depraved - ugly in both appearance (Gen. R. 40:4) and character, usually as sexually deviant (cf. Sifra, 7:11; Josephus, *Antiquities* I: 162). In line with this anti-Egyptian attitude of the rabbis, in Genesis, the Pharaoh is a “wicked man” (Tanh. B. Gen. 33) who was determined to seduce Sarah (Gen. R. 41:2). The Pharaoh of the Oppression was not “new” (Exodus 1:8), only his

---


anti-Israelite decrees were “new.” He was said to have bathed in the blood of the Hebrew children because he had leprosy and sought this method as a perverse cure (Ex. R. 1:34). The Pharaoh’s order to cast the infant males, but not the females, were taken as evidence of the Pharaoh’s desire to satisfy his sexual appetites. His treatment of the Israelite slaves included brutally burning or immuring infants and adults in unfinished buildings when the Israelites did not meet their work quota (Sot. 11a-b; Ex. R. 1:10-11; 18:9).

Of greater significance than this list of Paranoiac atrocities was the charge that Pharaoh claimed divine honors for himself (Ex. R. 8:12; Tanh. B., Ex. 16). The Egyptian claim of immortality in particular is a recurring theme in rabbinic literature. The comparison of Pharaoh and God is expressed poignantly in one midrash that has Pharaoh ask Moses and Aaron concerning YHWH: “What is the name of your God? Wherein does His strength consist, and His power? How many countries, how many provinces, how many cities has He under His dominion? In how many campaigns was He victorious? How many lands did He make subject to Himself? How many cities did He capture? When He goes to war, how many warriors, riders, chariots, and charioteers does He lead forth?” When Moses and Aaron respond that God’s power and strength fill the whole world, Pharaoh retorts: “I have no need of Him. I have created myself.”92 Such a text displays the rabbinic concurrence with the image of the Pharaoh as a universal antagonist.

Our purpose in this survey of the figure of the Egyptian Pharaoh has been to introduce the concept of a type of human cosmic opponent to YHWH whose image will be repeated in the form of despotic rulers, desecrators of the Israelite cult, and desolators of Jerusalem and the Temple. This image will be seen to progressively accumulate definition until in Daniel it takes a concrete form as a coming abomination that makes desolate. It is then this form of the type that finds

---

its antitypical fulfillment in eschatological form in the apocalyptic literature and the New Testament in the visage of the Anti-messiah or Antichrist.

**THE DESERECATION /RESTORATION MOTIF IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS**

In approaching the historical books the stage is now set in Israel’s divine drama. The stage is now set in the Land, the design announced by YHWH at the Exodus (Exodus 5:22-6:8; Hosea 2:14-23). Following the setting of the stage during the period of the conquest and settlement (Joshua - Judges), life was now to be lived with the cultus fully established and functioning to regulate Israel as a holy Nation in the midst of the nations. YHWH’s blessings will now be experienced in the Land, and His curse for disobedience, the threat of exile (Deuteronomy 28:15-68), has reality to motivate fidelity. In the Torah we have seen the triad of YHWH-Israel-Land as a consequence of the covenant; in the historical books we learn how this relationship served to safeguard the rights of the family, and how, if broken, the Land, which belonged inalienably to the Householder/Landowner (YHWH), could be recalled by Him, just as it had been regained by Him (the period of the conquest and settlement in Joshua-Judges).

Life in the Land from 1,000-597 B.C.E. (the period of the monarchy) was a life lived in relation to the Land, which was a symbol of the life of blessing (Deuteronomy 26:9). At stake was the quality of life, of blessing, which could be experienced only through a proper relationship with YHWH, i.e., the cult (Deuteronomy 8:6-18; cf. Jeremiah 2:7). The cult, rather than the exodus, now

---

93 In our use of the term “historical books” we are referring primarily to the books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.


95 On the social-ethical level this life was governed through הָבְלָה (“wisdom,” or better “a skill in living”) which took the legal outline of the cult and made it practical for life (cf. Israel’s Wisdom Literature, but especially Proverbs 1-9).
was to become the medium by which Israel and the nations came to know the sovereignty and incomparability of YHWH. Martens has stated it succinctly:

The exodus, an event played in the arena of international powers, represents a forceful medium for the experience of Yahweh. But events in the frame of history do not exhaust the means by which God becomes known. In the cult, Yahweh was known, not in a physical display of power, but in the no less forceful practices of worship. In these worship prescriptions and practices Yahweh was known in a way different from a physical display of power, but no less forceful.96

The Desecration Motif in the Historical Books

The establishment of a central Sanctuary was the goal of the exodus, according to Exodus 29:45-46 (cf. Leviticus 26:11-13). יְהֹוָה בִּתְבוּרָה בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: וַיֹּאמֶר יְהֹוָה לֵא לָא לַעֲלוֹת: וַיֹּאמֶר יְהֹוָה לֵא לָא לַעֲלוֹת: וַיֹּאמֶר יְהֹוָה לֵא לָא לַעֲלוֹת: And I will dwell among the people of Israel, and will be their God. And they will know that I am YHWH their God, Who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them ...”). In the historical books we are introduced to the realization of, and the eventual desecration and destruction of, the central Sanctuary established in Mount Zion in Jerusalem. Using the biblical metaphor of the Nation as YHWH’s choice vine, we find here Israel “planted in the mountain of YHWH’s inheritance” (Exodus 15:17), and in the “good Land” (“settlement,” Deuteronomy 8:10), to bloom and produce the fruits of holiness (“monarchy,” cf. Isaiah 5:1-2a, 4a), or to become infested with a disease that will ultimately cause it to be “abandoned, trampled” (Isaiah 5:5-6), and “burned” (“destruction, exile,” Isaiah 9:13a), yet, with a living “stump remaining” (“remnant,” cf. Isaiah 9:13b), which will be enabled to grow again (restoration). Our plan in this section is to simply demonstrate in a general fashion the use of the desecration/restoration motif in the literary narratives.

---

Our historical survey of the Temple in chapter two presented the role of King David as the one chosen by YHWH to choose the site for the Temple, a choice apparently governed by the previous traditions about Mount Moriah, called הַרְיָהְש ("the mount of YHWH") in Genesis 22:2, 14, and the supposed interpretation of it by David as "the mountain of [YHWH's] inheritance" (II Chronicles 3:1; cf. Exodus 15:17; Psalm 2:6; 78:54, 68:16; 76:2; 132:13-14).97 The realization of this tradition, of the goal of the exodus to wed YHWH and His people through the cult, and of David's ardent desire to build the Temple, a desire thwarted by his own role in the drama as "a man of bloodshed," all add emotional intensity to the unthinkable act of desecration. Nebuchadnezzar, the ruler of Babylon (the symbol of pagan opposition to YHWH), enters the scene as the object du horror, the "Temple-Desecrator," whose larger-than-life image projects the drama beyond the historical plane to set the stage for the eschatological drama yet to be played.98 With the literary atmosphere charged with the suspense of the unfolding drama, the motif of Temple desecration in the historical books brings its audience to its climax in three successive acts:

Act One: The drama begins with a play on the irony of Solomon, the Temple-builder, who sows the seeds of his own Sanctuary's destruction by his introduction of desecrating and defiling idolatrous practices (syncretism and foreign cults).99

---

97 The Chronicler portrays the completed Temple as the fulfillment of all the various traditions associated with the Tabernacle, Ark, and Temple, as the center to which they all contributed. If this reflects a post-exilic setting, then the purpose for this portrayal was, according to Williamson: "to smooth the way for return by those groups which may have set particular store by one or other of these traditions and so distanced themselves from the Jerusalem community." H. G. M. Williamson, I and 2 Chronicles. The New Century Bible. Edited by Ronald E. Clements (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Publishers Ltd., 1982), p. 29.

98 The figure of Nebuchadnezzar as a divine opponent and its eschatological significance will be discussed in the next chapter.

99 Political marriages are ostensibly the explanation for the necessity of Solomon building pagan altars (I Kings 11:1, 8), however, the text states that their was a growing duplicity in Solomon's commitment to the legitimate cultus (verses 2-4,
Act Two: The drama is heightened by the religious defection of the Northern Kingdom, pictured through the establishment of alternative (illegitimate) cultic centers that perpetuated religious syncretism (cf. Jeroboam’s golden calves at Dan and Bethel), and the forbidden alignment with foreign powers (a further desecration of the Land and Sanctuary), which placed the Temple in jeopardy of physical desecration through contact, should these foreigners launch an invasion.

Act Three: The drama is brought to its climax by the idolatrous contamination of the holy city (II Chronicles 36:14), the occasional apostasy of its later kings (especially Ahaz and Manasseh), and the anticipated invasion of foreign powers, described as instruments of YHWH’s retributive justice (cf. II Kings 24:2-3, 20; II Chronicles 36:17). Deportation and exile, a permanent state of defilement, becomes the final tragedy, seemingly dashing the hope of restoration by virtue of an irreversible captivity.

6, 9; cf. I Kings 3:3). The pagan installations, according to I Kings 11:5-7, were dedicated to the foreign deities: Ashtarte of the Phoenicians (verse 5a), Milcom of the Ammonites (verse 5b), Chemosh of the Moabites (verse 7a), and Molech of the Ammonites (verse 7b). The Chronicler omits this negative description of Solomon, choosing rather to focus on his regard for the cultus (cf. I Chronicles 8:11), yet includes a veiled reference to Solomon’s idolatrous associations indirectly in the warning of I Chronicles 7:19.

I do not hold that Jeroboam’s intention was simply a retreat to a non-competitive, pre-Davidic dynastic form of worship, i.e., a legitimate pre-Mosaic system in which the golden calves served as symbols of YHWH’s footstool (a pre-Mosaic Ark), although if this were the case, in light of the Davidic covenant (II Samuel 7:12-16), and the establishment of the Temple as the sole legitimate Sanctuary (II Chronicles 7:16), any alternative site was illegitimate and a desecration, a fact stated by the Judahite prophet Abijah (II Chronicles 13:5-12).

This ultimate drama of desecration was prepared for in these books progressively through the insertion of accounts of the plundering of the Temple treasure,\footnote{102} by the reduction of the Temple’s adornment to pay foreign tribute,\footnote{103} by the presumptive display of the Temple’s wealth [glory] to foreigners,\footnote{104} by the introduction of idols to the Holy place and Holy of Holies,\footnote{105} and finally by the burning of the edifice itself with fire.

**The Restoration Motif in the Historical Books**

The motif of restoration is equally inter-woven throughout the historical books of Kings and Chronicles as a literary [divine] drama.\footnote{106} With the climax of the drama now reached, a tension has been introduced that requires a resolution. Even though the historical books end without this resolution realized, it is fully anticipated; even mandated, as for example in the closing words of II Chronicles 36:23:

\[וַיָּמָשׂ֣נָהוּ הָיְךָ֔ה לֹֽאָלֵ֑י יְהוָ֛ה וַיֶּנְחַ֥ק יְהוָ֖ה מִכֶּ֑ל כְּלֵֽיָ֝וָּה לֹ֣א יִנִּ֖שָׂאֽוּ ילֹ֥וָֽוָּה יְהוָֽה֙
\]

\[The invaders and looters of the Temple treasury included: Egyptian pharaoh Shishak, c. 910 B.C.E. (I Kings 14:25-28; II Chronicles 12:1-11), and Northern Kingdom king Jehoash (Joash), c. 826 B.C.E. (II Kings 14:13-14).\]


\[The following passages proleptically introduce the Babylonians as Temple desecrators at this stage in the narrative, providing the readers an ironic hint of the tragedy they already know so well (cf. II Kings 20:12-21; II Chronicles 32:31; Isaiah 39:1-8).\]


"He has appointed me to build Him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever there is among you of all His people, may YHWH his God be with him, and let him go up [to rebuild]). This anti-climax comes through three acts of restoration, prepared for by literary contrasts within the desecration narrative, then erupting in full statement (historically, in the Persian period). Just as there is a parallel restoration promise within the desecration contexts, so too, there is a desecration threat within the restoration contexts. This sustains the drama with a challenge to the reader that the last scene of the last act has not yet been played, and serves didactically as a moral stimulus to apply the principles of the story in his own life-setting. These acts in the restoration drama may be distinguished as:

Act One: The religious defection that has defiled both people, Land, and Sanctuary will only affect those outside of the orbit of the cult in Judah. A reprieve from YHWH’s judgment is given the Southern Kingdom (i.e., the Davidic dynasty), even though it introduced the sacrilege. Instead, judgment will fall on the offending Northern Kingdom, who departed from the realm of sanctity, the Temple, and joined the foreign realm of defilement. Israel will serve as a warning to their sister Judah to restore the cult to purity and regain their holy status as a priestly Nation.

Act Two: The drama is heightened by the miraculous deliverance of Judah (Jerusalem) from the siege of Sennacherib, even while Israel falls to the Assyrian army (II Kings 19:35-37; Isaiah 37:36-38). It had been the Assyrians that had reduced the sanctity of the Temple by the removal of its treasures to pay their tribute (II Kings 18:13-16). Now divine intervention restores the sanctity of the Temple, at the heart of the besieged city, by repelling the foreign invaders that bring defilement. Desecration is reversed, the Name of YHWH is restored in the sight of the nations (II Kings 18:32c-35; Isaiah 36:18-20), and restoration of the cult is again made possible.

As the drama nears its desecration climax, attempts at restoration are made to reverse the destructive trend toward desecration and defilement. Righteous
kings depose unrighteous kings, restoring the cult, purifying the Sanctuary, while demonstrating renewed commitment to the covenant by the destruction of all pagan idols and altars.\footnote{Among the occasional restorations of the Temple and cult during this final period of Judah’s decline are those of Hezekiah, c. 715 B.C.E., who re-opens the Temple, returns its vessels, builds new storerooms, and renews the ritual of Pesach (II Chronicles 29:5-39; 30:1-27; 31:11-12), and Josiah, c. 622 B.C.E., who repairs the Temple, returns the Ark to the Holy of Holies, again renews the Pesach celebration (II Kings 22:3-23:3; II Chronicles 34:8-35:19). We might also add restoration as acts of repentance, e.g., Manasseh, who removed the idols he had placed in the Temple and renewed the official cult (II Chronicles 33:15).} There is even a glimpse of the total restoration (Israel together with Judah) in II Chronicles 30:18, 25, where a multitude from the Northern Kingdom are represented, and of sanctification apart from legitimate purification by the intercession of prayer (a model for the exilic hope of restoration, Daniel 6:10; cf. Ezekiel 1:1-3), II Chronicles 30:19-20.

In these acts of restoration, the audience is provided with a recurrent theme of hope, only to find it unsuccessful. Such repetition heightens the drama by prolonging the climax, but it also gives the reader an inward assurance that the tragic end will receive a resolution, thereby permitting an emotional control as the reader becomes involved with the story. The reader’s natural desire for resolution to conflict is also intensified by the tantalizing previews of restoration that are strategically placed at the conclusions of announcements of judgment/despersion. In these statements many of the basic elements of the restoration motif are included in the promise of YHWH in this deliverance:

1. \textit{The restoration of the people, and Land}: ולָכְפָּה אֵלֶּה בִּיתֵי-רֹאשֶׁת
   תָּגַּמָּה הַלֵּאָה נָכָּת הַלְּאִמאֵת עֹרֶה לַעֲמָשׁ (“And the remnant of the house of Judah that escaped shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward”), I Kings 18:30; Isaiah 37:31.

2. \textit{The restoration of a remnant in relation to the cult, i.e., Mount Zion}: ולָכְפָּה אֵלֶּה לַכְּלָיָה הַלְּאִמאֵת עֹרֶה לַעֲמָשׁ (“a remnant shall go forth from Jerusalem, survivors from
("For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and out of Mount Zion survivors. The zeal of YHWH [of hosts] will perform this"). II Kings 19:31.

(3) The restoration of YHWH's honor, i.e., the sanctification of the Name (cf. Ezekiel 36:22-23); נגוזת תַּחַת שמיים נאחז רָאשׁ עֶבֶרָה נִיטאֲזָה אֶלֶּה יְהוֹ הִגְזֵה ("For I will defend this city to save it for My own [Name’s] sake, and for My servant David’s sake"), II Kings 19:34.

Act Three: The realized restoration of the divine triad: YHWH (the cult), Land, and people (a remnant of both Judah and Israel). The focus of the restoration is the site of the legitimate cult, Judah, and this has been anticipated for the reader by the exception treatment afforded King Jehoiachin, the last of the Davidic dynasty, in Babylon. The Book of II Kings closes with this reference to the exiled Judean king to (1) reinforce the assurance of restoration, as yet promissory, that the tragic judgment and exile did not nullify YHWH’s commitment in the Davidic covenant to

Mount Zion”), while there, the word of YHWH from Jerusalem (“the torah will go forth from Zion, and the word of YHWH from Jerusalem”). Since our verse is also in Isaiah, and both texts involve a witness to the nations as a result of divine intervention, within a restoration context, it is possible that the intent here is to express the eschatological goal of Israel’s fulfillment of her priestly role in the instruction of torah to the world.

The idea of a remnant, a minority group of those faithful to YHWH and observant of the cult, is pervasive throughout Tanach. It is the fact that such a remnant exists, even though within the larger national entity that has become defiled and subject to judgment, that permits a restoration to be enacted in cultic terms, cf. further, Gerhard Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews University Monographs 5 (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1975). On the status of the remnant as being comprised of descendant deportees from both the Southern and Northern kingdoms, there is some evidence of Jewish migration from Assyria to Babylon during the Chaldean period, and of resident Jews from Israel and Judah together in Babylonian provinces during the Achaemenian period, cf. Ran Zadok, The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods According to the Sources. Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel 3 (University of Haifa, 1979), pp. 40-50.
restore Judah and its cult, and (2) to link the past lineage with the resumption of the dynasty in the future, represented by the present preservation of Jehoiachin (II Kings 25:27-30; cf. Jeremiah 25:31-34).

The evidence to the reader of restoration in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, follows the theological method of selection, like the Chronicler, of historical events in the David-Solomonic tradition, in order to project the image of the anticipated eschatological consummation of the promise in terms of the covenant of II Samuel 7. This evidence takes several forms:

1) **Extensive genealogical lists** (Ezra 2:1-70; 8:1-14; Nehemiah 7:5-65). The purpose of these [census] lists were to verify the return by legitimizing the continued existence of the tribal representatives, and by establishing the continuation of the cult and the cultic personnel (the list includes priests, Levites, and others associate with the cult. Ezra 2:36-54; 8:1-14; Nehemiah 7:39-56).

2) **Covenant renewal.** In this renewal the exclusivity, or separateness (Deuteronomy 7:3-4; Ezra 9:1-2), that had been abandoned by the Nation, resulting in its desecration and defilement, and exile (Ezra 9:6-7), was restored. Ezra and Nehemiah do this through the restoration of community purity by the nullification of illegitimate (foreign) marriages (Ezra 10:2-17; Nehemiah 13:23-29),\(^{110}\) and by the restoration of the observance of the Sabbath, the sign of the Mosaic covenant (Exodus 31:12-17), which in this case involved also contact with foreign influences (Nehemiah 13:15-18).

3) **Resumption of the cult.** This act involved both the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezra 3:1-13; 6:14-15), its dedication and purification of cultic personnel and participants (Ezra 6:16-21), and in keeping with the renewal of the

\(^{110}\) That this form of intermarriage (cf. Judges 3:5-6; Malachi 13:23-28), which may have included the adoption of syncretistic practices, was considered as the epitome of covenant violation is witnessed by the appeal of Shecaniah to the people to dissolve the illegitimate marriages by making a covenant with YHWH (Ezra 10:2).
covenant,\textsuperscript{111} the reinstitution of the festival schedule (Ezra 3:3-4; 6:19-22; Nehemiah 8:2-18), which included a separation from all foreigners for the purpose of covenantal ratification via confession (Nehemiah 9:2). Eugene Merrill has succinctly stated the significance of the cult for the post-exilic community:

It was Israel in worship that best modeled the dominion of Yahweh over all aspects of human life. Just as the destruction of the Temple and its ministries signaled the true beginning of the Exile, so its rebuilding and the renewal of its ministries would make the re-establishment of God’s people to their redemptive role. The community without worship could serve no effective purpose.\textsuperscript{112}

The central event, which serves to carry the drama in these books, is the rebuilding of the Temple. The restoration cannot be accomplished, in the reality of the cult, without the existence of the Temple as the focus of the community’s worship and life. The link forged with the Davidic dynasty in the exilic preservation of Jehoiachin is continued with Zerubbabel, who is not only a descendant of the house of David, but also a priest. In terms of recall, the audience is now encouraged to compare the Zeal of Zerubbabel with that of his ancestor David over the task of Temple building, and to contrast the singleness of commitment and spiritual purity of Zerubbabel with that of the first Temple builder, Solomon. The result is something that approaches an eschatological fulfillment, and may have influenced the visionary statement concerning of Zerubbabel (Zechariah 4:6-10) and the projection of the High Priest Joshua as a messianic type (Zechariah 6:12-15).

\textsuperscript{111}Cf. F. C. Fensham, "Some Theological and Religious Aspects in Ezra and Nehemiah," \textit{JNSL} 11 (1983): 64-66, who observes that "the practice of Israel in terms of the covenant was inextricably connected to the national worship system with its holy places, holy persons, holy actions, and holy times."

Joined with the rebuilding of the Temple is the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, for it is referred to as בֵּית הַלָּכְדָּה יְרוּשָׁלָּם ("the house of God which [is] at Jerusalem"), (Ezra 4:24), and served as the regnal capital of the Divine Presence, and therefore required a complementary restoration. For this reason, the Temple and the city are used interchangeably (cf. Ezra 7:15-17, 19), and Nehemiah appealed to those restoration Jews living outside Jerusalem to help repopulate the "holy city" (Nehemiah 11:1-2) that it might better correspond to the restoration ideal (cf. Ezekiel 36:37-38).

**Literary Typology in the Desecration/Restoration Motif**

As suggested earlier, within both the negative and positive elements of our motif are juxtaposed contrasting figures who serve as types of desecration or restoration to alternately maintain or alleviate the suspense of the drama by either unexpected disjunction or ironic fulfillment. In this respect, the figure of the Samaritans (Ezra 4:1-24) function as a type of minor Temple-desecrator, and the figures of Cyrus (Ezra 1:1-11; 5:13-15) and Darius (Ezra 6:1-12) function as types of Temple-restorers.

**The Samaritans as a Type of Temple Desecrator**

The Samaritans, called אֲרֵי יָרוֹדָה, אֲבָילָם ("the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin," Ezra 4:1a), were rejected from assisting in the rebuilding efforts because they were foreigners whose very purpose in the land had been to foster syncretistic worship and defuse a nationalistic unity.113 Such a posture was

---

113 The Assyrian deportation policy dictated the transplantation of foreign captives in settlements in territorial acquisitions, on the one hand because they served as an extension of the Assyrian empire which was too small to effectively maintain its provinces, and on the other to disrupt the former loyalties to state and gods by a process of political and religious amalgamation. This created a new ethnic and religiously syncretistic group, loyal to the hegemony of the Assyrian empire. In the case of Samaria, Esarhaddon had settled a foreign element in the region (c. 669 B.C.E.) which intermarried with the resident Israelite population (only the elite had been deported) and had produced the present Samaritan threat to the returning unmixed Jewish population. For a further discussion of Assyrian procedures cf. Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and*
completely antithetical to the concept of the Temple. Furthermore, the text implies that the Samaritan offer was a ruse, since their true intent was not to assist the Judeans, but to force a conflict that would bring Persian intervention and delay, if not end, the rebuilding. There is the historical possibility that the Samaritans already had a temple of their own, and would not have wanted a rival Temple in Jerusalem. By the first century the Samaritans boast a rival ed worship on Mount Gerazim, which was viewed for the Samaritan community as the center stage for the fulfillment of the eschatological promises (cf. John 4:20, 25). Alan Crown has speculated such an attitude may have fur thered the Judean-Samaritan schism at that time: "It is probable that the expectation of the restoration of their own temple prevented the Samaritans from sharing the ambivalence of the Essenes and of the Christians to the Jerusalem temple." While we would disagree with Crown that the Essenes or Christians were "ambivalent" toward the Temple, if he is correct in his assessment of the Samaritan attitude of the first-century, when their temple lay in ruins, it is even more possible that such an attitude existed during the Persian period when their temple would have been intact.

The Persians as a Type of Temple Desecrator

Rejection brought opposition, and the work of rebuilding the Temple was suspended between the administrations of Cyrus and Darius (c. 486-520 B.C.E.,


Josephus in Jewish Antiquities 2:7-8 records that the Samaritan temple was authorized by Alexander the Great, built of unhewn stone, and was comparable in size to the Jerusalem Temple. It was said to have been destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 168 B.C.E., although no archaeological evidence of its existence has been discovered, cf. Robert T. Anderson, "The Elusive Samaritan Temple," BA (June, 1991): 104-107.

Ezra 4:5-6 with 24). The nature of the opposition took the form of political protests to Ahasuerus (Xerxes) and Artaxerxes that the Jews were rebuilding ("the rebellious and evil city") and resulted in military intervention by the Persians to quell the rebuilding efforts. Here, unexpectedly in the account of restoration, is another instance of Temple desecration and defilement. Foreign invaders again come into the holy city and to the foundations of the holy house, and like Nebuchadnezzar before them, force a cessation of the cult (centered around the Temple). The effect of this surprise device on the reader is significant. The reader, who had comfortably accepted the anti-climactic resolution of the restoration, is now faced again with a tension, and the element of drama is renewed.

*The Persians (Cyrus) as a Type of Temple Restorer*

In the same manner, the surprise ended, the reader's interest is further sustained by the introduction of an unexpected irony in the resolution of the tension created by the Samaritan opposition. Here, the irony is that the very foreign power that destroyed the Temple will now be the means of rebuilding it. Cyrus, whose appointment as a divine instrument of restoration had been announced by the prophet Isaiah (Isaiah 44:28-45:1-25), is joined by Darius, who reverses the injunction against Temple rebuilding in compliance with the Cyrus' decree (Ezra 6:1-12).

The irony of reversal is heightened in the account by the order of the return of the sancta, stolen by Nebuchadnezzar and carried to Babylon, and especially by the specificity of the order: "put them in the house of God" (Ezra 6:5). In a sense, the foreign hands that had desecrated the Sanctuary and removed its sancta, now is compelled to make a complete restoration. Theologically, the reader realizes that YHWH is continuing to act according to His covenantal

\[116\] That the sacrificial system was also interrupted is implied in the decree of Darius: "let the house of God at Jerusalem, where sacrifices are offered, be rebuilt" (Ezra 6:3). To rebuild the Temple was to reinstate the sacrificial system, therefore, to stop the one was to hold in abeyance the other.
arrangement. In regards to Israel, as He has cursed, so He now has blessed. In regard to His divine honor, as it was profaned by His act of judgment, so now it is sanctified by His act of restoration (cf. Ezekiel 36:18-24).

The Rehearsal of the Creation in the Covenantal Restoration

Another literary device is discernible in the restoration motif in Nehemiah 9:1-38. In this lengthy benediction of Ezra, following the renewal of the covenant with an affirmation of loyalty, which included repentance for previous disloyalty, the rehearsal of covenant history begins appropriately grounded in YHWH’s initial work of creation (verse 6). Theologically, the restoration was predicated on creation, where in Genesis 1:2 a restoration of the “unformed” (יוֹצֵר) and “unfilled” (גָּבָה) land was effected by the שֵׂרָא יָהּ, which we have identified with the Shekinah.

This linkage between the Creation and the covenantal renewal ceremony is reinforced by the Ezra prayer being cast in the standard suzerain-vassal treaty form, which begins with the suzerain as initiator of the covenant. Here, YHWH as the Suzerain, is depicted as the sovereign Creator by the merism of “heavens and earth,” and the initiator and preserver of covenant with the words “You made … You fulfilled,” (verse 8). This linkage with creation brings the motif of restoration full circle, and reminds the reader of the cultic associations between Eden and the Exodus.

With the use of the desecration/restoration motif the thought of the Tanach is unified at this point (ante-diluvian-patriarchal and pre-monarchical -post-monarchical periods). We must now consider expressly the role of the prophets in propagating and developing this motif in their preparation for and reaction to the destruction of the First Temple.

---


THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF IN THE PROPHETS

Having seen the pre-exilic, and to some extent the post-exilic, uses of the desecration/restoration motif in literary analysis, we turn now to examine exegetically two examples from the exilic literature that are classic presentations of our motif. The first is a vivid portrayal of the desecration of the Temple through Jeremiah’s vision of multiplied idolatry in the Sanctuary and cult, known as Jeremiah’s “Temple sermon” (Jeremiah 7:1-8:3). The second, in Ezekiel 36:18-38, includes a theological assessment of desecration as the cause of the Exile, but primarily presents a theocentric treatment of eschatological restoration. A brief study of the contribution of Ezekiel 40-48 to the restoration ideal of the eschatological Temple completes this selective analysis.

The prophets stood, as Deerman observes, in paradoxical critique of the central institutions that sustained Israelite society, and was the basis of their continued historical existence: "What was assumed as central to the identity of society (its central institutions) was judged by these prophets as central to society's failure."119 This "paradox" arose from the pre-exilic prophet's assessment of the culture and national character of Israel as utterly devoid of true, non-syncretistic Yahwism, which form of offensive worship was manifested in the Temple and by the priesthood. Yet, it was these very institutions that were necessary for national survival. There is no other subject which receives more of the prophets' criticism than that of public ritualistic worship, but we should not understand by their critique of popular religious practice a rejection of the cultic institutions. This question, of whether the prophets condemned the ritual of public worship, or whether the condemnation is of the incongruity of public practice with public worship, has long been a subject of controversy. The resolution of the question is best determined by an analysis of the prophetic language itself. A classic example of such prophetic diatribe against popular public worship is the invective of Amos 5:21-24:

119J. Andrew Deerman, Religion and Culture in Ancient Israel, p. 154.
("I thoroughly despise your feasts, and I have no pleasure in your assemblies; even if you make whole-burnt offerings, your [gift]-offerings I reject, and I take no notice of your peace-offerings of your fatted cattle. Remove from My sight your noisy songs; and I will not listen to the [cultic praise] of your lute. Let justice cascade like waters, and righteousness like a perennial stream").

In the first bicolon the renunciatory attitude of YHWH toward prescribed cultic behavior, i.e., אֵיתָנִים ("feasts"), עַלְוָת ("assemblies"), עָלוּת ("whole-burnt-offerings"), שְׁלָחֵי מִן ("[gift]-offerings"), and [peace-offerings") is dramatically heightened by the use of the terms יָאָב ("hate") and דָּבָר ("reject"). The claim has been that such an attitude denoted by this language is uncharacteristically severe, and is unparalleled in earlier prophetic literature. But such an attitude and language is reminiscent of the covenantal curses rehearsed in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, sources which the Prophets recognized and used to return Israel to obedience and loyalty to her Suzerain, YHWH. Furthermore, the positive call in verse 24 to cultic fidelity uses the terms מַטָּח ("justice") and צָרֵךְ ("righteousness"); language which has its source in the cultic vocabulary of worship - the Psalms, which has reveals other

---


121 In Amos, the use of יָאָב for divine hatred is only at 6:8; all other uses are of human "hatred" (cf. 5:10, 15).

parallels in verses 21-23. These terms, both in Amos and the Psalms, relate to proper behavior in society, and indicate that far from condemning what is here called for (i.e., cultic expression) this language issues a corrective for corrupt societal practice, not legitimate cultic performance. Deerman points out that what may be the subject of Amos (and the prophets') societal criticism was the form syncretistic worship that was represented by pilgrimage sanctuaries, which had fragmented legitimate cultic expression into different forms and diluted the normative tradition by foreign cultic additions. He notes: "the sacrificial rites ignored the connection intended between worship and ethics" and where was demonstrated an" inadequacy of Yahwism." Amos, then, is representative of the prophetic stance, which did not seek to replace the Temple or its cultus, but to reform the practice of Israelite worship, which required a social demonstration commensurate with the language of worship.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Jeremiah and Ezekiel

Our selective focus will be upon the pre-exilic prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, whose prophecies both grew out of a common crisis, addressing an unfaithful audience with a message that includes the dual themes of judgment for desecration and the promise of restoration. Within the context of these themes, both Jeremiah and Ezekiel employ covenantal terminology (Ezekiel adds priestly terminology), depicting Israel's failure as infidelity to YHWH in terms of a marriage covenant (cf. Jeremiah 2-3; 31; Ezekiel 16. 23). Both enlarge upon YHWH's unconditionally in covenant faithfulness, announcing eschatological restoration as a נְבוֹת הָרֵיחָה ("new covenant"), Jeremiah 31:31, or בְּרִית עֶלְּם


125For further analysis: cf. H. Barstad, The Religious Polemics of Amos, VTSup 34 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984), who, however, disagrees that Amos directed his criticisms against syncretism.
("everlasting covenant"), Ezekiel 16:60. Both also place the Temple at the center of concern, criticizing defiling cultic practices (Jeremiah 7; Ezekiel 8-11), and predicting a rebuilt, purified, restored, and inviolable future Temple (Jeremiah 31:38-40; 33:18; Ezekiel 40-48). In view of these similarities, we have made selections from these two prophets among the pre-exilic writers because:

1. They contain significant examples of our motif
2. The examples of our motif are used by the New Testament in passages related to the Temple (Jeremiah 7:11 in Matthew 21:12-13) or the eschatological age (Ezekiel 36:25-27 in John 3:3-8; Ezekiel 47:1-12 in Revelation 22:1-5).

Our selections will consist of the famous "Temple Sermon" of Jeremiah 7:1-8:3, which will provide insight on the pre-exile use of the desecration motif, and the classic restoration texts of Ezekiel 36:18-38 and 40-48, which will help to establish the pre-exilic prophetic use of the restoration motif.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Jeremiah

Despite the attempts at restoration by Hezekiah and Josiah, Judah continued to decline after the pattern of syncretism set by Israel before her fall (722 B.C.E.). Now about autumn of 609 B.C.E. (cf. Jeremiah 26:1), the prophet Jeremiah, believing that the trend is irreversible (cf. Jeremiah 7:16, 29c-d) and that judgment must come as a result of cultic desecration and defilement (cf. Jeremiah 7:20), delivers an "oracle from YHWH" (Jeremiah 7:1) from the entrance steps to the Temple.\(^{127}\)

---

\(^{126}\) The dates for this period can be reasonably precise owing to the Babylonian Chronicle, cf. Donald J. Wiseman, Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings (626-556 B. C.) (London: The British Museum, 1956), pp. 13-32.

\(^{127}\) The view is now increasing held that the sermonic passages of Jeremiah reflect the actual ipsissima verba and activities of the prophet, written out with a didactic purpose to suit a later (exilic) audience, cf. in general, E. W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), and specifically to its incident: W. L. Holladay, Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1974), pp. 62-68.
The Temple Sermon in Jeremiah

The original account appears in Jeremiah 7:1-8:3, with an abbreviated

128 copy included in what is probably a Leidensgeschichte, or biographical history of

the prophet (chapters 26-45) in chapter 26, which records the consequences of the
delivery of the sermon. Many of Jeremiah’s prophecies contain warnings
about the impending destruction of Jerusalem (cf. Jeremiah 6:6, 8; 19:7-8; 25:18;
32:28-29; 34:2), however, this oracle represents his only attack on the cultic
community’s false Temple theology, and accords well with a similar indictment
made by Ezekiel (Ezekiel 8:1-18).

The address may have been occasioned by the political situation of
Jehoahaz’s usurpation by Egyptian-backed rival anti-Josiah policy party of
Jehoiakim. The assault, headed by Pharaoh Necho in September, 609 B.C.E.,
enthroned Jehoiakim, who then imposed stringent punitive levies against the
deposed king’s supporters. The sermon itself divides into five separate
sections:

1) the Temple sermon (7:1-15);
2) an attack on the worship of the Queen of Heaven (7:16-20);
3) an oracle condemning the false theology that regarded the sacrificial
    offerings as a substitute for obedience (7:21-28);

128 There seems to be little contest to the view that chapters 7 and 26 are the same
incident, as the affinities are too many and too precise to conclude otherwise. The
view that chapter 26 is part of a biographical (or autobiographical) section is
presented, for example, by Charles Feinberg, “Jeremiah,” EBC 6 (1986), pp. 426-
427, 537, while the view that this material is didactic, and was used by the
“Deuteronomist” to instruct the Judean exiles as to the cause of their punishment
is championed by Else Kraglund Holt, “Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon and the
Deuteronomists: An Investigation of the Redactional Relationship between

129 Cf. Jay A. Wilcoxon, “The Political Background of Jeremiah’s Temple
Sermon,” Scripture in History & Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert
Rylaarsdam. Edited by A. L. Merrill and T. W. Overholt (Pennsylvania: The
4) an oracle condemning child sacrifice and associated evil practices in Gai-Hinnom (7:29-34); and
(5) a condemnation of the worship of astral deities (8:1-3).

The cultic context and content of this address is emphasized in verse 2; שָׁם מָקַר יְהֹוָה בְּבֵית יְהוָה שֶׁמֶּשֶׁר בְּיַבֵּנָא יְהוָה כְּלִילֵי הַיָּמָה ("Stand in the gate of YHWH’s house and proclaim there this oracle: Say, ‘Hear the word of YHWH, all you of Judah who come through these gates to worship YHWH’"). The context is described as קְשֵׁר הַמִּזְרָחִית ("in the gate of YHWH’s house"), and there may be particular emphasis on Israel’s covenantal vassalage in the use of the term פְּרָשָׂתָם ("worship"). If the covenantal idea is implied in פְּרָשָׂתָם, it reinforces the cultic community’s violation of the provision of undivided loyalty to the suzerain (YHWH) in the Sinaitic contract (Exodus 20:3-5).

A rehearsal of the terms of the covenant appear in a more developed form in verse 23: יְהוָה צַדָּקָה אֲלֵהֶם לְאַלְפֵי קָם בֵּית וַחֲיֶם לְאַלְפֵי קָם בֵּית ("But this is what [lit. the matter] I commanded them, saying: ‘Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you will be My people [suzerain obligations]; and you will walk in all the way which I command you, that it may be well with you’ [vassal stipulations]").

The conditional provision of the covenant (as above) is presented by YHWH in the role of suzerain (note the epithet of ownership/covenant guardianship: יְהוָה צַדָּקָה אֲלֵהֶם אַלְפֵי קָם בֵּית וַחֲיֶם ("This is what YHWH of

---

Hosts, the God of Israel, has said: ‘Reform your [cultic] conduct and I will permit you to remain in this place’

This call to repentance serves as Jeremiah’s theme in this oracle, and reflects a latent restoration motif in the reference to המיקום הירושה (“this place”), which can have the extended meaning of “holy site,” and was used frequently as a circumlocution for the Temple.

Jeremiah with verse 4 begins his list of offenses to cult by an attack on the false theology of the inviolability of the Temple. By use of the superlative of

The clause is literally translated “make good your ways and your doings,” but since it is view of cultic reform, I have provided the dynamic equivalent in my translation, cf. John Bright, *Jeremiah, AB* 21 (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1986), p. 52, who translates: “Reform the whole pattern of your conduct.”

Cf. A. Cowley, “The Meaning of המיקום in Hebrew,” *JTS* 17 (1916), pp. 174-176; J. Gambroni, “המשכן ,” *TWAT*, 4 (1978), cols. 1111-1124; cf. also on the reference here: Deuteronomy 12:11; 14:23; I Kings 8:29-30, 35 for “the place where YHWH causes His Name to dwell,” and the facts that the nearest antecedent is the three-fold repetition of “Temple” in the next verse, and the verse 12 uses the same term to refer to the “house of YHWH at Shiloh.” Further support may be the parallel situation and statements in Ezekiel 10:4, 18-19; 11:22-23, that the Shekinah departed from the Temple, because of the same form of idolatrous practices recorded here. Jon Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, p. 166, n. 125 suggests that in the next verse (verse 4), the word הַמִּשְׁכָּן be read as a scribal abbreviation for הָמֵשְׁכָּן הַיָּהָה (“this Sanctuary”). If this is so, it would add further support to הַמִּשְׁכָּן as the Temple here. The alternative reference is for “the Land,” as clearly in verse 7, however, there is no need to make an artificial distinction between “the Land” and “the Temple,” since they are joined in the concept of “sacred place.” To desecrate and defile one is to simultaneously affect the other, with the same consequences of exile implied in verse 3.

The *true* theology of the inviolability of the Temple is expressed by Jeremiah in verse 7: יְהֹוָה יְשַׁמְתֶּנּוּ לֹא לָאָדָם לֹא לָאָדָם לָאָדָם לֹא לָאָדָם L (“then I will let you dwell in this place, in the Land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever”). Here, in words that echo the command to build the Sanctuary for a permanent dwelling of YHWH in the midst of Israel (Exodus 25:8 with Ezekiel 37:26) is expressed the covenant obligations of the suzerain (“then I ...”) based on the fidelity of the vassal (the “if you ...” of verse 6). We should not view Jeremiah’s condemnation of what Levenson calls “the Temple mythos,” connecting it with the cosmic mountain theology, as anti-Temple sentiment. From Jeremiah’s own statements in this discourse, it is clear that he regarded Mount Zion as the place that bore YHWH’s Name (7:10-11), and the focus of the divine
the third degree: רכוב ידוהי רכיב ידוהי רכיב (“The Temple of YHWH” x 3). Jeremiah is either emphasizing the assurance of inviolability held by the cultic community, or reciting a formula they invoked to express confidence (cf. I Samuel 4:3 of the Ark). Whichever is his point, his purpose is to make the connection made in the covenant between obligations to YHWH and consequent obligations of the cultic community to one another and to all within their borders (cf. Exodus 20:3-17; Deuteronomy 5:16-21).

In verses 5-9 he lists the practical and cultic violations that witnessed to their departure from the terms of covenant, concluding with an ironic statement of desecration considered by the deluded as restoration: ינפל לָהּ מַנְאָסֶה אֶלָּת כִּלֶּה (‘We are delivered!’ - that you may do all these abominations’). The irony lies in the very fact that they as desecrators stand, possibly in the very act of syncretistic worship (נסיבת לִבּוֹת לַאֲרוֹן הָעֵדָה אֲבָר מֶשֶׁחָה) in the holy Temple נסיבת לִבּוֹת לַאֲרוֹן הָעֵדָה אֲבָר מֶשֶׁחָה and proclaim their “salvation,” when by this very action they have doomed to destruction both themselves and the Temple. While quite nascent, Presence (7:10, 15), which therefore cannot mean that he saw the Temple as extraneous to the Israelite relationship with YHWH.

134 The raising of a term to the second or third superlative degree was a common emphatic device, cf. the בָּאָרָה בָּאָרָה (“bitumen pits”) of Genesis 14:10 (second degree) or the tri-hagion (שְׂרָק שְׂרָק שְׂרָק, “holy, holy, holy”) of Isaiah 6:3 (third degree). In the New Testament cf. the emphatic attestation of verity: ἡ ἁγιασμον, ἡ ἁγιασμον (“truly, truly”).

135 The reference to “Shiloh” in verse 12 makes this also a good possibility. In I Samuel 4:1-11 Israel was in apostasy and lost YHWH’s Presence with the capture of the Ark. There, the same belief in the Ark’s inviolability was proven false in the face of covenant disloyalty. Levenson, ibid, p. 166, calls this “trilogy of Temples” an “incantation to ward off adversity,” “a string of nonsensesyllables,” and “a mantra bled of meaning.”

136 The description of these pious Jews “standing before [YHWH] is the very language of presentation of the vassal in review before the suzerain. From the Amarna letters (14th-century B.C.E.) we read of examples of Egyptian vassals in Palestine making pious protestations of loyalty in letters to the pharaoh when, in reality, they were impiously disloyal (as the Amarna correspondence reveals), cf. ANET, pp. 483-490. Due to the administrative decline during the Amarna period
the use of the term פָּרֹס הָעֵבָּדִים ("abominations"), here may present the notion of Temple desecration and of a Temple Desecrator as part of the developing desecration motif eventually crystallized with Daniel's technical expression employing the two terms פָּרֹס and מַמֵּה.

Jeremiah has presented the human desecrators in verses 4-10, but now he presents YHWH as the divine "Desecrator," verse 12, Who will withdraw His protection as suzerain from His vassal state, and then bring against it in retributive justice the curses proscribed in the covenant for disloyalty. Relying on historical precedence, Jeremiah cites the case of Shiloh,137 whose similar violation proved that YHWH could treat as common even the Tabernacle and its sancta when defilement rendered them ritually unclean (I Samuel 4:10-11, 22): "But go now to My place [Tabernacle] which used to be at Shiloh, where I first established a dwelling place for My Name, and see what I did to it because of the [cultic] transgressions138 of My people Israel").

The Tanach does not record what occurred at Shiloh, except for the mention made in Psalm 78:60-61 that YHWH רָפָת מַלְכוּת נֵּלֶּה אֶתְּלֶהָ סְגָּם נַפְּרָבָה ("abandoned His dwelling place [Tabernacle], the tent which He had pitched among men at Shiloh"), and נתן לְעֵבָדִים את הַמַּמֵּה וְאוֹסֵר-אֵצָר ("delivered up His


138The literal rendering of is "evil of My people," but I Samuel 3:13-14 indicates that it was the cultic transgressions of Eli and his sons Hophni and Phinehas, which probably involved cult prostitution or some form of pagan sexual fertility rite (cf. I Samuel 2:22-24). Whatever the desecration, YHWH considered it worthy of capital punishment (I Samuel 2:25; 4:17).
Glory [Ark] to the hand of the adversary"). Based on this account, Jeremiah’s comparison of the Jerusalem Temple with Shiloh (verse 14) obviously has in mind both the spiritual departure of the Shekinah (cf. Ezekiel 10:4, 18-19; 11:22-23), and the physical destruction of the edifice (II Kings 23:27; 25:9; II Chronicles 36:19; Psalm 74:3-7).

Following the recitation of cultic transgressions in verses 17-19; 21-29; 31-33; and 8:1-2 in each instance there is a clear use of the desecration motif. In verse 20 it is stated in the classic form of judgment upon the divine triad: the Temple (הֶעַרְכָּת הָעַלְּלוֹן), the people (םְמַעֲרָכָה), and the Land (of Israel) (וְבָאָרִי הָעַלְּלוֹן), in verse 30, it takes the usual form of statement of defilement: "םָמָא שְׁלָכְתּוּם בְּכָפִית אָשָׁר יִנְשָׁאָר עַל יוּלְיָת לְמַעֲרָכָה ("they have placed their abominations in My house, thus defiling it"), in verse 34, there is the general pronouncement of reversal: "יִשָּׂרָאֵל וּמְצַה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׂרָאֵל יַרְדֵּנָה...לְמַעֲרָכָה ("I will cause to cease from the cities of Judah and from the streets of Jerusalem ... the Land will become a ruin"), and in 8:3 there is the technical expression of exile as the result of desecration: נָגַּה (Hiphil imperfect of נָגַה, "drive out").

Therefore, in the Temple sermon of Jeremiah, we have seen the use of the desecration motif to express the cultic violation of the covenant, which defiles the Temple and cultus, and negatively, removes YHWH from the obligation of covenant guardianship while positively, requiring Him to punish the desecration of His Sanctuary by a destruction of the desanctified edifice. Jeremiah will, of course, employ the restoration motif to counter this dread imbalance in the divine sphere (cf. Jeremiah 23:5-6; 29:10-14; 31:23-34). The terms of restoration, however, are not anthropocentric and conditional as the terms of desecration, but theocentric and unconditional. YHWH acts for the sake of His own divine honor,

---

139Note here in verse 30 the use of abomination vocabulary with שָׁלָם as typical of the desecration motif. Also in the list of defiling conduct here is the mention of נַיְפָּה אֲדָרָמִי ("and they hardened their necks"), (verse 26). The hardening motif (Versteckungsmotiv) is often a part of the desecration motif.
based on His sworn allegiance to uphold the covenant, regardless of the Nation’s past violations (cf. Jeremiah 31:35-37). The form of Jeremiah’s restoration motif will be considered representatively its similar presentation in Ezekiel.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Ezekiel

As Jeremiah’s Temple sermon presented the desecration as grounds for the Exile, Ezekiel addresses the theological problem resulting from desecration, namely the absence of the Divine Presence, and resolves the crisis by the announcement of a divine program of restoration. As Tuell has observed at Ezekiel 40-48: "This core vision is concerned with the problem of the Divine Presence, which indeed could be said to be the uniting theme of the entire text of Ezekiel." Ezekiel’s theological presentation essentially revolves around the bipolar themes of judgment (for desecration) and restoration, as such serves as a large-scale model for the demonstration of our general motif. However, since our interest is in the eschatological use of the motif as connected with the Temple, our focus will center on Ezekiel 36:16-38 in which we encounter a text that bridges the theological gap between the desecration and destruction of the First Temple (Ezekiel 4-24) and the restoration hope of the properly purified eschatological Temple (Ezekiel 40-48). Since this section contains some of the most explicit statements of desecration and restoration in an eschatological context among the Prophets, it serves as a paradigmatic presentation of our motif. Therefore,

---

140Note in verse 36 that the promise is to a “Nation” (the collective remnant), rather than to a “people” (allowing for individual distinction). The stronger statement is typical of the assurance of unity in eschatological restoration.


142The various interpretations (both Jewish and Christian) of this restoration include the literal return of Israel from the Babylonian Captivity, the spiritual redemptive imagery of Jesus’ cleansing atonement (cf. John 3:3-8), the advent of the Holy Spirit to the Church at Pentecost, and a future return of Israel at the end of days. The problem with all but the eschatological interpretation is that there is
we present a more extended exegesis of the text, with an emphasis on the cultic expressions that characterize our motif.

Our plan here will be to first examine the general and specific contexts of eschatological desecration and restoration, and then proceed to examine the elements that comprise these eschatological motifs within the verse structure of Ezekiel 36:16-38. Finally, we want to briefly consider the contribution of Ezekiel 40-48, which offers the foremost presentation of the eschatological Temple in Tanach.

The Contextual Setting of Ezekiel 36:18-38

The Book of Ezekiel may be arranged by the general content of its prophetic narratives into three major divisions, following the call and commission of the prophet in chapters 1-3:

(1) Prophetic announcements of judgment against Israel (4-24),
(2) Prophetic announcements of judgment against the nations (25-32), and
(3) Prophetic announcements of the restoration of Israel (33-48).

Focusing on the prophetic discourses concerning the Temple, they also fall into three divisions:


\[\text{no historical fulfillment for the details in this prophecy, unless one employs an allegorical hermeneutic which does not require such precision. It seems best to interpret this context with other complementary texts in the Prophets, and in harmony with the futurist perspective adopted by the apocalyptic writers in reference to this text.}\]

\[\text{The promise of restoration from a state of covenantal unfaithfulness, almost parallel to Ezekiel 36:18-36, is given in Jeremiah 31:31-34, however the important cultic expressions are missing that help distinguish our motif. However, it is possible that the reference to מְנַשְׁתָּא, verse 34, has in view activities that resulted in defilement, such as at Ezekiel 36:17-18.}\]
As we will be focusing on this section, especially chapters 36-37 in detail, it will be sufficient here to note that Ezekiel as an appointed watchman (33), observes the problem of Israel’s “false shepherds” (34) and predicts the necessary rebirth of the Nation (35:1-36:38). This is followed by the revitalization (37:1-14) and reuniting of the Nation (37:15-28), and the victory over Gog and Magog (38:1-39:29).

(3) Prophecies of Rebuilding and Ritual (40:1-48:35). As the early sections (4-32) announced divine judgment as a precursor to the latter sections (33-48) announcing divine restoration, so these Temple-oriented sections are interrupted in 25:1-32:32 only to introduce the apocalyptic judgment of the nations, which serves as a necessary prelude to the fulfillment of Israel’s eschatological hope which ultimately includes Gentile worship at the new Temple (cf. Isaiah 2:2-4; 11:10; 20:21-25; 56:6-7; 60:3-14; Micah 4:1-2; Haggai 2:7; Zechariah 14:16-18).

The Eschatological Desecration Context
Ezekiel 36:16-21 presents Ezekiel’s prophetic-priestly review of Israel’s history of incurring profanation. It has been preceded by the revelation of national unfaithfulness beginning with the prophet’s call in chapter 2:3-8 to speak to a בֵּית מֵרִי (‘rebellious nation’), verse 2 and a בֵּית מַרְיִים (‘rebellious house’), verse 5, and reaffirmed in his commissioning in chapter 3:1-27 where Israel is described as הָודֵד-פָּשָׁח וְקִשֹּׁת-לֹא (‘stubborn and hard-hearted’), verse 7. The cause of YHWH’s impending judgment is given in 6:1-14 as נְגֵלָלִים (‘your idols’), verse 4, and תְּנֻבָּתָם (‘their abominations’), verse 9. The charge of idolatry against the Nation is highlighted by its climatic demonstration in Temple desecration in chapter 8:1-18, in which vision the prophet moves from the innermost Sanctuary to the outer courts to
witness, as did Jeremiah, cultic apostasy. Desecration will result in desolation, therefore the Shekinah is depicted as abandoning the Temple in order that it might be rendered "profane" or "common," and thereby set apart to destruction (Ezekiel 9-11). It is this desecration of the Temple that sets in motion the wheels of divine retribution, and provides the background to the display of cultic profanation described in Ezekiel 36.

Ezekiel’s message to the idolatrous people in chapter 14, and his parables in chapters 15-18 continue this desecration motif through various metaphors for unfruitfulness and unfaithfulness, culminating in chapter 20 with a first recitation of Israel’s history of desecration. The command for this historical review comes from YHWH: הなし אתים אבות וארחיים ("reveal to them their father’s abominations"), verse 4 and because this chapter outlines the desecration/restoration context, of which Ezekiel 36:17-23 is an abbreviated account, it will be necessary to briefly consider its contents.

**Ezekiel’s History of Defilement**

The theological history of defilement in Ezekiel 20 has been divided by Grammie into three phases. Historically, these phases catalog Israel’s departure

---


146John G. Grammie, *Holiness in Israel*, p. 46. I have differed from Grammie in my division because he splits what I have listed as phase two into phases two (first generation) and three (second generation), while omitting verses 27-29 as the Canaan phase. I feel justified in adding verses 27-29 as a separate phase, even though the same cultic terminology is not immediately repeated in this section, because Ezekiel appears to be bringing the history up to his own time, from which he makes the transition to the contemporary situation in verse 30 with words similar to those in his introduction (verse 4): את המינים אתים אבות וארחיים (“will you defile yourselves after the manner of your fathers and act the harlot after their abominations?”). The desecration/restoration motif
from holiness and YHWH’s promise of restoration (1) in Egypt and on the
desert, (2) in the wilderness [first
generation] (verses 11-17), and [second generation], (verses 18-26), and (3) in
Eretz-Israel (verses 27-29). These phases built around the desecration/restoration
motif are:

Phase One: YHWH promise’s to deliver Israel if she forsakes idolatry; Israel
disobeys (יִשְׁמְרָה לְאָו אַבַּא לְשָׁמֶן אָלָיו, verse 8) but YHWH nevertheless
fulfills His promise לַעֲגֵה לֶכְבִּאל הַמִּשְׁמֶּרֶת לְעָלָיָה לְעָלָיָה (“for My Name’s sake that it might not be profaned before the eyes of the nations,”
verse 9).

Phase Two (Part 1): Statutes and laws are given to Israel, and YHWH
רְשָׁוֶת לְעָלָיָה לֵךְ (“and also the Sabbaths for a sign”) so that they may
לְכֹל לְעָלָיָה מְדַבְּרֶשֶׁה (“know that I, YHWH, sanctify them”), verse
12. But Israel rebelled, evoking YHWH’s wrath, yet, He acted again
לַעֲגֵה לֶכְבִּאל הַמִּשְׁמֶּרֶת (“for My Name’s sake, that I might not be
profaned before the eyes of the nations”), verse 14, resolving that the
generation that came out of Egypt would not be brought into YHWH’s
לְכֹל הָעֹלָמִים אַלּוֹדְגָה (verse 15a).

Phase Two (Part 2): This appeal was reiterated to the second generation, but the
same rebellion occurred, with YHWH once again following human failure
with divine faithfulness, but this time מַטְנָה (“pronouncing [them]
unclean”), and resolving to מַטְנָה (“make them desolate”), verse 26, and
tוּפָרָה אַנֵּס כִּי לִחְוָה אֲנָה אֲרָצוֹת (“scatter them among the nations
and disperse them among the lands”), verse 23. This final warning was to
be effected because the history of Israel after entrance into the Land
(verses 27-29), and up to the time of Ezekiel (verses 30-32), had also
manifested repeated rebellion: סָפָר אֲנַא בְּגִנֵּה אֲבָדוֹתָה מָנוְצְכִי בְּמִקְדָּשׁ

continues with verses 33-44 in a promise of divine intervention “for the sake of
[YHWH’s] holy Name” and consequent restoration to repentance (verse 43-44),
the Land (verse 38), and to holiness in a restored Temple (verse 40).
("Yet in this your fathers have blasphemed Me, in that they have committed a trespass against Me"), verse 27b.

**Phase Three:** The promise of the Land was given to Israel: הָאָרֶץ ("When I brought them into the Land, which I raised up My hand to give it to them"), verse 28a; cf. verses 29-31; they provoked YHWH by their idolatrous (or syncretistic) sacrifices and offerings: לְכָּלַיִם ("and they offered there their sacrifices and presented the provocation of their offering"), verse 28b; still YHWH pledged to become their King: מִלְכֵּךְ ("I will rule over you"), verse 33, bring them to the Land from exile: בְּנֵי בֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל ("when I bring you out from the peoples, and gather you out of the lands where you have been scattered ... when I bring you into the Land of Israel"), verses 41-42, and restore the Temple: בֵּית הֵרֵדוֹת ("in My holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel there they will serve Me ... there I will accept them and there will I require your offerings ..." ), verse 40 (cf. Chapters 40-48), for the sake of His "holy Name" שם קדושו, verse 39). However, YHWH warned of a judicial exile to purge the rebels, leaving a remnant of faithful Israelites: נְכֹלָיָם בָּאֶל מֶרְכָּז ("and I will bring you into the wilderness of the people and I will plead with you there"), vss. 34-38.

The repeated use of the desecration motif in these three phases of Israel's history sets the stage for the further manifestation of resultant judgment of Israel in chapters 21-24, presented through oracles (21-22) parables (23-24:14) and signs (24:15-27). Judgment especially for Temple desecration is highlighted in Ezekiel's command to "speak against the sanctuaries" (מַסְדִּיר, i.e. the Temple and its precincts), 21:6. This ends the section of judgment employing the desecration motif, for after the hiatus of Gentile judgment, the restoration motif begins with chapter 33.
The Eschatological Restoration Context

In 587 B.C., in the twelfth year of Ezekiel’s exile in Babylon, the news the fall of Jerusalem reached the prophet (Ezekiel 33:21). Ezekiel’s mouth, which had been closed (except for prophetic announcement) as a sign of the impending judgment (Ezekiel 3:26-27; 24:24), was now opened (Ezekiel 33:22) as had been promised (Ezekiel 24:26-27). Now that the long expected judgment had been executed, Ezekiel’s prophecies turn to the theme of salvation and restoration. Ezekiel 34 presents the motif of YHWH as the ideal Shepherd, on the one hand condemning the false shepherds of Israel, i.e., the רעים אלוהים (“shepherds that feed themselves”), and on the other providing a pastoral/redemptive motif as the background YHWH’s promised intervention (הנשון לעזבנין, “I will save My flock,” verse 22), and eschatological renewal, politically יְהוָה עָלַיִם רְאוּ הַאָזְרָה (“I will set up one shepherd over them, my servant David”), verse 23, materially הַמַּעֲרֹע כִּי אֲדוֹנָי אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה (“the tree of the field shall yield her fruit, and the earth shall yield her increase”); רַעַב פַּלַם (“they shall no more be consumed with hunger in the Land”), verses 27, 29, and spiritually יְהוָה אַלְמָנָא (“Thus they shall know that I, YHWH, their God am with them). Upon this outline the rest of the restoration context builds.

Ezekiel chapter 35 returns to the theme of judgment (here, of Mount Seir), מַעֲרֹע מִרְעָה מְשִׁית רְאוּ הַעָרָה (“Mount Seir, I am against you, and I will stretch out My hand against you and I will make you exceedingly desolate”), verse 3. In the continuation of this prophecy in Ezekiel 36:1-15, this desolation of Mount Seir, which had arrogantly mocked Israel’s desolation (verse 15), serves as a contrast of restoration from desolation (to the mountains of Israel). In this renewal section, the Land of Israel is directly addressed with respect to its eschatological destiny, יְהוָה אֹרְחָא אַלְמָנָא (“Mountains of Israel ... I am for you, and I will turn to you and you shall be tilled and sown,” verses 1a, 9). Just as retributive judgment is announced for those nations that previously desecrated Eretz-Israel (verses 1-7), so the promise of future productivity and settlement is announced for the Land itself (verses 8-15).
This renewal section is expanded in the immediate context (verses 16-38), and while it contains most of the thematic elements present in the previous prophetic sections, the purpose of this renewal message is not to reiterate what has preceded, but to explain the motive and process of restoration which had previously only been declared (11:17-20; 16:60-63; 20:40-44; 28:25-26; 34:11-16, 22-31). This restoration is presented theologically in verses 16-38, and then practically in 37:1-14. The primary concern of Ezekiel 36:16-38 is the theme of divine sanctification as a reversal of cultic de-sanctification or profanation. The development of the restoration motif is left to be expounded and enlarged by way of a dramatic prophetic vision narrative in Ezekiel 37:1-14. Thus, the contribution of Ezekiel 36:16-38 to the prophetic structure of the book is to establish the theological basis for the eschatological restoration that will be unfolded in chapters 37-39 and the restored Temple and ritual detailed in chapters 40-48.

**Ezekiel's Concept of National Defilement**

In verses 16-19, Ezekiel announced YHWH's explanation that the nation of Israel was exiled because it had defiled itself and the Land. In this section cultic defilement effecting ritual desecration is given as the explanation for the exile. The prophet introduces the divine oracle of restoration with the words יִתְנֶה יִרְכָּר חָיָה אֲלי לַאֱלֹהִים ("and the word of YHWH came to me"). Lindsars has observed in the use of this messenger formula\(^{147}\) that, Ezekiel frequently adopts a style of speech which differs markedly from that of other prophets. Instead of issuing a stern denunciation with the words כִּה נְאָה יְהוָה ("thus says YHWH"), he

\(^{147}\)This phrase establishes the prophet as the spokesman of YHWH, who is the source of all prophecy, and Who guarantees His divine authority and power to assure its fulfillment. Its primary function appears to be structural, indicating the initial contact of YHWH with the prophet and distinguishing the principle oracles as literary units. The literary units marked off by the messenger formula in Ezekiel are 1:3; 3:16; 6:1; 7:1; 11:14; 12:1, 8, 17, 21, 26; 13:1; 14:1, 12; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1, 11; 18:1; 20:2, 45; 21:1, 18; 22:1, 17; 23:1, 36; 24:1, 15, 20; 25:1; 26:1; 27:1; 28:1, 11, 20; 29:1; 30:1, 20; 31:1; 32:1, 17; 33:1, 23; 34:1; 35:1; 36:16; 37:15; 38:1. Cf. further, W. Zimmerli, "The Word of God in the Book of Ezekiel," *JTC* 4 (1967): 1-13.
reports a declaration from YHWH in the style of a priest carrying out his true function of giving torah.\textsuperscript{148}

The report of defilement and its cause are explained in verse 17: בָּרָאֲשִׁים כֶּּנֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל נֵגְזַּבְתּ לָהּ אַמָּתָה הַעֲדָיוֹת עַל עַדְּבָיו רַכְּבֵּם לְפָלֵג (“Son of man, when the house of Israel was dwelling in their Land, they defiled it by their conduct and their actions, like the defilement of a menstruous woman was their conduct before Me”). This report takes the form of a retrospective summary of the moral and spiritual history of “the house of Israel” with respect to their covenantal relationship.\textsuperscript{149}

The prophet had previously recounted the defiling origin of Israel (Ezekiel 16:1-5) and its moral defection (Ezekiel 16:15-34). The condition of the Nation is described as מָשָׂא (used twice in this verse and also in verses 18 and 29), which, as we have seen, refers to ceremonial uncleanness communicated by contact with whatever is ritually impure or polluting e.g. illicit sexual activity (Leviticus 18:23, 25, 27; 19:29), living unclean and dead animals (Leviticus 11:24-43). In the present verse the simile of a "menstruous (unclean) woman" מָשָׂא הַנְּדוֹת is employed to depict the "unapproachableness" of Israel.

This condition is said to have been incurred by bad "moral conduct" (רָדָבָה) and "reckless deeds" (נַעִילָתָה). Therefore, just as the ceremonial impurity of the menstruous woman separates her from the sphere of that which is considered holy, so the conduct of Israel has caused her to be removed from the "Holy" Land. Eichrodt explains this connection concerning מָשָׂא and נַעִילָתָה . . .

\textsuperscript{148}Barnabas Lindars, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," VT 15 (1965), p. 459. It is observable in Ezekiel 36 that sections dealing with declaratory judgment (1-15) are introduced with the phrase כָּל אֵל מִדֶּנֶּה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹנִי, and changes to the use of the phrase וַיִּשָּׁבְרוּ אֱלֹהַי אֲדֹנִי מִדֶּנֶּה when liturgical elements enter the message. This then would serve to emphasize the priestly function of Ezekiel in prophetic pronouncement. This accords well with the tradition that Ezekiel was a priest and accounts for the extensive use of cultic terms throughout the book.

when he says, "Ezekiel takes a cultic term and applies it not only to cultic sins . . . but also in the more general sense of showing contempt for God's holiness by breaking His commandments." The analogy of menstruation, which also occurs in Ezekiel 18:6; 22:10, may have had the further intention of showing YHWH's spatial separation (i.e., withdrawal of the Divine Presence), just as a man was commanded to distance himself (לא תקריב, "you shall not approach") from a menstruating woman (Leviticus 18:19).

In Israelite theology, a covenantal triad existed between YHWH, the people, and the Land. This relationship is assumed in Ezekiel's explanation that the cultic condition of the one determined the outcome of the other. This covenantal aspect is seen in verse 20 where עלenes ("His land") is an expression not only of possession but also relationship. Having drawn this fundamental relationship, the prophet in verses 18 and 19 reveals how this concept serves as the basis of the retributive response of YHWH, and in verses 20-23 as the basis for the explanation of the divine motivation in restoration.

The consequence of the defilement of the land is here presented in continuation of the historical recounting of Israel's moral-defection begun in verse 17. The additional aspect of defilement revealed is that of "idolatry" (לאלותה), which indicates that the infectious pollution is now seen to include the spiritual realm. It is at this point that Ezekiel reviews YHWH's indictment which takes the form of retributive judgment:


("Therefore I poured out My wrath upon them because they poured out blood upon the Land, and for their idols which defiled it"), verse 18. Ezekiel uses a word play to underscore the retributive nature of this judgment: YHWH "poured out" (שָׂפֵר) His wrath on Israel because they had "poured out (שָׂפֵר) blood upon the land." 152 The use of the phrase השָׂפֵר בָּלָהֵים is pictured in Ezekiel as something directly attributed to defilement, especially that associated with the worship of a foreign cultus, as here:....וְהָאֹסְרֵי אֲבָאָבֵי בְּלָהֵים...וּבְּאֶבָנָלָה בְּלוֹּתֵי שְׁפִי-מֶשָׁאָה ("I poured out My wrath upon them ...[because of] their idols that pollute/defile"). 153 It has been suggested, therefore, that the use of the verb שָׂפֵר may bear a technical significance in contexts dealing with the judgment of idolatry to epitomize a particular idolatrou[s practice such as child sacrifice (cf. 16:20, 21, 36; 23:37; 33:25). 154 Ezekiel's use of the term בְּלוֹתֵי שְׁפִי-מֶשָׁאָה ("idols") may itself indicate their defiling nature, as Weavers notes, "The favorite Ezekielian term 급을 is obviously one of ridicule, a pun on gelatim, 'dung pellets,' thus 'dung idols.' Its vocalization is on the analogy of sikkulim, 'detestable things.'"

---

152 The use of the verb שָׂפֵר to describe both the judicial action of YHWH and the sin of Israel that was judged portrays this retributive response as a lex talonis or "measure for measure" punishment of crimes committed. This form of judgment has previously been illustrated against Israel (14:19; 16:59; 35:6) and the nations (36:7).

153 The causes of השָׂפֵר ("poured out wrath") in Ezekiel (which in context primarily concern idolatrous worship) are: lewdness (16:36), libations (20:28), lusts (23:8), and other defiling practices (16:38; 18:10; 22:3, 4, 6, 9, 12, 27; 23:45; 24:7; 33:25). The foreign nations are also judged for their defilement of Israel (7:8; 9:8; 14:19; 20:8, 13, 21, 33-34; 22:31; 30:16).


The essence of the judgment is the ḥāmaš ("violent wrath") of YHWH. It is pictured as being "poured out" as from a cup or goblet (a *metonymy of effect for the cause*). In Ezekiel 23: 31-34 the figure of the "cup" is used of divine judgment against defilement (verse 30) where it is described as "the cup of horror and desolation" (verse 33). Formerly it had belonged to Samaria (a reference to the judgment of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C.) and has now passed to Israel (since she has "walked in the way of her sister," verse 31). The prophet moves in Ezekiel 36:19 to specify the nature of the judicial pronouncement as judgment by exile.

The violent nature of ḥāmaš is revealed in this verse by the expressions devoting the exilic judgment, בָּרַע ("scatter") and דָּרַך ("disperse"). These particular terms take the form of a doublet in Ezekiel (12:15; 20:23; 22:15; 29:12; 30:23, 26) which corresponds in thought and rhyme to the wording of the promise of return and restoration (20:34; 28:25; 34:13; 36:24; 37:21; 39:27, 28). This is emphasized in the present context by the chiastic arrangement of verses 19 and 24\(^{156}\):

---


\(^{156}\)The chiasmus arranges the parallel members in a variation of the usual order of verb-subject, or verb-subject-object, to especially emphasize particular members of the sentence. On the importance of chiastic structure in respect to textual problems in Ezekiel cf. Lawrence Boadt, "The A:B:B:A Chiasm of Identical Roots in Ezekiel," *VT* 25 (October 1975): 697-698.
Figure 5: Chiastic Structure of Ezekiel 36:19 and 24

A: אֲנָשְׁיָן אֵלֹהִים בְּנֵי אָדָם ("I will scatter [נָשַׁנְתִּי] ... among the nations"), 19a

B: לְכַלְכָּל֖וֹת אֵלֹהִים מִרְדָּכַת ("I will take [לְכַלְכָּל֔וֹת] ... from the nations"), 24a

B: קַבֵּנָא אֱלֹהִים מֶכֶל אֲרָצוֹת ([קַבֵּנָא] ... from the lands"), 24b

A: נָשַׁנְתִּי בְּנֵי אָדָם ("I will disperse [נָשַׁנְתִּי] ... among the lands"), 19b

The force of this correspondence, remarks Peter Altmann, is to "present the divine intervention of Yahweh in the sovereign disposal of judgment and salvation." Structuring the statements in this manner graphically portrays the inseparable theological connection between desecration (נָשַׁנְתִּי) and restoration (קַבֵּנָא) in our motif. The symmetry reveals that as surely as Ezekiel presented the prediction of retributive judgment resulting from desecration, he presented the promise of sovereign mercy resulting in restoration.

After restating the divine modus operandi as retributive judgment, Ezekiel comes in his historical summation to the theological crux presented by the judgment of exile in verse 20. Thus it has been seen that in verses 17-19 that the

---

157 Peter Altmann, "Erwählungstheologie and Universalismus im Alten Testament," BZAW 92 (1964): 24. This same correspondence is used for the announcements of the scattering and regathering of Egypt (Ezekiel 29:12-16; 30:23, 26). The point, as these contexts inform, is to establish the recognition of YHWH as וֹדֵד הָאֱלֹהִים "Sovereign Lord". The result of Egypt's return to their land is clearly not "restoration," but a (non-soteriological) return to a status so insignificant that they will never again gain dominance over the other nations (and especially the nation Israel).
retributive response of YHWH reveals His own preparation for effecting theodicy along the lines of His covenant with His land and His people.158 With verses 20-21 YHWH's concern for His Name announces that He will secure for Israel the status of sanctification that His holy nature demands. These verses explain that the concern for the problem of desanctification created by Israel159 was because it had profaned YHWH's holy name among the nations through the event of exile, creating the impression that YHWH was a local god and impotent to protect His people.160 The continued account of the historical exile resumes with verse 20 in the form of a report by YHWH concerning His perception of the attitude of the nations which effected divine desecration.

Ezekiel's Concept of Eschatological Desecration

The desecration of the past has resulted for Ezekiel in a state of desecration that will require an apocalyptic intervention to resolve, hence, the desecration in view in these subsequent verses is eschatological in context. In verse 20, Ezekiel clearly states the problem, created by the necessity of the exilic judgment, as "desecration," ישִׁטְּבִי יִשְׁתָּבֵי יִשְׂעָל יִשְׁתָּבֵי, ("they desecrated My holy

158 A summarization of this section may be found in Ezekiel 16:59-63, where it connects the breaking of YHWH's covenant with retributive judgment (verse 60) in order to bring about a remembrance of the covenant by YHWH (verses 61-62) and repentance on the part of Israel (verse 63; cf. 36:31-32). YHWH must act consistently with His nature as a God of justice and drive His people into exile. Yet He must also act consistently with His empathetic nature as a God of קַנָּה ("feel concern,"), verse 21.

159 The juxtaposition of two וָָו consecutive imperfects may indicate sequential action, cf. GKC 164b, p. 501.

160 The execution of divine justice, in expulsion of the house of Israel from their land (verses 17-19), produced a conundrum not only for the nation but also for the honor of YHWH with Whom they were identified, since He had promised to be with His people and be their God in the Land. Even though this promise was conditional in Deuteronomy 8:1, 7-10, 19-20, a fact not perceived by the nations, it was nevertheless unconditional in the Abrahamic Covenant (cf. Genesis 17:7-8).
Name”). This divine offense is delivered by לֹא ("desecrate, profane") with its objectָּשׁ (YHWH’s "holy name"). The ultimate degree of desecration is understood by the significance of the addition ofשׁ (YHWH) and reflected in the fact that this act causes YHWH to “grieve” (דָחַל).

161 The term שָׁעַם ("name") is figuratively a metonymy of adjunct, denoting "the true nature, inner being, or essence of that to which it belongs, hence the character or personality", E. W. Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, p. 608.

It may be seen further to indicate an ethical disclosure of the character or personality, and the attributes of the person to whom it is applied, hence reputation, honor. Examples of שָׁעַם as a reflection of the attributes or deeds of a thing or person may be seen in: (1) name changes—Abraham (Gen. 17:5; Num. 32:38; Neh. 9:7), Sarai to Sarah (Gen. 17:5), Jacob to Israel (Gen. 32:28; 35:10; 1 Kings 18:31; 2 Kings 24:17)—symbolic of change in state (Hos. 1:4, 6, 9; 2:1); (2) deeds or events associated with a name—Cain (Gen. 4:1), Abel (Gen. 4:2), Nahal (1 Sam. 25:25), Gershom (Exod. 2:22), Moses (Exod. 2:10), Isaiah’s son Maher-Shalal-hash-baz (Isa. 8:3), Peleg (Gen. 10:25), Esau (Gen. 25:25), Jacob (Gen. 25:26), Eve (Gen. 3:20), Enoch (Gen. 4:17), Jacob’s children (Gen. 28:32–30:24); (3) place names—Babel (Gen. 11:9), Beth-el (Gen. 28:19), Achor (Josh. 7:24), Baca (Ps. 84:6), Beer-lahai-roi (Gen. 16:14; 24:62), Beer-Sheba (Gen. 21:14), etc. The use of שָׁעַם in the sense of "reputation" may be seen primarily in passages associating Israel’s honor with that of YHWH’s because she bore His Name (2 Chron. 7:14; Ps. 83:4, 5; Isa. 43:7; 44:5; 45:4; 62:6; Jer. 14:9; 15:16; Dan. 9:18, 19; Exod. 28:21, 29; 39:14). Other such references are: Gen. 11:4; 12:2; 2 Sam. 18:18; 23:18, 22; 1 Kings 1:47; Prov. 21:1; Psa. 4:1. The use of שָׁעַם in reference to God frequently indicates: (1) YHWH’s self-manifestation (or revelation), (Ex. 3:13–15; 33:19; 34:6, 7); (2) His relation to His redemptive acts in history (Ex. 6:3–8; Josh. 9:9; Judg. 13:17–18; 2 Sam. 7:23; 1 Chron. 16:10, 29, 35; Neh. 9:6–38; Pss. 44:20; 45:17; 106:8); (3) it is associated with His presence dwelling in the Temple (Deut. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23, 24; 16:2; 1 Kings 14:21; 21:7; 2 Chron. 6:33, 34, 38; 20:9; Ezra 6:12). In Ezekiel the final eschatological dwelling of Israel is a city whose name is after the Presence of YHWH (Ezekiel 48:35); (4) the attributes of God are described by reference to His Name (Exod. 9:16; 34:14; Num. 6:24, 26, 27; Psa. 8:10, 9:2; 20:1, 23:3, 25:11, 31:3, 48:10; 52:9; 54:1, 6; 66:2 68:4; 72:17, 19; 74:21, 75:1, 76:1, 79:9; 83:18; 86:11; 96:2, 8; 99:3; 103:1; 105:3; 109:21, 111:9, 115:1; 124:8, 125:13; 138:2, 142:7, 143:11, 145:21, 148:13; Prov. 18:10; Isa. 42:8, 47:4, 57:15, 63:16; Jer. 32:18, 33:2, 46:18, 48:15; Amos 4:13; 5:8, 27, 9:6; Mic. 5:4; Zech. 14:9; Mal. 1:11, 14). The wisdom and omniscience of God are shown in Ps. 147:4; Isa. 40:26 by the fact that God knows the names of the stars; (5) the essential reality and sovereign power of YHWH is seen in the contrasts between His Name and those of other gods (1 Kings 18:24, 25, 36–39; cf., Mic. 4:5). It is interesting that the Qumran texts give
The meaning of לֵוָלֵו, and its distinction from יָנָפָנ, was discussed in Chapter 3, however, its use in Ezekiel requires special attention. Of the seventy-five occurrences of the term in Tanach, thirty-one are found in Ezekiel. A study of לֵוָלֵו in Ezekiel reveals that twenty-one of these refer to treating as common things which are consecrated as holy. These objects of desecration include: "holy things" (7:21; 22:26; 42:20; 44:23), "holy places" (7:22, 24; 48:15), "the sanctuary" (7:22; 23:39; 25:3; 28:18; 44:7), "holy occasions," usually "sabbaths" (20:13, 16, 21, 24; 22:8, 26; 23:18), and "holy position" (King of Tyre, 28:7). The remaining ten occurrences all refer to a profanation of the Name of YHWH (13:19; 20:9, 14, 22, 39; 36: 20-23; 39:7). Further, the terms לֵוָלֵו and יָנָפָנ, which are direct antonyms, are frequently juxtaposed in cultic contexts to emphasize the contrast involved in the act of treating a thing in one state as the other (Ezekiel 20:16, 20; 20:39, 41; 22:26; 36:23; 42:20; 44:23). It may be seen therefore, that the primary use of לֵוָלֵּו in Ezekiel is in the cultic sphere, and agrees with our distinction from יָנָפָנ as “rendering of things set apart as sacred as common.”

an important place to יָנָפָנ as the extension of the power of YHWH (see CDC XV, 3; DSW XI, 2, 3; XVIII, 6, 8; DST XI, 6; XII, 3), and that later Judaism substituted יָנָפָנ for the tetragrammaton יָנָפָנ to designate God in His ineffable reality. Cf. further analysis, O. Grether, "Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament," BZAW 64 (1934): 59f.

When יָנָפָנ is used with reference to YHWH it stands for the manifestation of His divine Being in respect to what He has previously been pleased to reveal about Himself through history and in His word. As Whitley notes, “the importance of this term in the context of theodicy is that it shows that YHWH's actions and dispositions are motivated in deference to the law of His Being,” C. F. Whitley, The Prophetic Achievement (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 169.

YHWH’s name, however, is unique and not common, therefore the adjective יָנָפָנ (“holy”) is used to modify it. The stress of יָנָפָנ here is qualitative and refers not to a moral attribute of YHWH but to His essential identity as the One who is distinctly apart from the sphere of the common or profane. Schultz notes that whenever YHWH declares His own name as "holy" He is describing Himself as the unique and only self-determining Sovereign, separate from His created order which is finite, and has become imperfect and sinful, cf. A. C. Schultz, Ezekiel's Concept of God,” ZPEB 2, p. 465.
The nature of holiness prompted YHWH's judicial response to the defilement incurred by Israel, yet this exilic action is intoned as decision by the nations: יְהוָהַ אֲשֶׁר אֶלְבָּא עָלֶה ("these are the people of YHWH, yet they have come out of His land"), verse 20b. Lofthouse has explained this problem stating that "sin is not only evil in itself, but it compels God to do what men are bound to misunderstand."\(^{162}\) The punishment of Israel was perceived by the surrounding nations as stemming from divine impotence, inferiority, inability, abandonment, or unfaithfulness. Rust points out that in the ancient Near East the fortunes of a nation and its deity were inseparable and the relationship between god, people, and land was intimate, therefore, a god who did not vindicate himself in the arena of history would be no god at all.\(^{163}\) Therefore the reputation of YHWH was rendered ineffectual even while it was actively effecting judgment in keeping with its character of moral rule. Instead of Israel's history moving towards the objective of the knowledge of YHWH in the heathen world via Israel's sanctification, it had moved in the opposite direction and resulted in a history of scandal via Israel's profanation. Having completed the historical review and addressed the problem of desecration, Ezekiel proceeds in verse 21 to explain YHWH's intended action to undertake for Himself the vindication of His name.

An inclusion for verses 20-21 is now seen by the use of the repeated phrase לְפָנִי אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרָבֹא לְפָנִי ("among the nations to whom they came"), forming part of a chiasmic structure tracing to and fro a sinister logic of לְפָנִי ("nations"), לָהֵן לְפָנִי ("they desecrated"), and לָהֵן ("My holy Name")\(^{164}\):

---


\(^{163}\) Charles Eric Rust, *Covenant and Hope: A Study in the Theology of the Prophets* (Waco: Word Books, 1972), p. 133. This was also the interpretation of Rashi, תהלים ד' Lưu מך המלך 5 vols. (Jerusalem: Eshkol, 1976), 4:25a [Hebrew]. Cf. also Exodus 32:12 and Numbers 14:16 where YHWH's reputation is joined to the welfare of Israel.

The Divine reputation had been desecrated because it had not been seen as holy (here in the sense of incomparability) among the nations. The divine demonstration so often repeated in Ezekiel is ידוע נאומך כי אני יהוה ("that the nations will know that I am YHWH"), is what has been thwarted by the exile of Israel. This problem of desecration is now given immediate attention by means of divine response.

While no scheme is yet revealed for the recovery of the divine honor, there is introduced the general motive which underlies the specific action of restoration displayed in verses 23-32. This is seen in the pivotal phrase ידוע נאומך כי אני יהוה ("but I had concern for My holy Name"), which is set in contrast to the attitude of the nations who professed no concern for it. The word חוסן, translated as "concern, pity, compassion" is used in Ezekiel 16:5 (in a passage describing Israel's contemptible state at the time of her election) to indicate an attitude of active, condescending responsibility. Adding a note of assurance to the comfort of YHWH's assertion of concern, the verb is used as a provident preterite implying that the basis of Israel's future restoration has already been settled.165 However,

before the prophet declares YHWH’s action, he will first clarify the motive of YHWH’s self-interest so that a proper foundation might be laid theologically for divine initiative in a soteriological setting. Whereas explanation had characterized the tone of the prophetic message in verses 17-21, with verse 22 the tone changes to one of declaration.\textsuperscript{166}

\textit{Ezekiel’s Concept of Eschatological Restoration}

Ezekiel’s concept of eschatological restoration is now the fore in the remainder of this section (verses 22-38).\textsuperscript{167} First in order is the restoration of the

\textsuperscript{166}The previous section was of an unfinished and incomplete nature, chiefly intended to form a sort of preambule to the great promises contained in verses 22-38. A new section is now begun with the introductory formula, פָּרָשִׁים יְהוָה ("thus says the Lord God"). The purpose of this formula is to introduce specific declarations from YHWH of judgment or salvation and serves to make authoritative the message about to be declared or announce a particular action to be taken by YHWH. For examples of this declaratory function cf. Ezekiel 2: 4; 3:11, 27; 5: 5, 7, 8, 11; 6:3, 11; 7:5; 11:5, 7, 16, 17, 21; 12:23, 25, 28; 13:3, 8, 13, 18, 20; 14:21; 15:6; 16:36, 59; 17:3, 9, 19, 22; 20:3, 5, 27, 30; 21:3, 26, 28; 22:3, 19, 28; 23:22, 28, 32, 35, 46; 24:3, 6, 9, 21; 25:6, 8, 12, 15, 16; 26:3, 7, 15, 19; 27:3; 28:2, 6, 12, 22, 25; 29:3, 8, 13, 19; 30:2, 6, 10, 13, 22; 31:10, 15; 32:3, 11; 33:25, 27; 34:11, 17, 20; 35:3, 14; 36:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 22, 33, 37; 37:5, 19, 21; 38:3, 10, 14, 17; 39:17, 25; 46:1, 16.

\textsuperscript{167}The eschatological announcement of YHWH’s response is emphasized in the opening word of verse 22 by ולע ("therefore"), which appears to function as a connecting link between two distinct units, drawing special attention to the response that is about to be made, cf. W. Eugene March, \textit{Lachen: Its Functions and Meanings}, \textit{Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg}, eds. Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler (Pittsburg: Pickwick, 1974), pp. 256-284.
divine honor (verse 23), 168 which is in reality effected through the restoration of Israel: to the Land (verse 24), to a state of ritual purity (verses 25-27), and to security in a rebuilt and ideal Jerusalem (verses 28-38). In verses 22-23a, Ezekiel introduces his restoration motif with YHWH’s eschatological announcement that He will restore the Divine honor, and Israel’s state of cultic purity כִּי יְהֹウェָה אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁמָיו מְשַׁמֵּשׁ ("for the sake of My holy Name"), verse 22. 169 To reflect that this is not merely a cosmic act but an act of sovereign resolve and power, לֶשֶׁה ("to do, make") appears in the form of the Qal active participle functioning absolutely (without an object). This force of the participle here gives the sense "I am about to do what I do," denoting not only the certainty and effectiveness of the action, but also expressing imminency. 170 In Ezekiel 20:9 this same phrase is employed in an enlarged context of Heilsgeschichte, so here, too, its understanding may be that wherever an assertion of divine self-manifestation is paramount, it provides an unshakable basis for the promise of restoration. 171

168 That a reversal is announced is also indicated by לְכוֹפָו ("therefore") linked with the phrase יְהֹウェָה נִבְנֵה ("thus says YHWH"). This combination occurs 24 times in Ezekiel in response to an undesirable situation, cf. Greenberg, Ezekiel, p. 11.

169 This phrase expands the explanation of verse 21 that YHWH had "concern" for His reputation by way of declaration, and is expanded itself with the phrase ("not for your sake, O house of Israel, am I about to act"). Elmer Martens, "Motivations for the Promise of Israel’s Restoration to the Land in Jeremiah and Ezekiel" (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1972), p. 264 observes: "This startling self-assertion "removes all grounds of human arrogance and appeal, and maintains YHWH’s freedom to act sovereignly from and for Himself."


171 By the use of this phrase it may be said that YHWH has already implicitly "sanctified" His Name, by virtue of the fact that He has excluded all others as a basis for "sanctifying action." This then prepares for the theme of sanctification in verse 23 which will make this action explicit.
Since the only resolution to Israel's problem of de-sanctification is a restoration of sanctification, the announcement of this might have been expected in verse 23. However, as Israel's sanctification is secondary to and dependent upon, the sanctification of YHWH's honor, this first requires vindication. Here the description of YHWH's Name is somewhat different from that in verses 20-22. In the previous verses the adjectival modifier was שָׁרָקֵ" ("holy"'), but has it now is replaced by דָּרוֹל "great." The sense of דָּרוֹל is of "great in importance," and like שָׁרָקֵ" underscores the incomparability of YHWH as opposed to the commonness of the gods of the nations among whom He had been associated by the exile of Israel.\(^{172}\) The opening words of verse 23a, יְבִיאָה יִנְשַׁלָּהוּ ("and I will sanctify My great Name"), are in the form of a statement that frequently occurs in Ezekiel, and which has been labeled the Qdsh-phrase.\(^{173}\) This phrase expresses the "vindication of holiness,"\(^{174}\) which was a theological necessity in view of the scandal of desecration.

\(^{172}\) The adjective may also emphasize the scope of the desecration and prove why YHWH must resist it in the sight of the nations. This expression of דָּרוֹל also parallels the use of שָׁרָקֵ" in the motive clause of verse 21. Whereas the "holiness of YHWH's Name" was the grounds for His אֶלֶב ("compassionate concern"), now it is the "greatness of YHWH's Name" makes observable the omnipotence by which He is able to secure due regard for Himself.

\(^{173}\) The expression is so used by Tatsuhito Koizumi, op. cit., p. 70.

\(^{174}\) An analysis of this phrase, which is built upon some form of the verb שָׁרָקֵ", reveals that it is an expression of the manifestation of YHWH's incomparable sovereignty, appearing especially in contexts of eschatological judgment (cf. Ezekiel 28:22; 38:16, 23) and salvation (cf. Ezekiel 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 39:27). It is regularly found with the formula, הִנֵּיה יָדִיעָהוּ ("and they will know that I am the Lord"), emphasizing the theme of theocidy (cf. Ezekiel 20: 42; 28:22, 26; 36:23; 38:16, 23; 39:28). In each case the vindication of YHWH is before the nations in order to reverse the state of desecration through the sanctification of His Name. It may also be seen that in every occurrence of this phrase in Ezekiel, the form of the verb is in the Niph'al and bears the usual reflexive nuance, רִפְּאֵ" ("I will prove Myself holy") [There is an exception in Ezekiel 38:23 where the verb is רַפְּאֵ" (Hithpa'el), however, this is probably a special use, equivalent to the Niph'al, since the preceding word which it modifies, יָדִיעָהוּ, has no Niph'al.
While verses 22 and 23 serve as declaratory introductions to the work of YHWH (which is set forth in detail in verses 24-28), they also summarize the content that will be presented in the final sections (24-32, 33-38). Therefore certain elements will reappear later in final form.\textsuperscript{175} The latter portion of verse 23 serves to establish the eschatological goal of YHWH’s self-sanctification with the statement יָדָעָהּ יִהְויָה יָדָעָה ("then the nations will know that I am YHWH"). This phrase, a recognition formula\textsuperscript{176}, is identified in Ezekiel as the concluding statement of action by YHWH in which He is acknowledged as sovereign by either those acted upon (36:32), or those spectators of the action (36:23, 36, 38).

\textsuperscript{175}One example is the concluding statement of verse 23 and the recognition of YHWH’s Lordship. This is announced as the goal to which the Qdsh-phrase has pointed and will receive its full expression in verse 38 at the conclusion of the restoration oracle.

\textsuperscript{176}The recognition formula is termed by Walther Zimmerli, the Erkenntnisaussage, which means "a definite form of statement about divine knowledge," and as an Erkenntnisspruch, defined as a "demand to recognize that YHWH is acting here."

For an expanded treatment of this phrase, and a listing of the some 81 occurrences of the phrase cf. Walther Zimmerli, "Das Wort des göttlichen Selbstweises (Erweiswort), eine prophetische Gattung, "Mélanges Bibliques: rediges en l’honneur de André Robert, pp. 54-64."
"It fittingly caps," as Allen notes, "the theme of YHWH clearing His Name."177 The personal pronouns and address of these phrases reveal that there are two groups for whom the recognition of God as "Sovereign Lord" (יְהוָה-אֱלֹהִים) is important—Israel and the nations.

The contexts of these passages disclose that definite events on the world scene are instrumental in bringing about this recognition by both groups. The nature of these incidents demands an acknowledgment of divine intervention, and thus of God’s essential identity as the "Sovereign Lord" of history (to the nations) and the covenant God (of Israel). A critical analysis of the form and structure of this phrase reveals its contribution to the goal of theodicy resolution which is at the heart of this verse.178 Therefore, concerning the recognition formula, it may be

177Leslie Allen, op. cit., p. 178.

178The structure of the expression reveals a combination of two phrases, the first phrase built upon the verb יְדַע ("to know"), and the second, an objective clause וְהִי יְהוָה ("that I am YHWH"). It has been pointed out by Zimmerli that the term יְדַע has its origin in the decision-making process, and is exemplified particularly in the court setting, cf. Zimmerli, Erkenntis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezekiel (Zürich: Zwiger, 1957), p. 49. Huffmon has expanded the legal aspect of יְדַע in relation to the technical terminology of ancient Near Eastern international treaties, and concludes that יְדַע involves the recognition of the authority and claims of a sovereign (suzerain), cf. Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada’," BASOR 181 (1966), pp. 31-37, and "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," JBL 79 (1959), pp. 285-95. This concept may be demonstrated from Ezekiel 36:23, 36, and 38 where the Qal perfect plus waw consecutive form of יְדַע in the third person plural indicates the dynamic witness of the restoration of Israel to the nations as the vindication of YHWH’s absolute authority in the sphere of human history and His claim to theocratic rule as the covenant-God of His people. In the second phrase, the short objective clause יְדַע אֵלֶּה, is composed of the traditional theophanic (divine manifestation) formula יִדְעֲךָ אֱלֹהִים and constitutes a self-presentation formula. It is a form of theophanic speech which appears in connection with a cultic proclamation of the law (as in Psalms 50 and 81). In the declaration of יִדְעֲךָ אֱלֹהִים, then, YHWH, who established His law and cultus, will assert Himself in divine intervention to bring about a revelation of Himself to those who have not previously acknowledged Him, or who have not apprehended Him properly, cf. See Gerhard von Rad, The Message of the Prophets (Grand Rapids: William B.
concluded that the knowledge of God is presented as an eschatological event, brought about by YHWH's word (as communicated through His prophets) and His final acts in history, and directed to the goal of securing for Himself due recognition as Lord of the nations and especially the God of Israel. The theodiscic resolution implied here, saw the exile as a necessary judgment, although intolerable from the divine perspective, and its resolution - the vindication of YHWH's incomparable holiness and transcendent power (i.e. His Name) as the eschatological goal of history.

Following the recognition formula at the conclusion of verse 23 is the declarative expression הוהי נאום יתalker שים הנבואה ("declares the Sovereign Lord"). This expression often follows statements of divine self-demonstration and is a reiteration of prophetic certainty. This future assurance connects the declaration of the sanctification of the Name in the opening of verse 23 with the final statement of the verse באת לפני יתalker שים הנבואה ("when I prove Myself holy in you before their eyes"), which is a restatement and reaffirmation of YHWH's intent. This declaration, in conjunction with the two previous statements of the passage, reveals the structure of the formula comprising verse 23, termed by Zimmerli the göttlichen Selbstweis ("saying of divine self-demonstration").

---

179 The denominative verb נאום means "to utter a prophecy," and therefore the nominative form נאום is used before divine names (since prophecy is properly a divine manifestation) and for prophetic citations of the divine word (usually as given through the prophet, see Jer. 23:21), BDB, p. 610. Also note remarks by Zimmerli on this form in connection with the divine recognition formula, cf. Zimmerli, Ezechiel. Biblischer-Kommentar Altes Testament (Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969-1979) 2:1250-1251.

180 According to Zimmerli, "Das Wort des göttlichen Selbstweises (Erweiswort), eine prophetische Gattung," pp. 154-164, the göttlichen Selbstweis consists of three members:

(I) the motivation for YHWH's action: יתalker אני נאום התברר לפני הנבואה ("I will sanctify My great Name desecrated among the nations"), verse 23a.
In consequence of the preceding self-disclosure and demonstration of YHWH, with verse 23, the theodiceic statement that YHWH's Name will be sanctified in Israel in testimony to the nations of His holiness is presented as the purpose of YHWH in fulfilling the prophecies about to be announced in verses 24-38. As the initial proclamation of theodicy in this oracle, verse 23 serves as a foundational statement upon which the subsequent verses elaborate and particularly introduces the subject of divine restoration, which will find its fullest expression in YHWH's declaration that He will sanctify His name among the nations through the sanctification of the nation Israel (24-28).

**Eschatological Restoration as Israelite Restoration**

Beginning with verse 24, Ezekiel's restoration motif turns from the declaration of divine restoration (of YHWH's honor) to a promise of Israelite restoration. The *first phase* of this Israelite restoration is to בָּהָרָן ("the Land"). This aspect of restoration associates the motif indirectly with Temple restoration. The Mosaic announcement of restoration the divine ideal in Exodus 15:17 began with the same regathering formula, נֹאֵם ("You will bring [them] in," cf. Exodus 23:20), used here at the end of verse 24, רָבָנָה ("I will bring [you] in"). This association in this context is strengthened by the use in Ezekiel 36:36 of both members of the Exodus 15:17 restoration formula: נֹאֵם כְּיַחֲדָמִי ("I will bring [them] in") and נֹאֵם כְּיַחֲדָמִי ("I will plant [them]").

Furthermore, the locus of the restoration in Exodus 15 is נָהַר עֵמֶק אֶרֶץ ("the mountain of your inheritance"), which is later identified with Mount Zion (II

---

(2) *the oracle itself*: קָרַבְתָּי אֶדֶרֶךְ תְּנַחְנֵל ... בַּעַלְוֹת כְּבֵה לְעָלֵיו יִשְׁכְּנֵנִי ("I will sanctify My great Name ... when I will be sanctified in you in their sight"), verse 23.

(3) *the purpose of YHWH in fulfilling the prophecies*: נָהַרְלִים כָּרָאתִי וְיִשְׁרָאֵל ... בַּעַלְוֹת כְּבֵה ... נָהַרְלִים אֲדַרְךָ ... יִשְׁכְּנֵנִי ("I will sanctify My great Name ... the nations will know that I am YHWH"), verse 23a, b.
Samuel 7:10; cf. Genesis 15:16; 22:2, 14), and especially the place of the Temple, called in Exodus 15 מֶכֶל (“the Sanctuary”), cf. II Samuel 7:13. While Ezekiel 36 addresses a general group, the specific reference of Jerusalem in verse 38, though used metaphorically, and the cultic language of restoration (verses 24-27, 33) may also understand a Temple setting. This new Exodus language has in view an eschatological restoration to the Land, the covenant, and the cult that will prevent Israel from repeating its scandalous history.

The action of YHWH in verse 24 is a tour de force, an act of power which puts to an end the outward occasion for the slanderous desecration of YHWH’s Name by the nations. The desecration itself is recorded in verse 20: "םז ל_Param אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוָה מַלְכּ אֱלֹהִים אָנָנוּר הַמַּלְכִּים וְאַלָּה הַמַּלְכִּים מַלְכּ הַהוֹוָה תִּירֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים אָנָנוּר הַמַּלְכִּים ("these are the people of Yahweh yet from His land they have gone out"). The theme of restoration to the Land is frequently a part of the salvation oracle and is characterized by divine intervention.¹⁸¹ This divine intervention is depicted as a physical regathering of the scattered Remnant (i.e. a geographical restoration to the Promised Land), cf. Isaiah 11:11-12. The expressions associated with this physical aspect of the restoration motif in Ezekiel may be seen to exhibit a formulative structure termed by Zimmerli, the Botenspruch (“messenger saying”).¹⁸² The Botenspruch is usually cast in a three-member statement¹⁸³, similar to the göttlichen Selbsterweis, the form of which is:

¹⁸¹For this model of structure in the salvation oracles in Ezekiel cf. 11:17-20; 20:41-42; 28:25-26; 34:7-13; 37:16-21; 39:25-29. This model is also seen in Jeremiah (cf. 12:15-16; 23:7-8; 29:11-14; 30:3; 31:8-10; 32:42-44).

¹⁸²For the occurrences of this formula in Ezekiel cf. 11:17; 20:34; 3Q:41-42; 34:13; 37:21; 39:27-28.

¹⁸³The order of b. and c. exhibits a consistent and uniform usage of verb forms in most all of the occurrences of the formula, although a certain flexibility is found in the phrases within each member. These variations deal with the change in the objects of the preposition and the addition of explanatory phrases. Of the eight occurrences, six have the Hiphil of יָגֶד in the final member (except for Ezekiel 11: 17, the Qal of יָגֶד, and in Ezekiel 39:28 - Pi’el of יָגֶד) while the Pi’el of יָנָק appears in every instance but Ezekiel 11:17.
A. ילִּקֵּה [x] מַרְדּוֹןָו ("I will take [x] from the nations"), vs. 24a

B. קָבָהָה [x] מְסַלְּלָהָוּת ("I will gather [x] from all the lands"), vs. 24b

C. לְבָאָה [x] מְשַׁמְּרוֹת ("I will bring [x] to your Land"), vs. 24c.\textsuperscript{184}

In each member of the formula the verb is the perfect plus \textit{waw} consecutive with a syntactical nuance as specific future. This sequence of perfects demonstrates YHWH's eschatological restoration. This formula is itself a logical and necessary sequence in Israel \textit{ordo salutis}, for, as A. J. Kligerman has stated, there can be no "fulfillment of any of the promises of the past unless Israel is restored to her native land."\textsuperscript{185} Thus a crucial element in the restoration motif for Ezekiel is the divine intervention that restores Israel to her geographical locale. This restoration cannot be spiritualized since in Ezekiel מַרְדּוֹן refers to a geographical territory, and מַרְדּוֹן is used especially to designate Eretz-Israel.\textsuperscript{186}

\textsuperscript{184}The Qal of לִקֵּה is substituted for the Hiphil of מְשַׁמְּרוֹת, which predominately occurs in the first member of the formula. This replacement is not unusual as the Hiphil of מְשַׁמְּרוֹת occurs only in Ezekiel 20:34, 41; 24:13. The variation of לִקֵּה is also seen in Ezekiel 37:21 and 39:27, and מְשַׁמְּרוֹת is used in Ezekiel 11:17. The reason for this substitution in Ezekiel 36:24 was probably due to stylistic concerns as מְשַׁמְּרוֹת is characteristically used with עָמָם, and therefore לִקֵּה might appear as more proper in connection with מְשַׁמְּרוֹת.

\textsuperscript{185}Aaron Judah Kligerman, \textit{Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), p. 106. The use of the pronoun מַרְדּוֹן implies that this is a personal return to private Land. The force of this is seen in the transition from מְשַׁמְּרוֹת ("the nations") and מְשַׁמְּרוֹת ("the foreign lands") to מְשַׁמְּרוֹת ("their own Land").

\textsuperscript{186}While מַרְדּוֹן is used with the cosmic connotation of "earth" as over against מְשַׁמְּרוֹת ("heavens"), e.g. Genesis 1:1, in Ezekiel, by contrast, מַרְדּוֹן refers to a geographical territory (cf. 6:14; 7:2, 23, 27; 8:17; 9:9; 11:15; 12:12, et al.) and מְשַׁמְּרוֹת is used more than 20 times to specify "the Land of Israel," cf. Herbert G. May, "Aspects of the Imagery of World Dominion and World State in the Old Testament," \textit{Essays in Old Testament Ethics}, p. 70.
**Eschatological Restoration as Cultic Purification**

The second phase of Israelite restoration is the cultic purification of the Remnant. These operations begin with inward renewal in verse 25 and proceed to outward renewal with verse 29. The *Sitz im Leben* of the first act of inward renewal (verse 25) is that of the cultic performance of the priestly community. The ceremonial imagery of renewal is portrayed in the words מַעֲלָ֣הּ מִ֣י מִדֵּ֔רֶשׁ "I will sprinkle clean water upon them" The word מַעֲלָ֣הּ means "to toss, throw" (in a volume), hence, "to sprinkle." It has been suggested that the LXX’s use here of ἐπαυξάω for מַעֲלָהּ may mean "to gush out," indicating the quality of the water as pure.\(^{187}\) In Tanach, the cultic use of מַעֲלָהּ is always to the fore and speaks of the levitical ritual of purification from defilement.\(^{188}\) Here the use is that of water sprinkled upon men for their cleansing at the conclusion of the covenant.\(^{189}\) Dieter Baltzer has suggested that by such an act of sprinkling, the purity of the

---

187 Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “ἔπαυξα,” *TDNT* 6 (1967): 977-978. Whether or not such an inference is intended, the modifying adjective σαφῆς ("clean, bright, pure, unmixed"), clearly signifies that this water is levitically clean and designed for purification.


189 The cultic use of מַעֲלָהּ is differentiated by: (1) different materials, such as water, oil, and blood; (2) different objects, such as the sanctuary, men, and things; (3) different purposes, such as cleansing, and dedication of the object sprinkled; and (4) different occasions, such as the consecration of priests, the day of atonement, and the conclusion of the covenant.
water is symbolically transferred to the cult participant\(^{190}\), and removes the stain of defilement that had contaminated people, city, and Temple.\(^{191}\)

This purification from desecration is indicated by the juxtaposition of מָדַר ("cleanse"), and its antonym מָזַר ("defile") in this passage. The priestly use of מָדַר here is "to be clean, pure" with the ritual significance of "morally" or "ethically clean, pure".\(^{192}\) מָזַר as the opposing term, "to be unclean, defiled," here bears the full ethical significance of ritual impurity.\(^{193}\) This ethical connotation is normally employed in Ezekiel in references to cleansing from sin (24:13; 36:33; 37:23) and ritual defilement (39:12, 14, 16; 43:26). In Ezekiel 22:26 and 44:23 מָדַר and מָזַר are even juxtaposed with the terms קדוש ("holy") and הָרָע ("profane").


\(^{191}\) In the early Greek use of μιατιοῦ the idea that "the doer transfers the stain of his defilement to fellow citizens, the city, the temple of his gods," is prevalent, and "only cultic cleansing by water of sacrifice will purge these stains," cf. F. Hauck, "καθαρός," *TDNT* 4: 645.


\(^{193}\) The ethical sense is that used in the Qumran literature (cf.*War Scroll* 13:5, "for all their works of filthy uncleanness"). Yadin, *ibid.* pp. 320-321. The LXX uses μιατιοῦ predominately for מָזַר with the idea of "cultic" or "ritual defilement," and has a declarative nuance in some contexts of "to declare," or "pronounce ritually unclean," cf. Friedrich Hauck, "μιατιοῦ," *TDNT* 4 (1965): 646.
The language here is partly metaphorical for divine forgiveness and spiritual cleansing, and partly literal, since this purification envisions an actual rite (probably the red heifer ceremony, cf. Numbers 19) which would require a functioning cult to perform this for the Nation. Therefore, the extent of this renewal is both individual\textsuperscript{194} and national\textsuperscript{195}, for it is both cleansing from ceremonial defilement, and a purging from idolatry (socially, morally, and cultic). The accomplishment of this purification requires a forensic act, as is implied by the use of the Piʾel perfect מִפְרָדֵת ("to declare ceremonially clean").\textsuperscript{196} Therefore, the first aspect of this restoration - inward renewal - is an act of purification whereby the Remnant is declared to be a ceremonially clean community, again ritually qualified to perform the Temple cultus.

The second aspect of inward renewal is an act of spiritual restoration that transforms the inner disposition by the removal of that which has brought defilement, and the implantation of that which will preserve ethical purity. In order to emphasize the essential elements of this proclamation the author has again structured verse 26 in a chiastic arrangement:

\textsuperscript{194}The need for individual restoration to a state of ritual purity has long been accepted in Judaism. For instance, in the Taharah ceremony (purification of the corpse), water is poured over the head while Ezekiel 36:25 is recited. In tractate Taharoth, the pre-interment washings are described, and the purpose is given in Sefer Hasidim that with the cessation of the sin-offering in Israel all of the People of Israel have incurred corpse impurity. Mishnah Parah 5:1, 8, notes that rabbinic law specified that the defiled must bathe in living (i.e., "running") water, but that it could only be collected by one who is himself levitically clean.

\textsuperscript{195}The midrashim interpret this cleansing in terms of a national restoration. Genesis Rabbah 49:11 explains that the hope of Israel is the regathering of Israel by Messiah who will plant them like a choice vine and sprinkle them with clean water so that they may not commit any more iniquity before Him (cf. Numbers Rabbah 9:49; Canticles Rabbah 1:3). Leviticus Rabbah applies the restoration of the leper ceremony, in which spring-water mixed with the blood of a dove is sprinkled on the cured leper and his house, to eschatological Israel. In Leviticus Rabbah 15:9 citing Ezekiel 36:25, it is stated that while in this world the priest may examine for leprosy, but in the world to come, God will render men clean.

\textsuperscript{196}Cf. BDB, s.v. "מִפְרָדֵת," p. 372; KB, s.v. "מִפְרָדֵת," p. 347.
Figure 7: Chiastic Structure of Ezekiel 36:26

A: נָתַן לְךָ ("I will give to you")
B: לְבָנָה ("a new heart")
B: רוֹחֵ֑נִי ("a new spirit")
A: אֲשֶׁר בְּבִיקבָּכֶם ("I will put within you")

The primary members of the chiasmus, לְבָנָה ("new heart") and רוֹחֵ֑נִי ("new spirit") are eschatological metaphors which describe Israel as the restoration community of prophetic vision, which will be enabled to secure a sanctified future history free from the desecrating history of the past. Because of the centrality of this event to restoration history, it is important to consider the details in this motif.

First, the attributive adjective לְבָנָה, which modifies both לְבָנָה and רוֹחֵ֑נִי, has the basic idea of "newness" or "freshness. The LXX usually translates רוֹחֵ֑נִי by κανάνος, indicating in non-theological usage "something new, something previously not there." The theological expression of רוֹחֵ֑נִי finds its place chiefly in the eschatological message of the prophets announcing a new covenant, a new covenant community, and a new creation. The "new heart" and "new spirit" therefore are inner dispositions which were formerly non-existent and have been given in order to begin a fresh new relationship.

It is equally important to understand the anthropological members of the chiasmus לְבָנָה and רוֹחֵ֑נִי. The word לְבָנָה, occurring some 858 times in the Tanach, is the most common of all anthropological terms and is almost exclusively applied

---

197 Haarbeck, Link, and Brown, "κανάνος," NIDNTT 2 (1964): 670. Note also the idea of "freshness" as Job longs for the time when his glory was (רוֹחֵ֑נִי) in him (Job 29:20).

to man. It refers to activity of the human will as it characterizes man in his intellectual, rational, perceptive, emotional, and volitional functions. In the majority of cases it is the function of reason that is ascribed to the heart, a fact which led Wolff to refer to בלב generally as "the reasonable man." The word בלב, by contrast, is more properly a theo-anthropological term, since it is used more with reference to God than to man. The general understanding of בלב is as a "vital power," signifying man as a living being who may often act as an authorized agent of YHWH, yet is ever a dependent creature. We may therefore draw a distinction here between בלב and בלב with בלב as the "rational, disposing inclination for life," and בלב as the "empowering, animating, energizing power of life."

The remainder of verse 26 contains the two contrasting negative metaphors בלב אבן (“the heart of stone”), and בלב בשר (“a heart of flesh”). The terms (“heart”) and (“flesh”) are covenantal metaphors relating to the obedience of Israel to Torah. Forcible imagery of the hardened condition of the will. As

---


202 Cf. the Sinaic Covenant, preceded by a call to priestly purity (Exodus 19:6), and a purification ceremony (תפלה, "let them wash their clothes"), Exodus 19:10, before the Law is given - written on tablets of stone, but by psychological extension, to be written on the fleshly tablet of the heart (as in the "new covenant" of Jeremiah 31:33). The בלב is seen as the center of obedience/disobedience to תור in Numbers 15:39; Deuteronomy 4:9; 29; 5:29; 6:5-6; 8:2; 5, 14 -17; 9:4-5; 11:18; 29:4, 18-19; 30:2; 6, 10, 14, 17; 32:46. Perhaps for this reason the High
an attributive genitive, לֵבָנוּ transfers its stony quality to the heart so that it denotes that which is obdurate, insensitive, incapable of action, dead. As opposed to the term לֵב הָאָרוֹן ("new heart"), i.e. the "new, fresh will," לֵב תֵּבָן ("stony heart") is the "old, corrupted, hardened will." The term לֵב, however, is contrasted with לֵב הָאָרוֹן, and is associated more closely with the הָרַע הַרְחֵשׁ as a "new inclination" given by YHWH. While תֵּבָן is used broadly of man and animal, and refers to the mortality of corporeal existence in its frailty, infirmity, and faithlessness. By its very property, תֵּבָן is that which binds people together in relationship, and therefore, it stresses positively the concept of "life." It is in this sense that לֵב תֵּבָן should be understood, as a "fleshy, living heart" in contrast to a "dead, stony one." It represents, therefore, in connection with הָרַע הַרְחֵשׁ, a responsive, sensitive, impressionable will, ready for obedient action. This act

Priest was to bear the Nation representatively "upon/over his heart") through the breastplate he wore into the Holy of Holies (Exodus 28:29-30). For the concept of circumcising the uncircumcised heart in relation to covenantal obedience, cf. Leviticus 26:41; Deuteronomy 10:16. As the "heart of stone" makes allusion to the disobedience to the Mosaic Covenant, the "heart of flesh" may allude to the Abrahamic (cf. Genesis 17:10-14; Exodus 12:44, 48; Leviticus 12:3, et. al.), in so far as the outward circumcision was a sign of inward obedience to torah through the circumcised heart.

203 Cf. A. S. Kapelrud, ""A"" THOT 1 (1969): 48. The Sages identified the נַפְשֶׁה as one of the seven names of the רָע הַרְחֵשׁ ("the evil inclination"), citing this text as proof, TB, Sukkah 52a.


206 Cf. Wolff, op. cit., p. 29.

207 This use of תֵּבָן in the sense of positive value is unique, occurring only in this passage and the parallel passage in Ezek. 11:19. The reason for this positive force was explained by Rashi as the recognition that the "heart of flesh" caused the "evil inclination" (i.e., the "heart of stone") to become "good." (תֵּבָן הָרַע הֲלוֹךְ, 4:254a).
of YHWH in bestowing a new obedient nature, further develops the restoration motif by preparing a people for theocratic rule, one of the goals of eschatological restoration.

The second phase of the Israelite restoration is continued in verse 27 with YHWH's separation of the Nation to covenant faithfulness. This is now the third aspect of inward renewal, empowering Israel to respond to YHWH and maintain faithfulness to Him. In verse 26 the bestowal of the רוח נвремי נני brought to Israel a new and undefiled disposition via the removal of the old, but with this verse, obedience is secured by the addition of something new. YHWH's own Spirit (טוח). The relationship between verses 26 and 27 is structurally one of simple

---

208 Paul Volz, Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließen Benden Judentum (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1910), pp. 76-77 observes the difference: "durch jene lebt der Mensch (Ruh-fluidum), durch diese wird er gut (Die Ruh Jahwes)." ("the individual is made lives by the [impartation] of the first (the influential spirit), and by the second (the Spirit of Yahweh) he is made good."

209 This follows Kimchi who suggested that the phrase יהוה נטרל referred to YHWH's "Holy Spirit," מדרש דניאל 4:254a. Support for this translation is found in the context, as the רוח נвремי נני is in contrast to the רוח נвремי נני which = רוח נвремי נני ("human spirit"), thus, "Divine Spirit" versus "human spirit," cf. Graf Henning Reventlow, "Wächter über Israel: Ezechiel und seine Tradition," BZAW 82(1962): p. 56. Additional reasons for this preference are because (1) a progressive work seems to be the order of vss. 25-27. (2) the רוח of Ezek. 37:14 (a parallel phrase) is clearly the same רוח נвремי נני from 37:1. (3) while Ezek. 11:19-20 seems to indicate that the רוח נвремי נני and רוח נвремי נני are able to accomplish the work set for רוח נвремי נני in 36:27, the comparison of 18:31 reveals that the work is only commanded, but the ability to perform awaits an act of YHWH (37:11-15). It may be questioned how the Nation as a whole can receive new obedience and the indwelling of the Divine Spirit? The explanation is that corporate obedience is only possible as "individual hearts" are first enlivened and indwelt. This implication of individual indwelling is seen in the word בכרה, understanding the preposition ב as "within," rather than "among," which better corresponds to the idea of בכרה as "inward part," cf. BDB, s.v. בכרה, p. 899; KB, s.v. בכרה, p. 853, identifies בכרה as the seat of thought and emotion, and particularly the seat of the בכרה (Psalms 39:4; 55:5;
The purpose of the impartation of the Divine Spirit is presented in the remaining section of verse 27, וַיְבָאָהּ יִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ נְבֶיָּהּ וּנְשָׁקָהּ ("and I will cause you to walk in my decrees and faithfully obey my laws"). The implication of divine agency securing this purpose is evinced by understanding the Qal perfect הָלַךְ as expressing causation. Therefore, YHWH’s action, then, is explained as empowering His people to walk according to the legal expressions of His will. The verb הָלַךְ is here figurative of the “way of life”, or “required conduct,” especially as it is related to "YHWH's ways". The verb רָכָּב reflects a “keeping with observant care,” or a “guarding with diligent preservation,” implying the duty of obedience. The construction of יִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ is a verbal hendiadys, and may be translated “you will carefully observe” or “you will faithfully obey.”

The spiritual restoration here, then, is in view of the fulfillment of the eschatological restoration of all Israel, which will be accomplished by an act of

---

109:22; Lamentations 1:20 and of the הָלַךְ (Ezekiel 11:19; Psalm 51:12; Isaiah 26:9; Zechariah 12:1).


A: פֶּסַח לַֽעַם לִבְּבֵךְ ("I will give you a new heart"), verse 26a
B: מִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ לִבְּבֵךְ ("a new spirit I will put within you"), verse 26b
A: פֶּסַח לַֽעַם לִבְּבֵךְ ("I will give you a heart of flesh"), verse 26c
B: מִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ לִבְּבֵךְ ("I will put My Spirit within you"), verse 27a

211 The only other textual example of a verb expressing causation with the relative (however here without גָּזַה) is Ecclesiastes 3:14. The use of מִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ after the verbs רָכָּב, לְמַעְשֵׁה, and מָסָר is also similar (Numbers 22:6; Deuteronomy 24:15; Esther 5:11; Joshua 2:10; 5:1; 1 Samuel 2:22; 2 Kings 8:5).

212 Cf. BDB, s.v. מִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ,” p. 1036; KB, s.v. מִשְׁתַּפְּרָהּ,” p. 993.
YHWH. The necessity of restoration was seen as the result of a need to resolve the problem of theodicy, a resolution which must include Israel as the subjects of the covenantal Promise yet unfulfilled, and which demanded vindication for the Divine honor. Restoration, according to Ezekiel in verses 16-27, depended upon the character of YHWH, which, as Brueggemann reminds us, is the best basis for the future hope, namely, a “God who will take seriously being God.”

The subsequent verses build upon this with elements of the restoration motif in restored covenantal blessings: geographical resettlement (verse 28), agricultural productivity (verses 29-30), repentance (verses 31-32), environmental prosperity (verse 33-36), and cultic utopia (verses 37-38). Each of these would have been anticipated as evidence of the reversal of the curse of retributive judgment outlined in Leviticus 26:14-43 and Deuteronomy 28:15-68. We will briefly survey each of these elements in the motif which demonstrate how outward restoration follows inward renewal to complete the eschatological picture.

Eschatological Restoration as Geographical Resettlement

Divine restoration restores the covenantal blessing of the Land as part of YHWH’s vindication. Beginning with verse 28 it is geographical resettlement that is in view - not regathering (which preceded in verse 24) - but an eschatological renewal of nature and the native Land to the divine ideal (cf. the Eden simile in verse 35). The new purified obedience furnished in verses 26-27 will assure permanent residence in the Land, for verse 28 is a continuation of the beneficial consequences stated in verse 27b. That this is Eretz-Israel, which God gave unconditionally to Israel’s descendants (cf. Genesis 17:8; Deuteronomy 11:19, 21; 18:35; Jeremiah 7:7; 11:5; Ezekiel 20:28, 42; 47:14), and the permanence of Israelite inheritance is indicated by the phrase לשבטך בפרים לך והתרחקו ("and you will dwell in the Land which I gave to your fathers”), verse 28a. The

verb נִשָּׁבָה ("to sit, remain, dwell") with the locative ב, indicates "residence," or "settlement." Though exiled from their land, God will restore their habitation and reputation among the nations, and also His own, for He is: הָאָלֶים נְפָרָם מָאָרְבִּים יְהֹוָה ("the faithful God, keeping the covenant and loyal love to those who love Him, and who keep His commands, to a thousand generations"), Deuteronomy 7:9.

The concluding statement of verse 28 is a recitation of the covenant-oath formula - יִהְיֶה לְךָ לִבְּבֵי אָדָם לְבוֹם לֵבָבוֹת (first stated in complete form in Leviticus 26:12). Since this phrase contains the only occurrence of the longer pronoun וּנְהַיָּהוּ ("I"), which may constitute an allusion to the ancient covenant formula. This oath throughout the Tanach defines and describes a relationship of obedience and fidelity between YHWH and His people. This idea is

214 הָאָלֶים נְפָרָם מָאָרְבִּים יְהֹוָה ("and I will walk among you, and will be your God, and you shall be My People"), cf. the abbreviated version here: יוֹנַה כֵּסָף לָךְ לָךְ לָךְ לָךְ לָךְ ("and you will be My People, and I will be your God"). The element that is missing is הָאָלֶים נְפָרָם מָאָרְבִּים יְהֹוָה ("and I will walk among you"), however, since verse 27 has in view the indwelling Presence of YHWH through His Spirit, such an addition was superfluous. The comparison of Ezekiel 36:27-28 and Leviticus 26:12 reveals: (1) YHWH's dwelling with His people in Leviticus 26:11a is extended to indwelling in Ezekiel 36:27a, (2) YHWH's acceptance of the people in Leviticus 26:11b is realized and actualized in Ezekiel 36:27b, (3) YHWH's unconditional covenant is announced in both Leviticus 26:12b and Ezekiel 36:28b.


expressed by the formula as it is figuratively a type of wedding metaphor depicting the intimacy of relationship designed by YHWH for the new covenant fulfillment. This promise of perpetual union is a fitting conclusion to YHWH's acts of inward renewal, for it expresses the eschatological restoration goal which His divine intervention is bringing to pass.

**Eschatological Restoration as Agricultural Prosperity**

The divine summoning of the Land to productivity in verses 29-30 follows an immediate restatement of cultic restoration in verse 29a. The opening declaration of verse 29 establishes this premise by a recapitulation of what was stated in verses 24-27. This succinct summation: "וַיֶּאֱבֹד אֱלֹהִים עַל פְּסֵמָיו וַיְשַׁלֶּהֶם" ("and I will deliver you from all your defilements"), is predicated on the character of God which has established itself free from any desecration (verses 21-23). Since the phrase מַעֲרֵרָם בֵּית צָדָק ("all their defilements") must include the desecrated Land of verse 17, a divine command is issued to the natural order in verse 29b.

When the people of the Land become ritually pure, the Land will respond in keeping with its new condition. Thus, the effects of the new inward creation of Israel from the previous section is extended to the outward form of the Nation, via its Land, in this section. For restoration to be complete, Israel must be completely brought out of the sphere of influence in which uncleanness is dominant. This sphere is the land which is under the Adamic curse and also requires a restoration in kind. We recall from Genesis 1-3 that the narrow focus of the context was Eretz-Israel, even though the entire created order was in the broader view. For Ezekiel, this Land was at the center of God's creation, and since the Fall had affected it in the natural order, the restoration would reverse its effects in the natural order.

Essential to the immediate concern of theodicy in this context, is a demonstration to Israel, by Israel, and by God, that the curse has not only been lifted, but reversed. To Israel, who saw a lack of productivity as a curse on the Land (Deuteronomy 28:38-42), the renewed fertility of the Land was assurance of
restoration. Because their condition before the nations was one of apparent rejection and judgment, resulting in national shame (כֶּרֶם, “reproach, disgrace”), as predicted in Deuteronomy 28:37, this change in fortune witnessed to the nations of their return to divine favor. YHWH’s own testimony to the nations, that as the God of Israel He is not impotent (as suggested in Ezekiel 26:20), is affirmed by His ability to command all of the physical realm (and the spiritual realm thought to be involved with it) by the power of His creative word.

The verb expressing this creative call to renewed productivity, אַרְבָּא, here has the force of "summon" with an expected response. This creative call, especially as here to the botanical realm, is reminiscent of the divine fiat of Genesis 1:11-12 in which fertility sprouts out of barrenness. This conception of the grain under divine mandate is emphasized by the use of the Hiphil of רֹבָּא ("to cause to increase," therefore, "to cause to yield abundantly").

Corollary to physical multiplication is the removal of physical deprivation as is manifest in verses 29b-30 with the declaration that רָעָב (“famine”), another of the retributive judgments, and especially its disgrace (רָעָב נְאָמָנִי), would never again be brought upon the Nation. Thus, YHWH will initiate His program of outward renewal by promising to fertilize the land and to free His people from the penalty of being unproductive. The reality of divine intervention is seen in the miraculous "increase" (רֹבָּא וַעֲצַמָּיו) of productivity as manifested in Ezekiel’s order of the renewal: proceeding from the lower vegetative order, קְטָרָה ("grain"), verse 29b, to the next higher order פָּרֵי נְחָל (“fruit-bearing trees”), and הָרָגָן ("the field"), verse 30a, after the pattern of Genesis 1:11-12. This imagery of the fertile field also appears in chapters 16, 17, 21, 31, and 39 and indicates the scope and magnitude of YHWH’s power and its fruitful ability to accomplish its

---

217 Cf. the use of אַרְבָּא in the similar eschatological statements of Isaiah 22:12; 46:11; and Amos 7:4.

218 רֹבָּא is also used in this sense in Ezekiel 36:10 and Nehemiah 9:37. This promise of future abundance in the messianic kingdom is discussed in TZ, Ketuvim 111b.
ends. With this verse the case of YHWH’s acts in nature as an instrument to bring forth national repentance is concluded and the expected response is seen in verse 31.

*Eschatological Restoration as Spiritual Repentance*

Restoration of the Land is here claimed as the instrument provoking national repentance. The realization of the future blessings will bring true remorse over past failures. These failures are described with the same terms as in the review of Israel’s previous dwelling in the Land, verses 17-18: המשלילולחנ ובחרים ("your conduct and your actions"), but here add negative modifiers to summarize the previous verdict of משמ הלולחנ ("defiled") as at verse 17: המשלילולחנ אither לאומנכי ("your immoral conduct and wanton acts"), 219 and the problem of הלולחנ ("their idols") as at verse 18: המשלו איתנובאם ("your iniquities and abhorrent practices"). 220

The response expected by YHWH from Israel is introduced by an adversative waw joined to the verb which serves as the basis of the response, תַּעַרEgyptian (“then you will remember”). The word רָע here means a “recognition” or “discernment” which turns toward YHWH, and approaches the act of

---

219 For מְפָּלִים cf. BDB, s.v. "רָע," p. 203 (compare the usage of this expression in Ezek. 16:47, 61; 18:23; 20:43; 23:13, 31; 33:8. 9, 11), and for מְפָּלִים cf. BDB, s.v. "עָלָל," p. 760. The verb means "to act arbitrarily, wantonly," and the noun מְפָּלִים is in all contexts always associated with evil.

220 The noun שלֵּנ ("iniquity") does not refer to particular moral acts but indicates the "guilt or punishment of iniquity, cf. this usage in the contexts of Ezek. 4:4; 9:9; 16:49; 36:33; Isa. 59:3; and Ps. 51:4. The noun תְּנָב תְּנָב ("abominations") is from the verb תְּנָב ("to do or regard as an abomination, be abhorred"). It is used in a ritualistic sense regarding improper sacrifices, idol worship, witchcraft, intermarriage with heathen, and child-sacrifice (cf. Ezekiel 11:18, 21), and in an ethical sense with respect to various kinds of unchastity and wickedness. It would seem that the ritualistic sense, which deals with the covenant relationship between YHWH and His people, is in view here.
“repentance.” This “repentant memory” is demonstrated by the people’s act of “self-loathing.” While it is essential to the notion of spiritual restoration that Israel reflect on her past history of covenantal unfaithfulness, it is the acknowledgment of YHWH’s sovereignty by the Nation in verse 32 that was the purpose of the Erweiswort (“Self-demonstration”) in verse 22. Israel’s raison d’être is that she might be brought to properly acknowledge YHWH’s character and thereby adopt a proper estimation of herself as His covenant people. This "acknowledgment" is the first appearance in this context with respect to Israel, the usual address being to the nations. This knowledge elicits again a self-abasement, the act of which is called for by two imperatives, נאם (“be humbled” or “ashamed”), and נאמ (“be humiliated” or “dishonored”). Thus, while the acknowledgment of YHWH’s sovereignty is the reason for Israel’s self-dishonor, it is also this knowledge that will result in her honor as the covenant people of the Self-revealing God who will enjoy the material blessing of restoration (verses 33–34).

**Eschatological Restoration as Environmental Prosperity**

In these verses, the eschatological restoration of the Land is evinced environmentally by the re-population of cities (verse 33b), the rebuilding of the

---


222 נאנתה נמנים (“and you will loathe yourselves in your own sight”), the Niphal of נאנתה with the adversative aspects of נמנים indicate a "self-loathing," cf. BDB, s.v. "ח GLfloatB," p. 876. Literally, taking the preposition ב as adversative, the expression would be, “you will feel a loathing against your faces.”

223 The nuance here of the verb "to know" (כז, in the Niphal) is reflexive, "let it be known to you," and indicates an internalized recognition of the fact (reiterated from verse 22) that YHWH's actions are strictly Self-motivated.

224 Cf. BDB, s.v. "כז", p. 101; cf. Ezek. 32:30, ח GLfloatB ("shame because of judgment").
waste places (33b-34a), and the cultivation of desolate regions (34b-36). Having restored the people to the Land, YHWH will now restore the Land to the people. The announcement of this eschatological settlement opens verse 33 with the introductory formula הוהי אדונינו יעָשֹׂר智能手机 (“thus says the Sovereign Lord”, cf. verse 22), in order to introduce a new, specific, declaration from YHWH concerning the restoration of the Land. The time element stated in view of this metropolitan restoration, יבשא יכתיי אַחֲרֵי (“on the day that I cleanse you”) is the certain eschatological day of YHWH’s decisive action.225 The figure is a synecdoche, putting יי for an indefinite period of time, since the rebuilding of edifices and repopulation will not be accomplished in a literal “day” but when the eschatological time of fulfillment comes: מַעַרְבָּה אַחֲרֵי מִלָּה יבשא (“when I cleanse you from all your iniquities”). At that time YHWH will יבשא נַעֲרָה (“cause the cities to be inhabited, and the waste places to be rebuilt”),226 and rebuild and

225 The infinitive construct with the preposition, opening this phrase, is the primary formula for introducing a temporal clause. Therefore, this phrase should be seen as a subordinate clause indicating the time for the subsequent action of restoration of the Land, but logically subordinate in thought. The futuristic sense of יי (“day”) is qualified in various ways in the Tanach with respect to its essential action or purpose. The repeated occurrences of יי in apocalyptic sections (Ezekiel 39:13; Zechariah 14:3), oracles of judgment against foreign nations (Ezekiel 31:15; Zephaniah 3:8) or Israel (Ezekiel 24:25), and oracles of salvation (Ezekiel 36:33; Isaiah 14:3; 30:26; Jeremiah 27:22) reveal that this “day” is the special day of Yahweh’s decisive action, cf. Simon J. De Vries, *Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow: Time in History and in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 47-50, and Richard L. Mayhue, “The Prophet’s Watchword: Day of the Lord,” *Grace Theological Journal* 6:2 (1985): 231-246.

226 The term יבשא (“waste places”) is perhaps here used to designate “the Arabah,” cf. BDB, s.v. מַעַרְבָּה, p. 352. When used with the definite article, מַעַרְבָּה is used to designate a geographical region, namely the rift valley running south from the Sea of Galilee to the Gulf of Aqabah. Without the article, it generally is used indefinitely or metaphorically of any place void of water and vegetation.
re-fortify the “war-ravaged” ( yönetici) areas, providing a true sense of הברכים ("security").

This reclamation of formerly ruined conditions will demonstrate to the nations that by a reversal of His judgments on Israel and her re-establishment, YHWH is the sovereign controller of all history and Israel is His people. The response itself, ישאר ב_means ויהוה the יארים ית陰yte פלש ("those passing by will say 'this land is like the garden of Eden'”) reveals that a radical transformation has occurred in the once desolate land. The simile of גן עדן ("the garden of Eden") implies that the newly created physical environment will be in some fashion

227 KB, s.v. " ASN", p. 988, notes that this is desolation that has been brought about by violence (cf. Ezekiel 29:12; 30:7; Jeremiah 12:11). The additional explanation is given in verse 34b that ועתה ביבנה והמים התפשטו областиיה ("ruined cities now have been enclosed, made inaccessible, fortified"), Qal passive participle, and הבארים והערים ("are inhabited"), Qal perfect. The picture is one of security and prosperity, as military defensibility often accompanies a stabilized order. While ביבנה in every context in which it appears usually has the sense of military fortification, defense (Num. 13:28; Deut. 1:28; 3:5; 9:1; 28:52; Josh. 14:12; 2 Sam. 20:6; 2 Kings 18:13; 19:26; Isa. 2:15; 25:2), it is possible that the term may indicate merely "walled cities" as opposed to those whose walls have collapsed due to being uninhabited and therefore unrepaired, and if so, the image is then of cities newly developed and repopulated. It would be tempting here to see a veiled reference to Daniel’s “Desolator,” whose desecration of the Temple and city of Jerusalem was the result of an attack against Israel, Daniel 9:27, cf. Matthew 24:6-7, 15-22; Mark 13:14-20 (cf. Luke 21:10, 20-24 who also uses the figure of desolation of Jerusalem, but probably with a different chronological referent from Matthew).

228 The idea of true versus false security appears in Ezekiel 38:8-11. While there exists considerable debate over not only the interpretation, but also the chronological setting, of Ezekiel 38-39, I would suggest that this is an eschatological battle that, in view of this context, occurs prior to the final resettlement of Israel in their Land. Thus, the “security” of Ezekiel 38:8, 11 is a false security, perhaps implied by the absence of walls for defense around the cities (verse 11), though this absence might as well be considered as an argument for true security, since such protective devices (note also in verse 11 the absence of “bars” and “gates”) were deemed necessary.
analogous to the original state before the fall. Perhaps the idea implied by this comparison here is influenced by the verb הָלָּשׁ ("till"), verse 34a, or it is used eschatologically of a return to a special paradisal creation in which YHWH has brought out order from chaos (cf. Genesis 1:1-2; Isaiah 45:18). Yates suggests that Ezekiel is making a comparison between the commercial trading economy of the sixth-century B.C.E., which were seen as capitalistic centers of greed and violence, and the agricultural economy of the biblical period, which from man’s original commission in Eden (Genesis 2:15), appears to have been the divine ideal.

It is also possible, that a veiled inference to cultic restoration is also implied, since the use of the Eden imagery in Ezekiel 28:13 appears with cultic overtones. There, in an account of another desecrator of Eden (perhaps a type of the eschatological Desecrator?) is made by allusion to the corruption of cultic life. Cosmic mountain typology is present in verses 13-17, and in verse 18a iniquity caused the desecration of sanctuaries. Morgenstern sees here the subject of the institution of divine kingship (over Tyrian kingship), verses 17c-d. 19. The garden motif appears to have a special appeal to Ezekiel, possibly because of the absence from Zion and the Temple, and the concept of the garden as an archtypal Mount Zion/Sanctuary. Bentzen at least suggests this when he says that both Genesis 1-3 and Ezekiel 28 are in essence paintings of an original man who

---

229 In a similarly worded eschatological context (Isaiah 51:3), the figure is used for the contrast between disharmony and infertility and harmony and fertility. In Ezekiel 31:9 it speaks of the incomparable beauty of Assyria. A literal return to Paradise is probably not envisioned (as the indicates comparison, not identity), cf. the use of this same comparison describing the land of Palestine before an invading army desolates it in Joel 2:3. The use in Ezekiel 28:13 is also suited to the overall restoration context, since it has cultic overtones (see above).


functions as the first sacral king in the first sanctuary-garden. Whether or not the simile can bear the cultic connection, the larger context certainly accords with such, and the use of the Jerusalem festival simile in verse 38 may argue that Ezekiel is thinking of the restoration along these lines.

Ezekiel logically follows this scene of restored order and the foreign (הָגוֹיִם הַשְּׁעַרְיָּה יִמֶּלֶךְ עַבְרֵי בְּנֵי חוֹדֶשׁ) reaction to it, by use of the recognition formula in verse 36. As a result of YHWH’s intervention, He has been vindicated before the nations (후﻿ל ﻿ִֹלְּוְיִם יִמֶּלֶךְ וֹתֵרָּה נְפָשִׁים וַיֵּרְדָּן וַיָּשִׁרוּ “then the nations ... will know that I YHWH rebuilt the ruined [places]”). YHWH’s own proclamation of sovereignty is delivered by a phrase that recalls His role as Israel’s Suzerain: (וַיְהִּוהָNu משָּׂרְדַּג וַיִּכְרָץ וַיִּשָּׂרֵץ “I, YHWH, have spoken, and I will accomplish [it]”), verse 36b. Now that YHWH’s honor has been vindicated among the nations He turns again to Israel to receive honor from Israel in respect to cultic activity in verses 37-38.

**Eschatological Restoration as Cultic Utopia**

The goal of eschatological restoration in the establishment of the house of Israel has been the universal recognition of YHWH’s sovereignty (cf. Habakkuk 2:14; Zechariah 14:9; Isaiah 11:9; Psalm 22: 27-28). Now that Israel’s covenantal communion with YHWH has been re-established, it resume its cultic identity as the flock of YHWH (Ezekiel 34:31). The restoration of cultic activities may be implied in the verb (בִּשְׁרֵם (“seek”), here used in the Niph’al as “inquire,” “petition,” indicating a restoration of prayer, and perhaps the entire cultus associated with

---


233The position of the first person pronoun (וַיִּשָּׂרֵץ) indicates that it is YHWH Himself Who will act and therefore emphasizes His sovereignty. The verb (בִּשְׁרֵם) has no object and looks at the activity of YHWH’s moving throughout time-space-history, and could be translated, "I will act, or take action." The affirmation then is that YHWH's spoken word will go forth with certainty to accomplish His purposes.
such activity. The subject of their request is ostensibly the increase their population.

A metaphor of multitude is used to express this increase of Israel in verse 38, however, it cannot simply be a numerical motive in view here, for the multiplication is "as a holy flock, the flock of Jerusalem". This description reveals that Israel is here destined to be restored as a ceremonial flock, or priestly Nation. To qualify this metaphor having a literal application, the phrase "flocks of men" is added in verse 38c. This genitive in apposition is apparently used to recall the statement of Ezekiel 34:31: "and you, My sheep, the sheep of My pasture, you are men". The phrase itself seems to...

---

234 The reflexive nuance of הלך ("I will be inquired of"), implies that YHWH will respond to their request, thus implying that a renewed cultus is in operation, with the Temple as the directional focal point of prayer (cf. 1 Kings 8:29). While this could simply mean that YHWH was hearing their single petition for numerical increase, the placement of this statement at the conclusion of this restoration section is not as a postscript, but as a climax - the Nation has been regathered, revived, and rebuilt, all so that they may serve YHWH as His "holy flock" (a simile obviously cultic in nature). It is difficult to believe that a priest like Ezekiel could have envisioned any other conclusion to restoration than in restored Temple worship (cf. Zechariah 6:12-13), especially in view of his concluding his book with this theme (40-48).

235 The metaphor of multitude is used to distinguish the flock as to its size. In II Chronicles 35:7 it is stated that at the feast of the Passover Josiah contributed a flock of 30,000 as an offering. The imagery then is of droves of flocks crowding the narrow streets of Jerusalem at her appointed seasons or feasts (הלך).

236 The entire phrase is: הנע באמצעות יזפיל, "as a holy flock, the flock of Jerusalem at her appointed season". The flock is specified as מנוח and here means "things consecrated at sacrificial places, or hallowed for sacrifice," cf. Bauer-Leander, Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen des Alten Testamentes, p. 582, para. 72; BDB, s.v. "םוע", p. 872. As a ceremonial flock, dedicated to the praise of YHWH, the house of Israel will become priests and servants (Isa. 61:6).

237 Cf. the usage in Genesis 16:12; Isaiah 9:5, and the support of the LXX which reads πρόσηκα αὐθραμον.
correspond both verbally and semantically to the promise given to Abraham concerning his posterity: ("I will multiply you exceedingly") in Genesis 17:2, thus providing another example of this eschatological restoration as a fulfillment of the original covenental promise.

In the final statement of verse 38, the restoration is seen as complete: Israel in her restored position and purpose filling all the places that formerly were desecrated: כל העירו הכפרים והערים המלאת יאש אבירה ("so shall the ruined cities be filled with flocks of men"). The repeated phrase יד לא יראמי ידיה ("then they will know that I am YHWH"), verse 38d, summarizes the restoration of the covenant purpose: Israel as a holy flock for the divine Shepherd, fulfilling its eschatological destiny in cultus.238 Thus, Wright concludes: "Israel's Divine Monarch envisages a cosmic government which fulfills man's ancient hope of what government should be."239

**Conclusion to Ezekiel's Use of the Desecration/Restoration Motif**

The desecration/restoration motif, as employed by Ezekiel, carries forward the essential components of the motif and develops them by theological integration into a unified eschatological context. Ezekiel followed the priestly distinction of מים and לוה, combining both as theological justification for the exile, which in creating a condition of desecration for the Land, Nation and reputation of YHWH among the nations, also demanded an eschatological restoration. Ezekiel, while not directly treating in chapter 36 the restoration of the Temple, did, nevertheless use cultic terminology which indirectly associated the restored Israel as a "holy flock" with the performance of the cultus, thus preparing the way for the extended eschatological presentation of the Temple in chapters 40-

238In this role Israel will serve as a teacher to the nations (cf. Isaiah 2:3; Zechariah 8:20-23), who now acknowledge YHWH's sovereignty (cf. Zechariah 14:16-19).

48. The use of Eden imagery may be connected to the cultic restoration of the Nation as implied by the garden-Sanctuary motif which it appears to recapitulate.

The Eschatological Temple as a Restoration Motif in Ezekiel 40-48

After the fall of Jerusalem, Ezekiel wrote of the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple with conviction equal to that with which he penned its destruction. While chapters 40-48 constitute a new vision of the prophecy, they are thematically linked with chapters 1-39, repeating earlier motifs in a more detailed fashion, e.g., the departure of the Shekinah in Ezekiel 8-11 with its return in 43:4-5. Tuell has summarized well the purpose of this vision:

Though city, king, Temple, and cult be destroyed, this vision is a promise of YHWH's continuing presence -- a concrete demonstration of YHWH's promise to be a sanctuary for the Judah's exiles (11:16). As the Jerusalem sanctuary had become, for Ezekiel, totally and irredeemably defiled, the perfect archetypal Temple of his vision is a place guarded from defilement, defended by massive fortified gates. Indeed, the gate by which the Divine enters the Temple is sealed for all time. The dwbh will never leave again; the Temple will never again be defiled.

Older commentators, working from a non-literal hermeneutic that mandated a past historical fulfillment, believed that this prophecy was simply the visionary experience of the post-exilic Remnant of their immediate future expressed in hyperbolic language. Hengstenberg, for example, could write:

"With the exception of the Messianic section in ch. 47:1-12, the fulfillment of all the rest of the prophecy belongs to the times

---


immediately after the return from the Chaldean exile. So must every one of its first hearers and readers have understood it."\textsuperscript{242}

Modern commentators, having had access to comparative Jewish apocalyptic literature, have understood the language here to move beyond the immediate experience of Return, and to encompass the ideal hope centered on the mA שלום דה
("the age to come").\textsuperscript{243} Even Hengstenburg must qualify his dogmatism by excepting Ezekiel 47:1-12 as "messianic," which accords with the mA שלום דמהשוית העולם דבר
("the messianic age"). Furthermore, this ideal view,\textsuperscript{244} which considers Ezekiel's Temple as only an apocalyptic dream, must confront the fact that Ezekiel records nine chapters of specific measurements. While one could contend that Ezekiel is simply expressing his ideal in language

---

\textsuperscript{242} E. W. Hengstenburg, \textit{The Prophecies of Ezekiel} (Minneapolis: James Reprints, 1869), p. 348.

\textsuperscript{243} Cf. N. T. Wright, \textit{The New Testament and the People of God} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 299, who notes: "In the later parts of the Hebrew Bible, and in post-biblical Jewish literature, we regularly find the same combination of themes [restoration to the Land and the rebuilding of the Temple], which summon up the key symbols of Israel’s entire worldview. To speak of Temple or Land is to evoke the image of exile and restoration, and so to cling to the hope of restoration. One of the central ways of expressing this hope was the division of time into two eras: the present age and the age to come." Cf. further, chapter 14, especially the summary page 298 in E. P. Sanders, \textit{Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE - 66 CE} (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, international, 1992).

familiar to his time, such a contention is invalidated by Ezekiel's measurements which contradicted the image of the Temple with which he and all the exiles were familiar. If his attempt was to only convey a spiritual truth through visionary symbols, why would he diverge from accepted cultic standards and established halakhah? Hullinger makes the additional point that Ezekiel "40-48 really gives no textual clues that it is to be interpreted symbolically as other visions in the book should be by virtue of their unrealistic characters (e.g. ch. 1)."

Perhaps the external occasion for the priestly plans of the Temple's restoration in Ezekiel 40-48 were conditioned by the immediate expectation of rebuilding at the Return. Grammie thinks along these lines, suggesting that the section was the result of the need to provide architectural and practical information for imperial assistance in the Persian administration's program for rebuilding the provinces. Whether or not this is so, chapters 40-48 are an expansion of Ezekiel 37:27-28, which following the restoration promise depicted in 36:18-38 and 37:1-24, sets forth the actualization of this hope in a revitalized central Sanctuary that will never be desecrated or destroyed (verse 26). Greenberg sees this promised inviolability of the future Temple as the apex of the fulfillment of the expected restoration. In his comments on Ezekiel 37: 26-28 he observes:

The fivefold repetition of "forever" stresses the irreversibility of the new dispensation. Unlike God's past experiment with Israel, the future restoration will have a guarantee of success; its capstone will be God's sanctifying presence dwelling forever in the


\[246\] Cf. John G. Grammie, Holiness in Israel, p. 53. He argues that the absence of the use of תָּלִם ("king") and instead the substitution of בֶּן ("prince"), the apparent absence of reference to the order of the high priest, and the historical record of Herodotus (The Histories 3.38, 89) of Darius' bureaucratic program of gathering together indigenous laws and customs. However, Jon Levenson, Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Jr., HSM 10 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976), pp. 44-107, argues that both the title and description of the prince's duties reveal a criticism of the conduct of previous Judean kings.
sanctuary amidst his people. The vision of the restored Temple (and God’s return to it) in chapters 40-48 follows as a proleptic corroboration of these promises.²⁴⁷

Some scholars noting the absence of the mention of a king or of the description of royal duties to be performed by the restored community’s leader, the ("prince"), have concluded that Ezekiel’s polity here is antimonarchical. However, as Deerman has pointed out, this passage expands the reference to the new Temple in Ezekiel 37:24-28, where clearly a Davidic ruler (called יְרוֹם) is present and therefore "there is no convincing reason to see the political structure of Ezek 40-48 as anti-Davidic simply because the terms melek and David are lacking."²⁴⁸ Tuell believes that this polity is the religious polity of the restoration community under Persian administration of Darius I,²⁴⁹ but even if such were the case, the realization of that polity, as Levenson has argued, is reserved for the eschatological kingdom of Israel.²⁵⁰

Other scholars observing that the legal code of the restoration program in these chapters is at variance with many aspects of the Sinaitic traditions, and even speaks of the giving of a new Torah (Ezekiel 43:12), have concluded that this represents a non-Mosaic departure.²⁵¹ Nevertheless, the Temple Vision of Ezekiel


²⁵¹Cf. Menahem Haran, “The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL-XL.VIII and its Relation to the Priestly School,” HUCA 50 (1979): 45-71, who notes some of these variances: no Ark or cherubim in the inner sanctum, neither table for the shewbread nor lampstand in the outer sanctum, no anointing oil within the Temple or its court, and no mention of the high-priesthood. It is his conclusion that “Ezekiel’s code, far from being a set of novellae supplementary to P, is a corpus independent of P and quite meagre in comparison thereto.” and that Ezekiel’s
40-48 is genuinely modeled on these traditions, being as Tuell has explained "just such a code: it is הָלָעֵד, the Law of the Temple ... parallel to the Mosaic הָלָעֵד." Such "departures" from the Book of the Covenant may be explained by the attempt to picture the heavenly archetype in concretized form, an attempt motivated by a desire to see a restoration to the divine ideal, rather than a restoration of limited scope and accomplishment, such as that executed by Zerubbabel with the Second Temple. In this regard, Ezekiel sees the holy mountain with its paradisal structure as the eschatological paradigm for the promised restoration of the cult and the cultic community (Ezekiel 43:1-12). Levenson has demonstrated that Ezekiel's intention here is "an attempt to realize the promise of Eden without canceling the divine singling-out of Zion and David" (cf. Ezekiel 40:2), and that "Zion has become the locus of revelation, for it, not Sinai, is now the place of theophany." The fact of theophany distinguishes this Jerusalem from any other Jerusalem in history, for the presence of the divine Glory (Ezekiel 43:7a), abides to the extent that the city cannot be understood without reference to YHWH, for the name of the city will be renamed יְהוָה יָשָׁבְיָהוּ ("YHWH is there"). This theophanic reality will also endue the city with perpetual holiness (Ezekiel 48:35). For this reason, Ezekiel 48 rearranges the tribal lands in such a way as to make the centrality of the Temple a literal, spatial, reality, rather than simply a theological notion.

As this account magnifies every aspect of the cultic dimensions, so too, does it intensify the separateness in the laws of cultic purity. For instance, what defiles the holy Name is the king's palace being too close to the Temple complex, and a recounting of the past history of the apostate kings and idolatrous deeds of Israel, especially those pagan cultic practices considered as "abominations" (cf.

code obviously contradicts P's presentation of cultic practices, e.g., the autumn pilgrim festivals, pp. 67-68.


Ezekiel 43:7-9). Likewise, the gradations of sacred space (or place) is stricter, since no uncircumcised foreigner is permitted to partake of Pesach, and no ordinary Israelite is allowed to enter the inner courtyard (cf. Ezekiel 44:17-19; 46:20). While there appears a discontinuity with the Holiness Code in the omission of some of the sancta and cultic personnel, such careful prescriptions for ceremonial purity provide the needed continuity.

Perhaps the primary distinguishing factor is that the Ezekielian program of restoration is wholly eschatological, i.e., it has never been realized in any form in past history. This appears obvious by the Edenic metaphors used to describe the fructated waters that flow from beneath the Sanctuary transforming the Dead Sea into a body of water teeming with aquatic life (Ezekiel 47:1-12). Whatever the substance of the Ezekielian vision, it is ultimately a reversal of the corruptible Sanctuary of the pre-exilic experience described in dreadful detail in Ezekiel 8-11. In this light, Ezekiel 40-48 serves as a model of the eschatological hope of restoration to the divine ideal - beyond the scope of human desecration and defilement - with a different order of priests (Zadokite), dedicated to holiness without syncretism, and with a new and superior sancta - the reality of YHWH’s Presence, rather than the representation of it.

THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF IN THE RESTORATION PROPHETS

The Persian period prophetic texts, referred to as the post-exilic prophets, or as here, the Restoration prophets, reveal a different posture with regard to

---

254These include for our study the compositions of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The first two works are notable for their date formulae, which introduce oracles with precise chronological notices that in many instances have been coordinated with the regnal year of the Persian ruler Darius I. This later evidence provides an external chronology with which to date the utterances, since Darius ascended the throne c. October 5, 522 B.C.E. and reigned until his death in November 486 B.C.E. For details of these chronological equivalencies cf. P. R. Ackroyd, “Two Old Testament Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period,” JNES 17 (1958): 13-27. We do not include other texts considered by some to fit into a Persian-period framework, e.g., Isaiah 40-55 (“Deutero-Isaiah”) and 56-66 (“Trito-Isaiah”), which appear to function better as a literary unit with Isaiah 1-39, despite the distinct thematic emphases. The problem of the reference in Isaiah
the Second Temple than that of the prophets who lived in light of the fulfillment of the covenant curses brought against Israel as a disloyal vassal by YHWH its suzerain. The post-exilic community was marked by a renewal of interest in the Temple, and the recovery of much of its significance from earlier days, however, there remained concern over violations of the cult (which would be expected from those who suffered their ancestor's punishment of exile for such practices), a concern that was especially pronounced in Ezra-Nehemiah.255

What is different for the concept of the Temple in the message of the Restoration prophets grows out of the specific socio-religious concerns of the time, issues different from the monarchical concerns of the Iron Age Judaean community. Petersen sees the issues that affected the Persian prophets as two-fold:

(1) Since Israel was no longer an independent monarchy, and the Second Temple had been built by primarily by the decree and financial assistance of the dominant Persian government (Ezra 6:4, 8), it was no longer viewed as the chapel of the Nation-state, thus, a new problem over hierarchical status developed. Unlike the First Temple period, not all of the inhabitants of the

48:6-7, a key issue in the debate, that "new things" must refer to recent realities, rather than to a prolepticism two centuries prior, and that if so, sixth-century readers could not be told they had "never heard of them," cf. Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 3, is possibly answered by recognizing the *rhetorical posture* of the eight-century prophet as addressing an exilic community of the sixth-century, who he assumes did not have access to his message for 150 years. If this is accepted, the message of the section becomes all the more forceful. The Book of Joel, sometimes dated to the Persian period is better dated to the pre-exilic period c. 835 B.C.E. during the reign of the Judean king Joash. Joel's references to the presence of YHWH in the Temple (Joel 2:27; 4:17 [English 3:17]) places the work before the destruction of the First Temple, since the *Shekinah* appears to have been absent from the post-exilic Temple (Haggai 2:7) and cf. later testimony of the Talmud and midrashim.

255 One reason for this heightened sensitivity with regard to proper cultic procedure in Nehemiah may be because" he, more than any other person, was responsible for the organization of the Temple cult" (cf. Nehemiah 13:30-31), Bezael Porten, "Temple: The Temple of Zerubbabel," *EJ* (1972) 15:958.
post-exilic community were equally enfranchised in the group that supported and benefited from the Temple.

(2) Since the restoration had not resulted in a revived Jewish state controlled by a re-established Davidic dynasty, the predictions concerning these events were projected into an eschatological future fulfillment.\(^{256}\)

With regards to the Temple in this latter distinction, the pre-exilic and exilic presentations of the desecration/restoration motif, while actively anticipating the historical fulfillment of their restoration visions, nevertheless did not find their ideals realized with the return to Judah and the rebuilding of the Temple. The accounts of the restoration in Ezra-Nehemiah leave the impression that the restored Temple and its cult was viewed as something less than a complete restoration. For instance, we read in Ezra 3:12-13 that the older people in the community, who had seen the glory of the Solomonic Temple, are recorded to have lamented over the comparatively smaller foundations of Zerubbabel’s Temple.

To the rabbis, neither the absence of a monarchy, nor the reduced physical splendor of the Second Temple were considered as things which distinguished it from the First Temple. In various lists they compiled in their comparison, the most outstanding difference was the absence of the שֵׁהָכִי or בְּרֵי הָדָר.\(^{257}\) If this was so, the loss of the Divine Presence manifested in the Temple, would have served to further the anticipation of a greater restoration to come, one in which

---


\(^{257}\) Cf. *Yoma* 21b which cites five things which were in the First Temple, but not in the Second, viz. (1) the Ark, the Kipporei, and the Cherubim, (2) the holy fire, (3) the Shekinah, (4) the spirit (of prophecy), (5) the Urim and Thummim, and also *Yoma* 52b which has a slightly different list, viz. (1) the Ark, (2) the manna, (3) the [purification]water, (4) Aaron’s rod, (5) the chest of the Philistines; cf. also Midrash Numbers Rabba 15:10 which list five things stored away from the First Temple, viz. the Ark, the Menorah, the holy fire, the spirit (of prophecy), and the cherubim.
YHWH Himself would fulfill His original design in the construction of the Temple, i.e., "to dwell", or "set My sanctuary in their midst forever" (cf. Exodus 25:8; Ezekiel 37:26).

If, then, the impression in the return was that the Temple's restoration was but a shadow of what had been lost, the Restoration prophets proclaim that it is but a foretaste of what shall yet be gained. Walter Kaiser describes this as the motivating factor in their appeals to the post-exilic community:

What seemed to be small and insignificant to them in a day like 520 B.C. was directly connected in glory and durability with God's final wrap-up of history. Was the rebuilt temple small and insignificant in their eyes? Yet it was that very temple whose glory would be even greater than the Solomonic temple. No work done at the urging of God's prophets could be regarded solely on empirical grounds. There was the larger connection of the part to the whole of God's total finale in history.258

Their message seems to be that the post-exilic stage is but the rehearsal of an anticipated eschatological drama to be acted out in complete fulfillment of the original creation/restoration ideal. Confirmation of this is given by the prophet Haggai, in this same context of Temple dedication and motivated by this very act of comparative lament (Haggai 2:6-9). Other examples in these prophets of an historical track running parallel to an eschatological track may be seen in the classic "Day of the Lord" passages which contain references to events which are historico-eschatological and appear to have a temporal interruption, or postponement, in ultimate fulfillment. The initial use of this form of prophetic postponement was with the prophet Isaiah, whose book is usually divided along historical (chapters 1-39)/eschatological (chapters 40-66) lines. The following "Day of the Lord" passages may evidence such a postponement with a near/historical partial fulfillment and a final/eschatological fulfillment.259 The


chart below groups these passages, together with those from Isaiah, adding for comparison New Testament texts which either cite or allude to these passages and apply them eschatologically:

Figure 8: Prophetic Postponement in "Day of the Lord" Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near Historical Fulfillment</th>
<th>Far Eschatological Fulfillment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 2:5-9</td>
<td>Isaiah 2:10-22 (cf. Rev. 6:16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 10:20-23</td>
<td>Isaiah 11:11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah 1-14</td>
<td>Obadiah 15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephaniah 1:7-16</td>
<td>Zephaniah 1:17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah 1:4-13</td>
<td>Zechariah 1:14-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi 3:8</td>
<td>Malachi 3:9-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our purpose in this section is to survey the major uses of our motif in the Restoration prophets, which will serve as a transition to the non-canonical Jewish apocalyptic and the Dead Sea literature, as well as to the New Testament. We will begin our study with a discussion of the use of eschatological correspondence by the Restoration prophets and then proceed to a brief overview of their eschatological contributions.

The Restoration Use of Eschatological Correspondence

The preceding discussion has entertained the idea that despite the return to Judea and the continuation of the cult, the historical situation proposed that the present form of the restoration was but the initial stage of a final consummation of the divine ideal. If this is so, then historical events, and the figures connected with them, may have suggested to the Restoration prophets future realities and personages they envisioned as essential to the eschatological fulfillment of restoration.

This may well be what is meant in the explanation to the High Priest Joshua that he and his friends were to be נเสมอ (Zechariah 3:8). This word is used of miraculous signs given by God (I Kings 13:3, 5; II Chronicles 32:24; Ezekiel 12:6, 11; 24:24, 27, et. al.) and as a synonym for נפלא (“wonder”) or in parallelism with רוש (“sign”), (cf. Isaiah 8:18; 20:3). From this survey of usage it would appear that the term signified something that “astonished”, or better, that conveyed “a deeper, hidden, reality.” For this reason the word has been variously translated as “sign,” or “symbol.” In a similar way, in Haggai 2:23, the priest Zerubbabel is called a יָדוֹ (“seal”). The literal function of the term as “that which authenticates legal business and has a binding effect” stands behind the metaphorical use in this context. According to Wolff:

to seal something also includes an element of completion. Zerubbabel as Yahweh’s seal, would then be the guarantor of the temple’s completion ... In addition, Yahweh’s seal would


261The function of the יָדוֹ in the ancient Near East was as a device to authenticate legal enactments, identify property, and authorize a proxy (cf. Jeremiah 32:10-44; I Kings 21:8). It is used literally of a ring used for signification or documentation (Jeremiah 22:24; Genesis 41:42; Esther 3:10), and in the metaphorical sense of an identification of ownership in Song of Songs 8:6 or of high and unique identification (cf. Ezekiel 28:12).
guarantee the fulfillment of the promises associated with the building of the temple (cf. 1:8b; 2:9b, 19b).\textsuperscript{262}

Since the context in which Zerubbabel will function as a מנהון is eschatological (note the opening eschatological marker in verse 23a: זוהי, "on that day"), the promise which Zerubbabel signifies is also eschatological, i.e., he serves as the rector designatus of YHWH's future theocracy in the continuation of the Davidic dynasty.\textsuperscript{263} The thought connected with these descriptions of figures as "token" or "symbolic" of other realities is again a use of analogous correspondence, or typology.

We have already seen this type of structural analogy in the use of the תבנית as a heavenly pattern to which the earthly Tabernacle (Exodus 25:9, 40) and Temple (I Chronicles 28:19) were to correspond. This use of correspondence was also a part of the desecration motif as the prophet's used the covenant curses

\textsuperscript{262}Hans Walter Wolff, *Haggai: A Commentary*. Translated by Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988), pp. 106, 108. Wolff suggests that Haggai's use of the rare metaphor would have possibly been drawn from its similar use with his grandfather Jehoiachin (Jeremiah 22:24). Even though this connection might imply a promise of Zerubbabel as a continuation of the Davidic dynasty, Wolff rejects this hypothesis because the context does not seem to suggest a reminiscence of the Nathan prophecy," (p. 106), however, see comments below.

(Leviticus 26:14-39; Deuteronomy 28:29) as a paradigm for the experience of exile, and in the prophet’s use of the restoration motif where the return to the Land from bondage was depicted as an eschatological exodus (e.g., Exodus 19:4-6 with Haggai 2:5), and the covenant blessings (Leviticus 26:40-45; Deuteronomy 30:1-10) used to describe both the rescue from foreign lands and the expected eschatological revitalization of the Land.

To these examples we may also add the anticipated revival of the Israelite kingdom with reference to an eschatological David (David redivivus), (Jeremiah 30:9; Ezekiel 37:24-25). This same analogous correspondence will be seen in Zechariah 3:8; 6:12 for the man whose name is בָּנֹד ("Branch"), who will not only build the Temple, but also rule as a priest on the Davidic throne.

The typological interpretation of these texts was made necessary by the disconfirmation, or delay of the anticipated fulfillment. Zerubbabel did not usher in a new independent Davidic dynasty (Haggai 2:22-23), nor did the nations come with their wealth to the Temple (Haggai 2:7-8; Zechariah 8:22), nor did the rebuilt Temple see the return of the Shekinah that had been expected at its dedication (Haggai 1:8; Zechariah 1:16; 2:5, 10-13). With respect to this latter, all-


265The restoration as the reversal of exile brought a corresponding shift in the application from the curses’ section of Deuteronomy to the blessing’s section, cf. Jeremiah 32:37 Isaiah 51:3; Ezekiel 36:29-36; Amos 9:13; Joel 3:18.

important event, which would have guaranteed the Restoration community the consummation they awaited, Clements writes:

The temple was rebuilt and much of the programme outlined in the Priestly Writing was implemented, yet its crowning promise, that the presence of God would be in Israel’s midst remained in the realm of eschatological hope. It was not fulfilled in the present but would be so in the future.  

However, the Restoration prophets, though inspired by the quest for the legitimate king of the future, and perhaps expecting the imminent fulfillment of the hope they prophesied, nevertheless recognized that it would not be realized through a human-divine synergism, but by a divine intervention alone: אֱלֹהִי יְהוָה שָׁלוֹם לָךְ בְּחֵלֶל וְלָא בְּכָלָה כִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְקִנַּּן אֶתְמוּר אָלְיוּ אֲלֵי כְּבוֹדָהוֹ (“This is the word of YHWH to Zerubbabel: ‘Not by power, nor by might, but by My Spirit,’ says Almighty YHWH [literally, “YHWH of hosts”]”), Zechariah 4:6, and as a result, postponed their expectations to the eschatological future, i.e., לִבְנַי יְהוָה וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל (“Our procedure will now be to examine the primary texts in the Restoration prophets that possibly point to an eschatological Temple within an eschatological restoration motif.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Haggai

The central focus of Haggai is the Temple. The first major aspect of this focus is the spiritual complacency of the Restoration community in the rebuilding of the Temple itself (Haggai 1:2). According to Verhoeef, the real danger inherent in this cultic lethargy was that the people, having become accustomed to life


without a Temple, could have “spiritualized” their religion.²⁶⁹ He clearly sets the
call to rebuild the Temple within the covenant framework, including its proviso
for blessings (Haggai 1:5, 7-8; 2:19c) and curses (Haggai 1:6, 9-11; 2:15-19b). In
this instance, we find a use of the desecration motif (verses 9-11) within a
restoration context to emphasize the reversal (here only implied in 2:19c; but, cf.
Malachi 2:10-11) that will be the result of the people’s compliance with YHWH’s
Will.

The Desecration Motif in Haggai

The desecration motif is introduced by an analysis of the present post-
exilic situation of deprivation. The people had not built YHWH’s house because
they had been self-consumed and believed that there was not sufficient resources
to begin the task (Haggai 1:6). This occupation with the common in preference to
the holy (cultic) is emphasized in a word play with “their house” versus
“YHWH’s house” in verse 9: יַעֲנוּ בֵּיתֶיהָ מִלָּהָיָהוּ בֵּית יְהֹוָה לְיַעֲנוּ בֵּית לָהֶם (“because of My house, it being desolate, while you are running each on behalf of
his own house”). YHWH demands a reversal of priorities, explaining that the
agricultural catastrophe they are experiencing is actually a result of desecration
(Haggai 1:9-10). Again, the retributive judgment is reinforced paronomastically;
they are told that they experience יָרֵעָה (“drought”), verse 11, because they have
left YHWH’s house יָרָעָה (“a ruin”), verse 9.

The climax of the desecration is a priestly analysis of desecration and
defilement, with the verdict that the Restoration community is in a state of ritual
defilement that contaminates everything that is contacted (Haggai 2:12-14). This
defilement is יַעֲנוּ מָאָס (“defilement of a person”), an abbreviation for מַעַט מָאָס (“defilement of a person of a dead body”), or corpse defilement (cf. Leviticus
21:11; 22:4; Numbers 5:2; 9:6-7, 10), which is the highest degree of impurity.
Without a Temple and a functioning cultus, this condition will remain and further

²⁶⁹Pieter A. Verhoef, The Books of Haggai and Malachi. NICOT (Grand Rapids:
restoration will be impossible. Rather, in view of the covenant with YHWH, defilement has brought divine reprisal in the form of covenantal curses.

The covenantal curse is described as the withholding of moisture for the earth (verse 10), as well as a direct frustration of their harvest (verse 9), and perhaps a plague (verse 11), but the blessing will flow from the foundation of the newly consecrated Temple (Haggai 2:18-19) as the fructated waters will flow from beneath the eschatological Temple (Ezekiel 47:1-12). The reversal of fortunes will come in the eschatological age, and several aspects of the restoration motif are used to convey the future consummation (eschaton).

**The Restoration Motif in Haggai**

The call to action to rebuild the Temple by Haggai employs the language of David in his original justification for Temple building (II Samuel 7:2): מֶרֶךְ בֶּן נְקָב הַשָּׁמַר לְךָ לְבָנָי אֶת הַבְּשָׂרָּה בֶּן יִשָּׁרֵי יְהוָה ("Is it time for you yourselves to dwell in your paneled houses while this house [lies] desolate?"). Haggai 1:4. By use of the expression בְּנוֹת פָּרָשָׂת ("this house"), Haggai has revived the concept of YHWH's Self-disclosure through the cultus, for a "house" is necessary for the performance of ritual holiness through which YHWH will be able to bring His transcendent נְקָב ("glory, "Haggai 1:8) to rest once again on His "dwelling place."

As a result of the people's obedient response to the divine mandate to "build a house for YHWH's Name," described here as מָלִיךְ יְהוָה ("they feared before YHWH"), the proper expression in covenant terms (Genesis 22:12; Exodus 18:21; 20:20; Deuteronomy 6:2, et. al.), Haggai describes the divine promise to complete the restoration begun with the return to the Land. The nature of the prophetic oracle is to view simultaneously events both near (historical) and far (eschatological), resulting in enactment of the promise necessarily being perceived to come in two stages.\(^{270}\)

\(^{270}\text{Cf. Verhoef, op. cit., pp. 36-37, 150, who also sees the idea of fulfillment in stages, but adopts a strictly christological interpretation in which the stages are: (1) Zerubbabel, (2) Jesus, (3) the Christian Church.}\)
**Stage One:** The immediate rebuilding of the Second Temple under Zerubbabel (including its subsequent enlargement under Herod), Haggai 2:18-19. The subsequent failure of this Temple to literally fulfill the prophetic predictions associated with it (i.e., the ultimate restoration of theocracy and accompanying paradisal splendor) required a later fulfillment at the end of history.

**Stage Two:** The future rebuilding of the Third Temple (the Eschatological Temple of Ezekiel 40-48), Haggai 2:21-23. This eschatological promise is expressed in terms of the restoration motif, and reveal the following elements common to it:

1. *Eschatological “glory” will accompany the future rebuilding of the Temple.* This  עלodo ("glory") comes in two forms: one physical and the other spiritual. The spiritual “glory” is first expressed in Haggai 1:8 with the words: 271 הנביה יאשאכד יאכדר ("rebuild the house [Temple!]") Then I will [again] take pleasure in it and will reveal My glory”) refer to an active demonstration, or manifestation, of the Divine Presence.272 This spiritual “glory” may also be in view in Haggai 2:5

---

271 The possibility according to the MT is either a reading of אכדר נכה ("and I will honor Myself," or "and I will be honored"), a *Niphal* imperfect indicative, or אכדר קד ("that I may honor Myself," or "that I may be honored"), a *Niphal* cohortative. Another alternative is that the original had a paragogic מ which was dropped by the Massoretes because this מ represented the fifth thing missing from the Second Temple, i.e., the *Shekinah* (see complete listing in above note).

272 The *Niphal* may be rendered either with a passive or a reflexive meaning. The passive nuance is widely preferred by translators to give the thought that YHWH will be honored as He should be by the rebuilding of the Temple, as with the command in verse 8a. However, the honor of YHWH has already been conveyed with this use in parallelism with עכדר אכדר ("I will be pleased"), verse 8b. Others suggest adding a subjective element to the passive sense: "YHWH will consider Himself honored" (when they have rebuilt). Yet again, the honoring of YHWH will be an afterthought. Rather, with the previous verb עכדר אכדר we have the active sense "I will take pleasure," indicating the acceptance of the action of rebuilding, and with עכדר אכדר a continued active sense "I will reveal My glory."
which reads: "according to the promise I made with you when you came out of Egypt: My Spirit will always remain among you. Do not fear!"

Despite the structural problems connected with verse 5a, the intent of the verse is to recall the promise made in Exodus 29:45-46: "And I will dwell among the sons of Israel and will be their God. And they shall know that I am YHWH their God Who brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I might dwell among them; I am YHWH their God.") While the association of רוח with רוח הרוח might suggest the idea of YHWH’s abiding presence through the prophetic word, this appears to be a later tradition (cf. New Testament’s, λόγος καὶ πνεῦμα, "word and Spirit"). It seems preferable to interpret רוח with the lead of the supposedly incorporated scribal marginal reference to the Exodus context, and see here an allusion to the “glory cloud” (טואם), which would accord well with the verb describing its activity.

---

273 Consensus of scholarly opinion is that verse 5a is to be considered as a gloss, since it is absent from the LXX, Vetus Latina, and Peshitta, and it breaks the connection between the two clauses in verses 4 and 5, viz., אֲנִי אֲלֵךְ אַחֲרֵי מָצָא (`I am with you’), verse 4, and רוח הנוֹרִיתָה בּוֹלַךְ (`My Spirit will always remain among you’), verse 5, which apparently were meant to be parallel as in Exodus 29:44-45.

274 The use of the participle רוחוֹ with רוח is unusual, but makes better sense with the idea of the “glory cloud” than with a sense of “the guiding, sustaining presence of God” among the leadership and people (cf. Isaiah 63:11-14). Also, if an interpretation of renewal, such as in Ezekiel 36:27, were in view, בּוֹלָכָם ("within you’), rather than בּוֹלַךְ would have been expected. The participle further denotes continuous action and may include both past and present within its meaning, which also would have suggested the scribal connection with the exodus experience of the Shekinah abiding with the Israelites throughout their wilderness journey (with which the remnant might compare their return as a new exodus).
The physical “glory” that was expected to accompany the rebuilt Temple was described in Haggai 2:7b-8: יִזְכָּה כְּלֵבָד חֲגָלָם וְעָלָמְתֵּן אָדָם (‘...and the wealth of all the nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory declares Almighty YHWH. The silver is Mine, and the gold is Mine, declares Almighty YHWH’). In context with verses 6-7a, 22, the reference here is to the spoils of war\(^{275}\) which YHWH as the suzerain has full right to receive. The wealth of the conquered nations will accrue to the Temple in such a way so as to fill it with abundance (a fitting contrast to the post-exilic poverty), increasing its splendor and value (cf. Zechariah 14:14). We have then a restoration of the Temple in eschatological terms that brings continuity with both the past (exodus) and present (return from exile) experiences of the Restoration community, and projects the expectation future in apocalyptic tones.

(2) YHWH as a divine Warrior will defeat the Gentile nations of the world. Haggai’s description of the apocalyptic intervention of YHWH is given in Haggai 2:6-7a, 21b-22:

וכָּל הַאֲפַר יִזְכָּה צִבְאָה עוֹד אֲלֹהִים וְיֵשָׁו יְרוּשָׁלַיִם אֱמָר בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם

(‘For thus says Almighty YHWH: ‘In just a little while longer [literally: “again, for once [it is] in a short while”] I will shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land. I will shake all nations ... I am going to

\(^{275}\)This is clearly indicated by the description of YHWH as יְהוָה הַקָּפֹר (‘YHWH of armies’), and to the “glory” as קְפֹר (‘the silver’) and נְכָר (‘the gold’). The use of “silver and gold” may be literal, or be used representatively of the quintessence of all material values (cf. Hosea 2:8; Ezekiel 7:19; Proverbs 22:1; Ecclesiastes 2:8).
shake the heavens and the earth, and I will overthrow the thrones of kingdoms and shatter the might of the kingdoms of the nations. I will overthrow chariots and their drivers; horses and their riders shall fall, each by the sword of his fellow.”).

In these verses there is the display of YHWH’s sovereignty which is a common trait of the restoration motif. This is conveyed by the emphatic use of יָשָׂר and by the appellative הַקָּדוֹשׁ, הַנְּעָרָה, along with the repetition of the Self-declaration formula לָעַל הָאֹתְרֵךְ הַצְּרָה (cf. Self-attestation formula הַדָּוָד הָנֶסֶנָא in verse 23), which call attention to YHWH’s Self-demonstration of sovereignty. This was also seen in verse 8 by the repetition of YHWH’s ownership of the nation’s wealth (לְךָ...לְךָ). The terrestrial display of YHWH’s sovereignty is described first in verses 6-7a, 21b as a universal “shaking” (םְעַמָּר) by the merisms רָעָםָם ("the heavens and the earth") and יָהֳנָה ("the sea and the dry land").

The apocalyptic nature of these verses is controlled by the recognition that the participle סַלִּים (the Hiphil of סָלַם) functions as a futurum instans after a specification of time, and therefore belongs to the terminology of epiphany during holy war in which YHWH will violently intervene on behalf of Israel with natural and miraculous disasters (cf. Exodus 15:16; Judges 5:4; Psalm 18:8 [English, verse 7]; 68:8-9 [English, verses 7-8]; 2 Samuel 22:8; Isaiah 13:13; 24:18; Ezekiel 38:20; Habakkuk 3:6). A structural analysis of the military elements in

---

276 The LXX (Codex Alexandrinus) particularly sought to emphasize YHWH’s sovereignty by their embellishment of verse 22 with the words: καὶ καταστρέψω πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ καταβαλὼ τὰ ὁρια αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνάσχυσω τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μου (“and I will overturn their entire might and I will pull down their boundaries and strengthen My chosen one”).

277 Thus, the nuance is of a time in the immediate future, cf. P. Joüon, Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique. Reprint. (Rome: Pontific Biblical Institute, 1965), par. 121.

278 Cf. Verhoeof, op. cit., pp. 139-140.
verses 21-22 reveals the extent of this holy war, i.e., a total defeat of all forces opposed to YHWH and His people.

This is a divine judgment as seen not only by the universality and nature of the description, but also by the closing words of verse 22: נַעֲשֶׂה עַל בְּגֵדֵר בֹּאֶר בָּעָל ("And I will overthrow...each by the sword of his fellow"), that recall the divinely inspired panics of the early Israelite period (Judges 7:22; cf. Ezekiel 38:21; Zechariah 14:13). The purpose of the “shaking” will be to upset the nations and harness them for the purpose of rebuilding the Temple (through their material provision, Haggai 2:7).

(3) Universal peace will emanate from the site of the Temple. The consequent of Israelite supremacy over the nations is cultic domination of the world, and this will result in universal peace (שלום) from YHWH at the site of the Temple (Haggai 2:9b; cf. Zechariah 14:8; Ezekiel 47:1-12). In accord with the establishment of peace under the aegis of YHWH, there here may be implied in the bringing of these material provisions a sense of offering as in Isaiah and Ezekiel, where the purpose for the routing of the nations is to cause them to acknowledge YHWH’s sovereignty, and to bring them to worship Him at the Temple Mount (cf. Isaiah 2:2-4; 56:7; Ezekiel 36:36; 37:28), however, if so it is an involuntary offering that is in view.

Therefore, in Haggai, the prospect of divine intervention was entertained at the re-foundation ceremony, but whether the prophecy was meant for that occasion or for a time future, subsequent events would reveal. The desecration motif, described as a willful neglect of the cultus, would be reversed with the promise of restoration, which though it was to come in stages, served to motivate initial restoration in rebuilding and the revival of the cultus, until the eschaton when universal restoration would be enacted.
The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Zechariah

The eschatological oracles of Zechariah, as ἱερὸς Λόγος of the Second Temple complement and extend those of Haggai. The focus is not as Haggai on the rebuilding of the Temple, but moves from the presumption of a rebuilt Temple (Zechariah 3:7) to deal with theological and eschatological issues that affect the Temple.

The Temple in Zechariah

The Temple is prominently featured, especially in chapters 1-8, and described variously as הֵיכָל יְהוָה (“the Temple of YHWH”), Zechariah 6:12-15, or דֹּדֵךְ (“the Temple”), Zechariah 8:9, חֵיתו (“My house”), Zechariah 1:16; 3:7; 9:8; cf. 4:9 (בְּבֵיתָ-יְהוָה יְהוֹדָה, “this house”), בֵּית-יְהוָה דָּבָר (“house of Almighty YHWH”), Zechariah 7:3; 8:9; 11:13; 14:21; cf. 14:20, “YHWH’s house”). In addition, by metonymy, the Temple - indicated in most cases by the phrase בְּבֵית-יְהוָה דָּבָר (“and I will dwell in her midst”) - as זִיוֹן (“Zion”), Zechariah 1:14; 2:14 [English, 2:10]; 8:2-3; and ירושלים (“Jerusalem”), Zechariah 1:16; 8:3, 8; 14:11, 16, 21. There is also a reference to the heavenly Temple, called here מֵתוֹן פָּרָשָׁה (“My holy habitation”), Zechariah 2:17 [English, 2:13].

The central importance of the Temple in Zechariah’s thought is seen in Zechariah 1:12 where reference is made to the seventy-year exile (586-516 B.C.E.), which from the vantage point of the writer, had not yet practically ended. The point made in chapter two concerning the significance of the Temple as an indication of the end of exile is given support here with the recognition that the


280While in Psalm 26:8; 76:2 the phrase מֵתוֹן פָּרָשָׁה may refer to the earthly Temple, here the contrast is made between YHWH’s permanent dwelling (in the heavenly Sanctuary) and the earthly Sanctuary to which He is about to come.
return from Babylonian captivity itself was not considered as a fulfillment of Jeremiah’s prophecy (Jeremiah 29:10). The true terminus of the exile appeared to be the rebuilding of the Temple.

Our approach to the material in Zechariah will be to categorize the various references of the desecration and restoration employed with reference to the Temple throughout the entire composition281 in an attempt to display the common elements of our motif.

The Desecration Motif in Zechariah

The desecration motif in Zechariah is presented in both historical (Zechariah 1:6) and apocalyptic (Zechariah 12:1-3) fashion. The historical presentation is patterned after the pre-exilic expressions of desecration of the

\[\text{281For the purposes of this literary analysis we will assume the unity of the composition, cf. C. L. Meyers & E. M. Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1-8. AB (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1987), pp. lx.- lxi.},\]

\[\text{who observes that the similarities between the first two chapters of the composite work and the two concluding chapters form an inclusio that gives balance to the larger composition. The present higher critical school has assigned chapters 9-14 to a “Deutero-Zechariah” in the Greek period, based on style, vocabulary, and the supposition that Alexander the Great is in the background of Zechariah 9:1-8 and that conditions expressed reflect Ptolemaic rule in third-century B.C.E. Palestine, especially the references to Egypt in Zechariah 9:11; 10:10-11; 14:18, 19, cf. M. Delcor, “Les Allusions à Alexandre le Grand dans Zacharie 9:1-8,” VT 1 (1955): 110-124. Other scholars, while not attributing the work to the biblical Zechariah, have argued for a fifth-century date for all or part of 9-14 (usually 9-11), cf. D. R. Jones, “A Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah IX-XI,” VT 12 (1962): 241ff, Paul Lamarche, Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianisme. Études Bibliques (Paris: Librairie LeCoffre, 1961), p. 121. Despite the arguments against unity, the fact remains that a great number of similarities between Zechariah 1-8 and 9-14 exist in the area of style (metaphorical and idiosyncratic repetitions, use of the vocative) and structural thought (five-fold development, various restoration elements, messianisms), and all fourteen chapters have been handed down to us as one book in every manuscript discovered thus far including the fragment in Greek found at Qumran which has the end of chapter 8 and the beginning of chapter 9 without any indication of spacing to suggest a division between the two parts. For a survey of critical views with an argument for unity cf. Joyce Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary. TOTC (London: The Tyndale House, 1972), pp. 60-74, 81-84.}\]
Land by Israel and by the nations. The historical presentation is seen in Zechariah 7:8-14 in which desecration comes through social sins (verses 9-10) and unrepentant hearts, described by a series of hardening motifs: לָקַּחְתָּהּ לְחַפִּירָה יָנַּמְנָה לְחַפִּירָה ("they refused to pay attention, and turned a stubborn shoulder, and stopped their ears from hearing, and made their hearts like flint..."). The resultant description of exilic judgment follows the usual desecration motif: אֲשָׂרֵתָהּ עַל כָּל הָעָם ("but I scattered them among all the nations"), and יָנַּמְנָה לְשָׁמֵהַ הַגָּאִירֵנוּ ("and the Land is desolated behind them ...they made the pleasant Land desolate"), This historical review would have been elicited by the present unrestored conditions of the Land experienced by the Restoration community as described in Haggai 1:6, 9-11, which had brought a similar review (Haggai 2:17).

Another feature of the desecration motif is its inclusion of the mediation of YHWH’s wrath as executed by the nations, and the resultant desecration and defilement that resulted from profane contact with the Temple and the sancta. Here the desecration is that the nations (four horns: probably, Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Perisa, and Egypt) had gone beyond YHWH’s intention (to temporarily exile Israel) and had sought to permanently annihilate her (Zechariah 1:15). The expression מָשָׂא רֹעֵי לְדָשָׁה ("they helped the evil") refers to Israel’s oppressor’s arrogance to usurp their limited role as appointed instruments of YHWH’s wrath, and autonomously determine the degree and duration of Israel’s punishment. This willful self-assertion in defiance of YHWH’s purpose to follow desecration with restoration, itself brought further desecration which would demand the punishment of the offending nations (Zechariah 2:1-3, 12-13 [English 1:18-19; 2:8-9]), cf. Zephaniah 2:1-15; 3:1-8.

Yet another means of conveying the historical desecration of the Temple is through the description of the violated covenant, since by this contract YHWH was obligated to protect His vassal and sacred possessions. In Zechariah 11:10, 14, the rejection by Israel of the shepherd sent by YHWH results in YHWH breaking נָכְפֹּת אֵלָהָיִם ("and I will break My covenant") two covenantal staffs (cf. verse 7) called דַּבֶּרֶת ("Favor"), verse 11, and דַּבֶּרֶת ("Bands"), verse 14,
which respectively symbolized the end of benevolent rule and the consequent removal of protection from the Jews in the Diaspora (cf. I Kings 22:28; Joel 2:6), and the dissolution of the union (אֲדַנְקֵן, "brotherhood") between the north and the south.282

Desecration as the result of cultic impurity is presented in relation to the High Priest (Zechariah 3:3-4), whose spiritual condition is described in appearance as בֵּית בָּרִיי אָלְמָה ("clothed with filthy garments"). Since the High Priest represents the Nation, there may be here a representation of the impurity of the people in their role as a priestly Nation. Cultic desecration of the Land: קֶסֶע הָאָדָם ("the iniquity of that Land") is also described in the restoration context of Zechariah 3:9 with respect to its removal. Cultic and divine Name desecration is presented as a covenantal curse (הַלָּאָם)283 going forth over the face of the whole Land because of social injustice and false oaths by the divine Name

---


283 הַלָּאָם appears in connection with the covenant in Genesis 24:41; 26:28; Deuteronomy 29:12; Ezekiel 16:59, etc.
(Zechariah 3:3-4), of personified “wickedness” (חקם), both ethical and cultic\(^{284}\) (Zechariah 5:8), and of idolatry, including “teraphim,” “diviners,” “false dreams” (Zechariah 10:2-3) and numerous “idols,” “false prophets,” and “the unclean spirit (נפש רעה) in the Land” (Zechariah 13:1-6). It is because the holy city is so polluted from defilement by multiplied idols that it will require a “national cleansing” from cultic impurity (Zechariah 13:1).

Eschatological desecration of Jerusalem and Judah is indicated in Zechariah 12-14 through the use of the “Day of the Lord” motif (יום דנוב).\(^{285}\)

\(^{284}\) The term חקר is used as the antithesis of זרים (“righteousness”) in a comprehensive sense, cf. Proverbs 11:5; 13:6; Ezekiel 18:20; 33:12. The word here is feminine because this “wickedness” is being personified as a wanton woman.

\(^{285}\) The Day of the Lord motif is an essential motif in eschatology, being designated by the phrases ימים יזריים (LXX ἡμέρα κυρίου) in a comprehensive usage. It has been argued to occur between 16-20 times in Tanach (depending on whether one lists references that do not use the precise terminology of the motif): Isaiah 2:12; 13:6, 9; Ezekiel 13:5; 30:3; Joel 1:15; 2:1, 11, 3:4 [English, 2:31]; 4:14 [English, 3:14]; Amos 5:18 [lss], 20; Obadiah verse 15; Zephaniah 1:7, 14 [lss]; Malachi 3:23 [English, 4:5]; Zechariah 14:1. Also in the range of usage are variant forms of the motif expressed as: ימים יזריים יבש (“the day of YHWH’s anger”), Ezekiel 7:19; Zephaniah 1:18, ימים יזריים יבש (“the day of YHWH’s wrath”), Zephaniah 2:2, 3; Lamentations 2:22, ימים יזריים יבש (“the day of YHWH’s sacrifice”), Zephaniah 1:8, ימים יזריים יבש (“day of the Sovereign Lord ... day of vengeance”), Jeremiah 46:10; cf. Isaiah 34:8; ימי רעצות יבש (“an acceptable day to YHWH”), Isaiah 58:5; and ימים יזריים יבש (“day of trouble ... to the Sovereign Lord”), Isaiah 22:5. Apart from this terminology, the motif of this “day” may be found in every absolute and final element of prophecy concerning the future. The motif-content of the “Day of YHWH” has been identified by Seth Erlandsson, *The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2-14:23, Coniectanea Biblica*, Old Testament 4 (Lund: Gleerup, 1970), pp. 143-145, as containing six associated motifs: (1) wrath (Isaiah 13:9, 13 = Zephaniah 1:18; 2:2; 3:8), (2) slaughter (Isaiah 34; Zephaniah 1:7, 8, et. al.), (3) devastation (Isaiah 13:9; et. al.), (4) lamentation (Isaiah 13:6; Ezekiel 30:3; Joel 1:15), (5) calamity and terror (Isaiah 13:7; et. al.), and (6) cosmic changes (Isaiah 13:10; Joel 2:2; Zephaniah 1:15; et. al.).
While it has been argued that this motif had its origin in the cult, the covenant, or the sacral institution of holy war, its nature is not historical, but eschatological, as Gressmann, who originally studied the concept, concluded. Zechariah is the first of the Restoration period compositions to explicitly employ the motif, and while some have mistakenly interpreted Zechariah 14 in a non-eschatological manner, we must insist with Mayhue that “nothing in history has yet come remotely close to fulfilling the cataclysmic and conclusive events which Zechariah predicts (14:6-11).”


289Cf. H. Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905), pp. 141ff. We accept Gressmann’s assignment of this motif to eschatology, but disagree with his developmental stages of the concept from the borrowed mythology of the Babylonians and Canaanites, to a popular Israelite notion, and finally to a prophetic reaction with an essentially negative (judgment) theme. We prefer to see this as a prophetic development whose origin is to be found in the progressive revelation of theocratic history, which requires divine intervention in its schema and eventuates in apocalyptic theophany.


The seven occurrences of the phrase "Day of the Lord" in Zechariah 14 appear to substantiate Gressmann’s identification of the motif as essentially negative. This has been questioned, since in Zechariah 14:4, 6, 13, and 21 it clearly describes divine judgment, but in verses 8-9, and 20 it appears to describe restoration blessings. Upon closer examination, however, it will be seen that the restoration blessings are chronologically subsequent to the "Day of the Lord," and not inherent within it.\(^{292}\) Therefore, we conclude that this motif is an eschatological feature of the larger desecration motif, with a specific focus on the apocalyptic intervention of YHWH to execute His decreed judgments, which prepares for the consequential restoration motif, but is not technically an intrinsic part of it.

The eschatological desecration of Jerusalem in Zechariah 12 and 14 must include the Temple, since the negative desecration references to "all nations of the earth" being "gathered against" it for battle (Zechariah 12:3; 14:2), contrast exactly to the positive restoration references to "all nations gathered" to it for worship (Zechariah 14:16; cf. Isaiah 2:2; 56:7). Desecration of the Temple is also implied by the geographical reference to YHWH’s epiphany "on the Mount of Olives, which is front of Jerusalem on the east," i.e., directly across from the Temple Mount. The reason YHWH does not "descend" to the Temple Mount is, as Baldwin has pointed out, because it is occupied by the enemy.\(^{293}\)

The temporal setting for this desecration is teleological, since the last great invasion and exile of the holy city will result in the climatic intervention of YHWH to defend it (Zechariah 14:3, 12-13), establish it as the \textit{sumnum bonum} of

\(^{292}\)Mayhue cites four observations in support of this conclusion: (1) Every use of the motif in the Tanach speaks in a context of YHWH’s judgment upon sinful Israel, (2) The fulfillment of the motif in the near future sense never involves blessing, (3) Not all the passages that deal with the motif in the far eschatological realm mention blessing (cf. Isaiah 2:12; 13:9; Zephaniah 14:1), (4) The motif is always described as a time of YHWH’s anger and wrath, not blessing, \textit{Ibid}, pp. 242-243.

\(^{293}\)Cf. Joyce Baldwin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 201.
human institutional existence (Zechariah 14:16-21), and the curse will be lifted from mankind (Zechariah 14:11). In Zechariah 12:2-3, desecration is implied in the defiling presence of the nations who will besiege the sacred places, although the primary intention of these passages are to depict Jerusalem as מֹסֵר יַרְעָל לְכָל־הַמָּגָם (“a basin of reeling to all the nations”), cf. Isaiah 51:21-23; Psalm 75:8, which intoxicates the Gentile confederacy so that it attacks and desecrates the city and Temple (cf. Daniel 9:27), thereby provoking the wrath of YHWH against the nations. In other words, Jerusalem becomes the positive attraction that draws the nations to negatively desecrate, yet only so that they may be positively defeated as their act calls forth divine intervention. The usual features of desecration are evident in Zechariah 14:1: לָכֵיָה הָעֵיר בָּשַׂמֶּית הַכָּתוּבָה בְּכָל־הָעֵיר בָּשַׂמֶּית הַכָּתוּבָה בְּכָל־כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל (“the city will be captured, the houses plundered, the women ravished, and half of the city exiled…”). It will be these decisive acts of desecration that will demand a reversal of fortunes in eschatological restoration.

**Restoration Motif in Zechariah**

The restoration motif is introduced in the opening section of the book (Zechariah 1:1-6). This section is characterized by the issuing of a divine call to the Nation to foment restoration by initializing the process with repentance. The words of Zechariah 1:3 echo the familiar refrain of the restoration motif built around the restoration formula with אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְיִשְׂרָאֵל (“Return to Me,” declares Almighty YHWH, ‘that I may return to you,’ says Almighty YHWH”).

The announcement of YHWH’s intentions for restoration is given in Zechariah 1:14-17 through two declarations: אני יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אני יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (“I am exceedingly jealous for Jerusalem and Zion”), verse 14, and אני יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אני יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (“I will return to Jerusalem with compassion”), verse 16a, and the imagery of the builder’s line stretched over Jerusalem (וְיוֹרֵשׁ בָּשָׁמֶית לוֹ), verse 16c, which marks off the holy city for constructive blessing, first with the restoration of the Temple, verse 16b, and then by a reaffirmation of election and restored prosperity, verse 17. The classic affirmation of restoration by reversal is
seen in Zechariah 8:11: צָאוֹת תּוֹלְדֵי יְהוָה לֹא כְּפִּיסָם אֵלֶּיהָ תִּשְׁאֵר הָעָם יְהוָה וְהוּא יַעֲשֵׂה הָאָרֶץ בְּיָדוֹ וְהוּא יַשׁוּב הָעָם אֶלָּא יִשְׂרָאֵל ("But I will not treat the remnant of this people as in the former days, declares Almighty YHWH"). The antithetical elements of reversal (from past to future) are displayed in Zechariah 8:13-15 through a parallelism of opposing pairs using the "as...so" comparative construction:

Figure 9: Desecration/Restoration Parallelism in Zechariah 8:13-15

| A: הָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־עָם (“as you were a curse”), verse 13a |
| B: הָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־עָם (“you may become a blessing”), verse 13b |
| A: כָּל־עָם יַשְׁחִיתֵנִי לֹא יָכֻּתָה (“as I purposed to do harm to you”), verse 14a |
| B: כָּל־עָם יַשְׁחִיתֵנִי לֹא יָכֻּתָה (“so I have again purposed ... to do good”), verse 15a |

This basic outline of restoration by reversal of fortunes is filled out in Zechariah by element details of the restoration motif. We will summarize a conjecturalordo salutis of Zechariah by categorizing the various salvific elements under restoration motifs. The pattern for this temporal-theological order is given roughly in Zechariah 9:9-10:12:

(a) "Behold your king [Messiah] is coming to you”), 9:9c;
(b) תְּרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל לְךָ ("then YHWH will appear over them”), 9:14;
(c) יְהוָה יִלְּדוּ לְךָ ("Almighty YHWH will defend them”), 9:15;
(d) יְהוָה יֵשַׁלֵּם לְךָ אֵלֶּיהָ ("And YHWH their God will save them”), 9:16;
(e) הָעָם יַשְׁחִיתֵנִי לֹא יָכֻּתָה וְהוּא יַשְׁחִית ("I will bring them back ...gather them together, for I have redeemed them"), 10:6, 8; cf. 9:11;
(f) יִשְׁמַח עֲבָדֵךְ אָרֶץ הִמְסָמֵךְ ("I shall strengthen them in YHWH, and they will walk in His Name"), 10:12; cf. 10:6.
The movement here is from salvation (messianic deliverance) to sanctification (cultic purification and observant practice). Taking the data from the collected texts we may assemble the motifs as:

(1) The Regathering of National Israel to the Land. Restoration from the Diaspora (lands “east” and “west”) to return to the Land is given in Zechariah 8:7-8:

(“Behold, I am going to save My people from the land of the east and from the land of the west; and I will bring them [back], and they will live in the midst of Jerusalem, and they will be My people and I will be their God in truth and righteousness”).

In restoration language, the return is to Jerusalem, the center of the cult, and the place where covenant is enacted לֶמֶן לַאֲלָלָה הֲרָכֵּל לֶמֶן לַעֳלָהָה (“they will be My people and I will be their God”). Unlike the conditional aspect of the Sinai covenant, this time the covenant is guaranteed by the double-goal of sanctification: בֵּאלֵמֶנָה אֲבָלֵמֶנָה (“truth and righteousness”). Regathering of exiles is also part of the restoration blessings listed in Zechariah 9:11 (Babylonian exilic imagery); 10:6, 8-12 (Assyrian and Egyptian exilic imagery).

(2) The Advent of King Messiah. The king-theme is a dominant note of pre-exilic prophecy (cf. Isaiah 9:6-7; 11:1-5; 32:1-8; Hosea 3:4-5; Amos 9:11-12; Micah 5:2-4), however, Zechariah’s use of the figure may have been influenced by his many references to the revival of the Davidic dynasty (cf. Zechariah 12:7-8, 10, 12; 13:1), since David served as a messianic prototype. However, the pre-exilic type has already been seen in Haggai 2:23, especially with respect to Zerubbabel the Temple builder, which is a messianic function presented in Zechariah 6:12-13.

The identification of the הָאָדָם לֶמֶשֶׂה with the Messiah is at least as old as Targum Jonathan, which at both Zechariah 3:8 and 6:12 translated לאָדָם לֶמֶשִּׁ ה (“Messiah”). Thus, the concept is a natural one in the context of
eschatological restoration. This messianic figure, described as to his character and purpose (to declare “peace to the nations,” and to establish his kingly-rule over all the earth) is presented in Zechariah 9:9-10. In Zechariah 3:8 and 6:12-13 the High Priest Joshua and his fellow priests served as a symbol (졸עם, “wonder,” used as “a token of a future event,” cf. Isaiah 8:18)\(^\text{294}\) of YHWH’s servant called זָרַע (“Shoot Branch,” cf. אל דֶּרֶך in Isaiah 11:1).\(^\text{295}\) This זָרַע symbolized by the priests reveals his role in the restoration of the cultus, and the re-purification of the people, primarily through the act of rebuilding the Temple.

(3) The Divine Intervention and Defeat of the nations. The most dramatic display of apocalyptic intervention comes in Zechariah 14:2-7 where YHWH’s appearance to gather the nations to battle, is accompanied by an angelic entourage (verse 5), geologic upheaval (verse 4), celestial phenomena (verses 6-7), and topographic transformations (verse 8). YHWH is portrayed as a conquering champion (Zechariah 9:13-15), and as a divine warrior (Zechariah 12:4) Who brings supernatural confusion and panic to the Gentile armies attacking Jerusalem and Judah. This panic is said to come “from YHWH” (Zechariah 14:13), and to have resulted from horrible physical plagues (Zechariah 14:12). The goal of this intervention

---

\(^{294}\) The term זָרַע literally may mean “a marvelous or wondrous sign,” cf. German Wunderzeichen, since its original meaning is that of “marvel, wonder” (cf. Psalm 71:7), however, its use in connection with זָרַע is analogous to that which exist between τεράσ and οὔτερο in Greek, and prodigium and signum in Latin. It is “wondrous” primarily because it foreshadows a future event. The construct with זָרַע (“men”) is appositional, viz. “men [priests] are a marvelous sign.”

\(^{295}\) There may be an allusion to Zerubbabel’s name, which means “Shoot of Babylon,” since the four-word phrase is without articles. The fit seems to be justified by the two both functioning as Temple builders (Zechariah 4:7-9; 6:12-13). I do not, however, agree that the figure crowned (6:14) was originally Zerubbabel, but prefer to leave it as the text states, with Joshua, because none of the ancient versions substitutes Zerubbabel’s name. However, this does not mean that there might not have been two crowns, or that the one crown could have been placed in turn on both heads.
is seen as the recognition of YHWH’s sole sovereignty (Zechariah 14:9) and the obeisance of the nations through cultic observance (Zechariah 14:16-18).

(4) The Rebuilding of the Messianic Temple. As Petersen has pointed out, “Zechariah represents the implementation of Haggai’s expectations for temple reconstruction...”296 The connection with Haggai 2:4-5 is drawn in Zechariah 4:6-7 with a similar exhortation to Zerubbabel to rebuild the Temple with the result that in the unspecified future YHWH would conform the work to the eschatological model. Since in Haggai there had been seen the contrast between the First and Second Temples, Zechariah here uses that comparison (4:10) to reveal that the smaller Second Temple actually contained the eschatological seed of glory that would be brought to fruition by divine might, whereas the larger First Temple, glorious through human construction, was destined for destruction.

This is first stated directly in Zechariah 4:6: נַחֲנָה בְּעַלְּבָּה בְּלָהָ צָלָה אֱלֹהִים יְאַדְּרִיתָ הָיָה צָלָה (“Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, says Almighty YHWH”). This word to the Temple-builder him that despite his limited ability and resources, ultimately the Temple would not depend on human, or military, strength (תָּרוֹן), such as the army of workers Solomon had employed to enable his building (1 Kings 5:13-18), nor upon available manpower (לֹא), cf. Nehemiah 4:10, but the creative, energizing force of YHWH (תָּרוֹן).

The crowning accomplishment for the Temple would be eschatological, enacted by divine intervention, and the future promise for this is expressed in Zechariah 4:7:

("What are you, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel you will become a plain; and he will bring forth the head stone with shouts of "Grace, grace to it!").

The "mountain" had been the obstacles and the obstructionists (cf. Ezra 4:2, 4) which had prevented the completion of the Second Temple, but these will be leveled so that the work can progress.

The promise of future intervention will follow the laying of the last stone (הַנָּחַל נֵחַל) in the finished Temple, as the true estimate of the holy place is given in the exclamation: הֵלֵּל וְשָׂא (“Grace, grace to it!”). When human effort has been expended, the divine might will graciously crown the work and bring it to its eschatological goal.

The Temple will also be a divine work of divine intervention in the sense that it will be performed by the Messiah. We have already discussed the נִמְשָׁכָה as a messianic type, and so we only need here to consider the connection of the Messiah with Temple building.

Following our example of analogical correspondence, as Zerubbabel is the builder of the first restoration Temple (Zechariah 4:9), so the Messiah, whom he foreshadows, will be the builder of the final Restoration Temple. The additional thought in verse 12 is that Messiah as a נִמְשָׁכָה will "sprout up" (נִשַׁמְשָׁךְ), i.e., he will arise out of obscurity in his

297 The נִמְשָׁכָה has been interpreted to be a "foundation stone", rather than a "capstone", since no such top stone is evidenced in comparative Near Eastern texts. It is true that the pyramids had a capstone, however, it is not possible to make the connection between tomb and temple easily. The evidence for a foundation stone, on the other hand, is well attested (cf. ANET, pp. 340-341, and the evidence summarized by Albert Petitjean, Les Oracles du Proto-Zacharie. Études Bibliques (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), pp. 243-251. The problem with a foundation stone in this context, however, is that the foundation of the Temple had already been laid (Zechariah 4:9), and the promise is that the edifice will be completed, not begun. It seems preferable to take נִמְשָׁכָה as "completion stone," and to see the end of human work signaling the beginning of the divine accomplishment.
native Land (Eretz-Israel) to obtain a place of prominence as the seed of promise in the Land of Promise.

This prominence will be his dual role as King-Priest, as typified by Zerubbabel as governor and Joshua as High Priest (verse 13). In the case of Messiah, not only would he build the Temple, but he would also bear the unique royal honor of a priest on the throne. 298 This “royal honor” (רדת) will not only be drawn from the priestly association with the Temple, but with the Messiah as a majestic representative of YHWH. 299

5 (5) The Restoration of the Cultus and National Cleansing The purification of the High Priest Joshua in Zechariah 3:4-7 represents the restoration of the cultus after the captivity. It has been suggested that the use of אַלָּא in Zechariah 3:2 in connection with the טִמְנְרָם פְּלָשִׁים (“filthy garments”) may refer to sackcloth and ashes, customary clothing for those in mourning. 300 In this case the mourning would be for the incomplete Temple and the interrupted cultus.

The simile of Zechariah 3:2: אַלָּא אִוָד הֶדְנָא מָשָׁה (“Is this not a brand plucked from the fire?”) has also been said to suggest the

298 The rendering of the phrase יִמָּה מִיִּלֶּא עַל כִּיָּאֲרֵי (“and there shall be a priest upon his throne”) has been questioned simply on the grounds of the unusual allocation of rule to a priest. Many commentators take the preposition על as “by,” seeking to remove the difficulty, however, there seems to be no justification for this since the normal meaning is “on,” and it has this use in the previous clause to which this clause is joined. The LXX, recognizing the use of as “on,” sought to correct the problem by substituting the phrase “on his right hand” for “on his throne.”

299 The use of רָדָת as “majesty” or “royal honor” appears in I Chronicles 29:25; Daniel 11:21; Isaiah 30:30; Psalm 21:2; 45:4; 96:6; 104:1; 111:3; Jeremiah 22:18, where it signifies the special glory of YHWH, and of the glorious distinction conferred by Him upon His representatives, such as kings. The term is appropriate here also because of its use to designate the “beauty” of the olive (Hosea 14:6), which may have a connection with since the olive tree appeared in the vision (4:3) in which Zerubbabel was first presented as Temple-builder (4:6-10).

300 Cf. The Jerusalem Bible, p. 1533 (marginal note).
desecration of contact with foreigners (Babylonians, or Babylon symbolized as a “furnace of exile”) which would have left a ritual pollution or stain on the normally white, priestly ephod. In verse 4, however, the filthy garments are connected with ענין (“iniquity”), and most likely refers back to the הרגמים והסטיליסמס [מסתיליסמס] הרגמים [מסתיליסמס] ורפלים (“evil ways and evil deeds”) that had prevented YHWH’s “return” [in restoration] (רש) thus far (Zechariah 1:4).

There is possibly an echo of this in the Zechariah 1:4 passage with the command issued to Joshua in verse 7: מַלְךָ אֶת בֶּןֶק הָמֶשָׁרְדָא וַעֲמָרָה (“If you will walk in My ways, and if you will perform My service …”). The re-commissioning of the High Priest involves the faithful performance of the prescribed ritual, as the verb שבלה indicates (cf. Numbers 3:7-8, 25, 28, 31-32, 36, 38), thus the reinstitution of the cultus. If the High Priest stands for the priesthood, or by extension, for all Israel as a priestly Nation, then the symbolic re-robing ceremony of verse 4 may describe eschatological national purification (cf. Ezekiel 36:25).

This eschatological national cleansing appears in Zechariah 12:10 and 13:1:

(“And I will pour out on the house of David and on the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplications …In that day a fountain will be opened for the house of David and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for impurity.”).

The eschatological context of both of these texts is earmarked by the introductory Day of the Lord motif formula יָמִינוֹ (“in that day,” cf. 12:9a; 13:1a). Each text involves a type of national ב冊 (“restoration”) either in seeking for YHWH’s grace (both לָן and וַאֲנָחָה), 12:10, or experiencing cultic purification, 13:1. In the first instance a new spirit is received, and in the second, a new heart (cf. Deuteronomy 30:6; Jeremiah 31:31-34; Ezekiel 36:26-27). The result of cleansing from רע (“sinful
actions”) and הָעַבְדָּה ("ritual and sexual impurity"), will be a total abolishment of idolatry and its consequent uncleanness from the Land identified by the removal of the רָאָה הָעַבְדָּה ("the spirit of defilement"), Zechariah 13:2.

Nowhere is the result of eschatological cultic restoration in relation to the Temple and its sancta more vividly displayed than in the words of Zechariah 14:20-21:

(“In that day there will be inscribed on the bells of the horses, 'Holy to YHWH;' and the cooking pots in YHWH's house will be like the bowls before the altar; and every cooking pot in Jerusalem and in Judah will be holy to Almighty YHWH; and all who sacrifice will come and take them and boil in them; and there will no longer be a Canaanite in the house of Almighty YHWH in that day.”)

The extent of eschatological sanctification is shown by ascribing as holy even the common cooking pots, and not simply cooking pots, but every cooking pot in and around the holy city. The inscription on the mitre of the High Priest which read קרֶשׁ לְיִהוֵה ("Holy to YHWH") is now inscribed, as it were, on everything in the vicinity of the Temple, for its holiness acts as pervasively as once did defilement’s contamination, as symbolized by the abolition of the Canaanite, the epitome of unholiness. This extension of sanctity to even the most mundane objects anticipates the extended holiness of the Temple-city in the Temple Scroll. Therefore, the restoration reversal is from pollution to purity, with the Temple as the nexus of a ritual utopianism (cf. Ezekiel 43:12).

(6) Restoration of the Divine Presence to the Temple. This restoration to the divine ideal, with YHWH dwelling in the midst of His people, is described in Zechariah variously as:
The latter four occurrences of the motif employ the traditional formula with נַצָּך, however, the first occurrence (2:9 [2:5]) adds the descriptive element of הבָּנָדָר. This recalls the exodus manifestation of the Shekinah as a wall of fire around her (“a wall of fire around her”) and הבָּנָדָר (“glory”), cf. Exodus 13:22; 14:20; 40:34, and links with the return of the departed Glory to the Temple (Ezekiel 43:2-5; 44:4). Zechariah sees this “Glory” extending here to the entire city, and later to the whole Land (Zechariah 14:20-21).

Restoration, then, begins with a return of the Divine Presence to the rebuilt Temple (Zechariah 1:16; 6:12-13) from which point as the מִשְׁכָּר הָאָרָי (LXX ὑπερφυλακτή) the holiness of YHWH emanates to all the Land. The restoration to the divine ideal for Jerusalem, according to the cosmic-archetypal pattern, is depicted in Zechariah 8:3 by the two epithets: עִיר חַיִּיתָה (“City of Truth”) and הר קִדְמָה (“Holy Mountain”). Both phrases describe the cultic significance of the city as the site of the Temple, from which issues “truth,” i.e., תּוֹרָה (cf. Isaiah 2:3), and which exists as the place of holiness par excellence.

(7) The Restoration of Corporate Election-Status. In Zechariah 1:17 and 2:16 [English, 2:12] the reinstitution of Israel’s status as “the Chosen People” is stated as a divine declaration: יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׂרֶאֶל (“I will again choose Jerusalem”). The same attestation is made descriptively in Zechariah 2:12 [English 2:8] where Israel is called: עֵינָי (“the apple of His eye”). The enjoyment of this status formerly was delayed, as the nations rather than coming to Israel’s light, appeared to extinguish it, but now it will be realized according to the divine ideal.
In Zechariah 8:22-23 the Elect status of the Nation, as favored by YHWH, is described as attracting the Gentile nations, who will compete for favorable status in association with the Jews:

(“So many peoples and mighty nations will come to seek Almighty YHWH in Jerusalem and to entreat the favor of YHWH. Thus says Almighty YHWH: ‘In those days ten men out of all the languages of the nations will grasp the garment of a Jew saying, ‘Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.’”).

The inclusion of Gentiles in this passage leads to another prominent motif, that of Gentile conversion to the true God.

(8) The Restoration of Utopian (Edenic) Conditions. We have already seen in Zechariah 14:20-21 the restoration to cultic utopianism in the extension of ritual purity to the common artifacts of daily life, representing an all-pervasive holiness of existence. In this same chapter this ultimate restoration is also revealed by the transformation of Jerusalem’s topography, removing all obstacles to natural prosperity and access to YHWH’s Presence (Zechariah 14:8, 10-11).

In Jerusalem of the past, the lack of an abundant water was a constant source of insecurity. Only the Gihon spring which serviced the city via the brook Shiloah (Siloam), cf. Isaiah 8:6, or the channeling of water via aqueducts from springs in the Bethlehem area, were available to meet the ever-expanding demands of the populace. The fact that such resources were dependent upon seasonal rainfall only increased the insecurity of inadequacy. This dependence is ended in Zechariah 14:8 with the provision of an abundant stream of life-giving water flowing eastwardly from beneath the Sanctuary in Jerusalem (cf. Ezekiel 47:1-12) and freshening both the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. This unending supply of water will transform the stony ground and produce an
Edenic paradise, which is implied in Zechariah 8:12 (cf. Isaiah 51:3; Ezekiel 36:34-35).

In this utopian restoration, the presence of YHWH, enthroned as King over the entire earth (Zechariah 14:9), at the Temple, must be accessible to all. Therefore, we find in Zechariah 14:10-11 that all of the mountains that formerly surrounded Jerusalem and protectively hid the Temple Mount (Psalm 121:1; 125:2), will be leveled so that the Temple Mount dominates the Land, as is fitting for the city of the Great King of all the earth (cf. Psalm 47:2; 48:2). This accords with the eschatological descriptions of an elevated Temple Mount, raised high above the hills, to which all worshippers ascend (Isaiah 2:2). Access to the holy city and the Temple Mount was also limited in former times by the imposition of a בָּנָה (“ban”), Zechariah 14:11, usually a divine consignment to annihilation as with the Canaanite cities during the period of the conquest (Joshua 6:17-18), but here in the sense of desecration and deportation (cf. Isaiah 43:28). The removal of this “ban” guaranteed that such a threat would never again be experienced. As with all such reversals of fortunes, here insecurity would be turned to security (יהב). The cessation of this “ban” likewise implies that the cause for its imposition, i.e., cultic violations, no longer exists, and therefore, the Nation is holy.

9 The Restoration of Biological and Botanical Prosperity. Typical to the restoration motif is the reversal in the natural realm once cursing is turned to blessing. In the biological realm, restoration reverses the curse of depopulation of Israeliite cities, and especially Jerusalem, by the promise of renewed numerical multiplication. The Presence of YHWH within a restored Temple (Zechariah 8:3), is complemented by the presence of a restored multitude within the streets of Jerusalem (Zechariah 8:4-5). Two groups: the very old (יִדְוָה), verse 4, and the very young (יִדְוָה), verse 5, are perhaps the groups most affected by exile, but the point here is probably the restoration of the age balance in keeping with
the harmonious order established by YHWH’s Presence dwelling in the people’s midst.301

The completeness of this balance is conveyed by the complementary comparisons of the two groups in verses 4-5: first, by the comparison of the enduring presence (מרוב והימיו) of the aged, and the filling (מעלות היימה) presence of the young, and second, by the counsel (סבוכה) of the aged, and the play (מעלות המים) of the young. Thus, biological restoration will follow from cultic restoration, as the stabilization of the cultus translates into the practical stabilization of the family, no longer to be diminished or separated by the threat of poverty or war, since YHWH is present to protect and preserve their future.

Restoration is also manifested in the botanical realm. Zechariah’s main reference to this phenomena is in 8:12 where we read: ‘שעלים$result Electricity$ and והים$t$ (“For [there will be] peace for the seed: the vine will yield its fruit, the land will yield its produce, and the heavens will give their dew …”). We notice in this passage that the restoration will come in three interdependent realms: סלע (“the vine”), הים (“the land”), and השמים (“the heavens”), each affected by the new restoration conditions characterized by מלא (“with its full-orbed sense of “completeness, prosperity, security”).

Eschatology is linked to history in this context, as again reversal terminology is employed (cf. verses 11a, 13, 15) to show that the future will go beyond a mere restoration of what was lost in the past to inaugurate an entirely new era. While the Persian period restoration community had experienced natural disasters and agricultural deprivation as covenantal curses (cf. Haggai 1:10-11), the promise here is of the

301 Such balance may also be intended by the inclusiveness of both sexes ( ydk הנ娛樂 והמעיים) in both age groups to indicate that the restoration order will not be affected by the former threat of the diminishing of one sex over the other (such as young men taken in war, young women taken as slaves).
The bestowal of the covenant blessings (Leviticus 26:3-13; Deuteronomy 28:11-12), which will be only be realized eschatologically when the possibility of further reversals are past (cf. Ezekiel 34:25-27).

(10) The Restoration of Security and Inviolability. In many of the preceding references the security resulting from restoration was seen. Here we simply want to draw attention to the motif of security expressed, e.g. in Zechariah 2:8-9 [English, 2:4-5] by the declaration that eschatological Jerusalem will be a city distinguished as פַּרְוָה תַּמְכּ (“wallless villages”), verse 8 [English, verse 4], because YHWH will be her security (יוֹם אֶשֶׁר יַזְדָּמַן וְשֹׁבֵב יָדְיוֹ לֵעָה לֹא יִרְוֶשׁ אֶל יְהוֹיָם יָשׁוּב (a wall of fire around her”), verse 9 [English, verse 5]. Since walls were considered essential for security, their absence is indicative of a condition of peace (Zechariah 14:11; cf. Isaiah 2:4). Furthermore, walls restricted the size of population, but with no walls comes the potential of unlimited population increase.

This restored security is exemplified by the proverbial ideal of independent prosperity and harmonious fellowship, in Zechariah 3:10: פִּיָּמְ.drawable רָאָת הָאָדָם הָאָדָם יִקְרָא אָנָה לֶגֶד לְעָשּׂוֹ שָׁבְעָה אֶל יָהוּדָה וְאֶל יָהֳדֶּשׁ אֶל יָהוּדָה (“In that day, says Almighty YHWH, every one will invite his neighbor to sit under [his own] vine and under [his own] fig tree.”). cf. I Kings 4:25; II Kings 18:31; Micah 4:4. The setting for this fulfillment is eschatological since the text opens with the Day of the Lord motif formula בֵּיהוּדָה מִשְׁפַּט, and may chronologically follow the national cleansing of Israel, and the advent of Messiah, since it is subsequent to these events in context (verses 8-9). True security, however, is the result of the enthronement of YHWH in a restored theocracy (Zechariah 8:3; 14:9), which will subjugate all contrary forces and bring them harmoniously under the divine rule (Zechariah 9:10; 12:9; 14:16-19). As a result, Jerusalem will at last be truly inviolable, because YHWH’s Presence will be an abiding wall of defense (Zechariah 2:8 [English 2:5]).

(11) The Restoration of Gentile Participation in the Cultus. One of the dominant restoration motifs is that of the formerly oppressive and hostile Gentile
nations being turned to not only be no longer a threat, but to be a part of the worshipping community joined to the Israelite cult. This is stated in its most dramatic form in Zechariah 2:15 [English 2:11]: "And many nations will join themselves to YHWH in that day and will become My people; and I will dwell in your midst ... "). Remarkably, the covenantal language of identification (cf. Jeremiah 24:7; 30:22; 31:33; 32:38) includes the restored Gentile nations within its provisions (cf. Isaiah 19:24-25), making them co-participants in both the obligations and benefits of the cult (cf. Isaiah 19:21; 27:13; 56:6-8; 60:3, 21; 66:20). Because the nations become vassals of YHWH, they have the right to be called “His people,” just as He as their suzerain can be called “their God.” The result of the nations adherence to cultic purity will be the Presence of YHWH in their midst, כלם יגנבו (as was stated in the previous verse for Israel).

Within the sphere of Gentile restoration passages describing the cultic participation of the nations, we should include Zechariah 6:15, which may depict Gentiles as actually having a part in the building of the eschatological Temple. Zechariah 6:15 states: " those who are far off shall come and build the Temple of YHWH”). The problem of the reference in is that in the immediate historical context it would appear to be limited to Jews of the Diaspora. However, these Jews could not have come to build, since the Temple was already under construction and nearing completion, and the reference to the building of the Temple by the of verses 12-13 certainly seems to await a future fulfillment. Therefore, in concert with these indications of extension beyond the immediate historical context, we would see the Gentile nations as part of this effort as a first token of their new covenantal status and obligation in Temple worship.

The picture of restored Gentiles taking part in Temple worship is expanded in Zechariah 8:22-23 and 14:16-19. We have already considered Zechariah 8:23 with reference to Israel’s exaltation to prominence in the
“last days,” but in verse 22 we further note the reference to the nations coming to Jerusalem to entreat the favor of YHWH and to learn torah from Jews: לָאוּ תָּמִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁמֵיהֶם לָבוּשׁ אֶת-דוֹרְתָּם עַד אֲדֹנָי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֶלֹהֵי־עָדְתֵּן אֵלֶּה (“And many peoples and mighty nations shall come to seek Almighty YHWH in Jerusalem, and to seek the favor of the Presence of [literally, the face of] YHWH”).

In Zechariah 14:16-19 a more specific account is given of the particular requirements placed upon the nations in cultic observance. In verse 16a these nations are identified as the remnant from the climatic apocalyptic battle of Zechariah 12:1-14:15: כְּלֵי תַּmanınָם וּכְלֵי חַשְּׂרָה לָבוּשׁ (לָאוּ תָּמִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁמֵיהֶם לָבוּשׁ אֶת-דוֹרְתָּם עַד אֲדֹנָי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֶלֹהֵי־עָדְתֵּן אֵלֶּה (“...all the nations that went up against Jerusalem ...”). The only nation mentioned by name is Egypt, because its geographical situation marked it out for a special proviso, as will be mentioned below. These that formerly “went up against” Jerusalem, will now “go up to worship [in Jerusalem], verse 16b.” The prescribed form of worship is the now universal festival uniting all nations, Succot (verse 16c). The object of the nations worship is לָאוּ תָּמִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁמֵיהֶם לָבוּשׁ (“the King, Almighty YHWH”), a probable reference to YHWH’s covenantal status as suzerain, and the nations as conquered, and now incorporated, subject vassals. The obligation of regular audience (for review) of vassal states before the suzerain, is here fulfilled by the pilgrimage festival of Succot.

This background helps explain the application of the covenantal blessings and curses to the nations in verses 17-19. In these verses, agricultural prosperity, generated by the bestowal of the seasonal rains, was conditioned upon appearance before the suzerain at Succot. The exception to this was Egypt (verse 18), whose dependence was not upon seasonal rains, but the inundation of the Nile. In their case, the threat for failure to appear before the suzerain was that of plague (הַמֵּשֶׁחֲרוֹת), verse 19, a form of punishment that had originally been used to secure their acknowledgment of YHWH’s sole sovereignty during the time of the exodus. Thus, in the restoration, the nations will recognize YHWH, worship Him
annually at the Temple, and be subject to the conditional stipulations of covenant law as His vassal ("His people").

**The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Malachi**

With Malachi, the events surrounding the promise of restoration under Haggai, Zerubbabel and Nehemiah have been left unfulfilled for almost a century. The explanation for the delay of the expected restoration is given with respect to the cultus, which though having been re-established, had not been maintained in ritual purity. The Second Temple, not seeing a glimpse of the glorious future predicted for it, had become the prominent institution in Israel, for Malachi's message is consumed by the concerns of the priesthood and sacrificial system. His focus is the Temple complex, particularly the ritual activity at the altar (Malachi 1:6-14; 2:1-17), and the neglect of the Temple tax, which affected the Temple storehouses (Malachi 3:7-12; cf. II Chronicles 31:11). Many of the same elements and motifs found in Haggai and Zechariah, as well as in Joel, are repeated here, demonstrating that an imminent, though futurist perspective, was still the guiding hermeneutic. The eschatological motivation is again presented as a correction for the present abuse of the cultus, with repentance paving the way for restoration (Malachi 3:24 [English, 4:6]). Having dealt with many of the interpretive details of our motif in Haggai and Zechariah, we will here simply survey the various motifs of desecration and restoration, commenting only on features that are unique to our study.

**The Eschatological Context of Malachi**

The use of the Day of the Lord motif in Malachi demonstrates its usage as predominately apocalyptic and judgmental. In Malachi 3:23 [English, 4:5] it is called זָאָשֵׁי הַיָּמִים הַגָּדוֹלִים ("the great and terrible Day of YHWH"), cf. Joel 2:11; 3:4 [English, 2:31]; Zephaniah 1:14, and is characterized by "furnaces, fire, chaff, and ash - all features of a final conflagration set aflame by YHWH’s intervention (Malachi 3:19-21 [English 4:1-3]). However, Malachi differentiates between a judgment of purification, which will take place at the Temple (Malachi
3:2-3), and the final judgment which will climatically destroy the wicked
(Malachi 3:19, 23 [English 4:1, 5]).

In this respect, the first judgment is peculiar to the people of Israel, since it
relates to an eschatological restoration of the cultus, and the second judgment is
cosmic or universal, since it relates to the nations, i.e., the annihilation of the
wicked. It is important to observe that the concern of desecration in this book is
set within a context of eschatological fulfillment. The desecration will ultimately
only be relieved when YHWH intervenes in history, purifies His people and the
Temple, and removes the threat of continued contamination by contact with the
defiling influence of idolatrous nations. It is the eschatological element, then, that
ties the desecration and restoration motifs together in this context. The vision of
apocalyptic intervention here, like the visions in Zechariah and the shaking of all
nations in Haggai, present the theme of judgmental upheaval and the
establishment of cultic holiness set the stage for the subsequent development of
this language in the apocalyptic literature and Qumran.

The Desecration Motif in Malachi

The Desecration of the Temple is explicitly stated as the reason for the
failed experience of the promised restoration in Malachi 2:11
פְּנֵיה הָיָה זַכָּתוּבָהּ: יִשְׂרָאֵל בֶּן אֱלֹהִים קֹדֶשׁ פָּרָשׁ יְהוָה
(“Judah has acted faithlessly; an abomination has been committed in Israel and Jerusalem: Judah has desecrated
the Sanctuary of YHWH, which He loves ...”). This “desecration” (זָכָתוּבָה) is
because (פְּנֵיה) of “abominations” (זַכָּתוּבָה); two terms which define Temple
profanation by idolatry or ritual impurity, especially of foreign nations (cf.
דִּבְרֵי מַעֲרָבָת, “abominations” of the nations, Deuteronomy 18:9-13). The use here of
Judah with both the feminine הָיָה and the masculine הָיָה, is to distinguish
“Judah” (grammatically feminine) in terms of both the Land and its inhabitants,
who are united in a solidarity of guilt. Although the Targum interpreted
יִשְׂרָאֵל הָיָה, with reference to Judah herself as a “sanctified house,” it would be an isolated
analogical use of this expression which normally refers to the Temple, the closest
comparison being the use of בֵּית הָיוָה (“treasured possession”) for Israel (Exodus
19:5-6; Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2; Isaiah 62:12; 63:18; Jeremiah 2:3; Daniel 12:7; Psalm 114:2).

While some have argued that the context is covenantal and suggests Israel as a chosen Nation, hence a “holiness of YHWH,” the context is equally cultic, as the two terms above are technical cultic expressions, and verse 12 mentions “presenting an offering to Almighty YHWH.” Furthermore, the “abomination” here is cultic defilement through intermarriage with pagan idolaters, the very offense that brought desecration to the First Temple (as introduced by Solomon and climaxed by Manasseh). This sin is especially compounded in view of the historical consequences it brought to itsן (our fathers”), verse 10.

Malachi’s concern is that the repeated sins of the past put the restoration community at risk of another Exile by virtue of desecration and the divine reprisal, mandated by the suzerain-vassal treaty model. Malachi’s list of these cultic desecrations include:

1. The desecration of the divine Name: כְּרַנְדָּל לְאֹסָאְם בֵּנֵי אָשֶׁר יַעֲרוּ בִּתּוֹث (“...for My Name will be great among the nations, says Almighty YHWH, but you are desecrating it…”), Malachi 1:11c-12a; cf. 1:6: טַעַנִּים מְזַנֵּיכָה (“O priests who despise My Name”).

2. The desecration of the altar through defiled offerings, i.e., defective animals (Leviticus 22:20-25; Deuteronomy 15:21), Malachi 1:7-8: כְּרַנְדָּל לְאֹסָאְם עַל-יְהוָה מַעֲשֶׂה בְּעָלָם (“You are presenting defiled food upon My altar ...when you offer the blind for sacrifice ...the lame and the sick”). This wanton neglect of ceremonial purity was tantamount to contempt for YHWH’s Name, or in this case His sovereign authority as the sole Suzerain, since the comparison is made in verse 8 to earthly authority (the governor), to whom they would never offer such tainted tribute. This relationship as a suzerain is especially emphasized in Malachi 1:14: כִּי מַלֶּךּ מְדֹלְיוֹ פֶּן אֲפֶרֶם יַעֲרוּ בִּתּוֹת (“for I am a great King, says Almighty YHWH…”).

3. The desecration of the Priestly Covenant (Malachi 2:8-9). Since the focus of Malachi is on the cultic aspects of the Mosaic Law, there is here a
generalization of the law in terms of the priesthood, called יִרְבּוּ הַעֲנָיִם ("the covenant of Levi"). Just as Malachi has used the eponym "Jacob" to represent Israel (Malachi 1:2), so here the eponym "Levi" is used to represent the priesthood (Malachi 2:4-8; 3:3). Malachi is especially interested in the priests, for as go the priests, so go the people.

This association is drawn by the prophet in his description of the nature of the offense as נִשְׁפָּה ("corruption") of the covenant which mandated the priestly function of disseminating тора in order to secure the community's observance of the purification laws. This responsibility in sanctification has been violated, as Malachi asserts in verse 8: יִרְבּוּ הַעֲנָיִם מִן הָעָנִים רְעִיֵּנָהּ לְשָׁבְעָהּ "But as for you, you have turned aside from the way [of тора]; you have caused many to stumble by instruction [торах]").

(4) The desecration of Covenantal Purity (Malachi 2:10-16). Rather than separate the thematic issue of cultic violation into interrelated malpractices: mixed marriages and divorce, we prefer to view one central transgression and these offenses as illustrations of it. This central transgression is cultic activity without regard to cultic purity, an attitude of indifference that invades and thereby corrupts every aspect of covenantal obligation (Malachi 2:10).

Mixed marriages introduced the foreign (desecrating) element into the exclusive and intimate bond of sanctity between Israel as YHWH's people, and YHWH as Israel's God (Malachi 2:11-12). Divorce is an example of marital infidelity, a failure to preserve the covenantal commitment (כַּיּוֹד הָעֵדֶה) made with YHWH as witness.  

---

302 Malachi does not make the usual distinction between the priests as the clerus maior and the Levites as the clerus minor, probably because of the generalizing tendency mentioned above. For a thorough discussion of the history of the priesthood cf. K. Mino, "Die Heiligheidseiwet (Levitikus 17-26): 'n Historiese en teologiese beoordeling" (Th.D. dissertation: University of Stellenbosch, 1984), pp. 230-235.
Malachi 2:13-16. Several interpretations of the motives of the divorce here have been offered, however, in each case the concern is over the violation of an original contract, an act which was not discernible by the violator as indeed a violation (Malachi 2:13-14a).

Malachi 3:5 also records YHWH’s witness against other violations of covenant:

"וְיִהְיֶה יָדָם שְׁפִּיעָה בְּכֶסֶם עַל בֵּית ה' וְלֹא יִהְיֶה לְשׁוֹנָה מְשִׁיקָר הַכְּשִׁיטָה" ("and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers and against the adulterers and against those who swear falsely, and against those who oppress the wage earner in his wages, the widow and the orphan, and those who turn aside the alien, and do not fear Me, says Almighty YHWH.")

The expression המאה ("wife of your covenant") most likely refers to the laws regulating marriage in the Sinaic Covenant, which was contracted in submission to the revealed will of YHWH (Exodus 20:14), and in relation to which YHWH stood as a “witness” (Malachi 2:14) to guarantee its obedient execution (cf. Genesis 31:48-54). While such verses as Proverbs 2:17 and Ezekiel 16:8 speak of marriage as a “covenant,” they may refer to the “marriage contract,” however, in view of the nature of the covenantal relationship with YHWH just described, these references might support the identification here.

These positions have been summarized by Verhoef, op. cit., p. 275 as: (1) The “wife of their youth” had grown old and unattractive, and was therefore abandoned in favor of a more acceptable substitute, (2) The Israelite wife was deserted because a “mixed marriage” was contracted, and the influential Gentile family of the second wife would not have recognized the Israelite custom of allotting the place of honor to the first wife in a polygamous marriage, (3) The husband, seeking to honor the restoration trend toward monogamous marriage would have sent away his first wives, in order to start afresh with a single wife, albeit of foreign extraction with pagan religious practices.

(5) *The desecration of the Temple treasury* (Malachi 3:7-12). The specific desecration is described as קְנוּיָה אֲלָדוֹת מֹאָב ("robbing God"), verses 8-9 by a violation with respect to בֵּית הַמִּשְׁמַר הָהָרְוּפִּים ("the tithes and the offerings"). The definite articles in these terms refer to specific compulsory obligations of the covenant:

(1) בֵּית הַמִּשְׁמַר ("the tenth-part"), which consisted of two tithes: the annual tithe for the maintenance of the Levites (Leviticus 27:30; Numbers 18:21), and a second tithe brought to Jerusalem for YHWH’s feast (Deuteronomy 14:22), and

(2) בֵּית הָרְוּפִּים, which were contributions set aside for a holy purpose, generally for the Sanctuary itself (cf. Leviticus 22:2-3, 12, 15; Numbers 5:9; 15:17-21; 18:8-20), to maintain the edifice (Exodus 25:1-7; Ezra 8:25) and to provide for the needs of the priesthood (Exodus 29:27-28; Leviticus 7:32, 34; 10:14; 22:12). Since these contributions were designed for the Temple, which represented YHWH’s Presence, the neglect of these provisions was to depreciate both the place of the cult and the service of the cult, and so to deprecate God (cf. II Chronicles 31; Nehemiah 13:10).

The divine response to these desecrations was given in Malachi 2:2 and 3:9 as a curse of their blessings, i.e., a threatened reversal of restoration. The important observation with regard to our motif, is that the desecrations are cultic in nature, even when viewed as social sins, and that while they are present problems of the period, they are tied to the past in a continuity that is offered relief only in eschatological terms, as we will see in our following discussion of the restoration motif.

*The Restoration Motif in Malachi*

The restoration motif in Malachi is juxtaposed with the desecration motif to establish a cursing/blessing, or judgment/grace statement. For example, in Malachi 1:6, 12 the desecration of the divine Name is followed by an eschatological declaration in Malachi 1:11, 14 that YHWH will make His Name great (ארִי הָנָּא). This threat/promise form is also seen in the larger context of
Temple desecration (Malachi 1:2:17), the restoration response is introduced in Malachi 3:1 as: מַעֲשֶׂהֽוּ וּמַעֲשֶׂהֽוּ מִיִּמְנֹּס בְּכֶסֶם מִיִּמְנֹּס (“...and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to His Temple ...”), followed by a description of the restoration reversal of cultic impurity (verses 2-6), and eschatological prosperity and prominence (verses 18-21 [English, 4:1-3]).

The eschatological dimensions of the restoration are seen in several places in the discourses. In Malachi 1:11, YHWH’s manifested greatness is seen as universal: יְהֹוָה יָשָׁב עֹצֶב הָאָרֶץ וּלְשֹׁם נְתָנָה לַשָּׁמָי (“For from the rising of the sun even to its setting, My Name will be great ...”), cf. Psalm 50:1; 113:3. In this same text the inclusiveness of restoration also appears in its revelation to the Gentiles: יְהֹוָה יָשָׁב עֹצֶב הָאָרֶץ (“for My Name will be great among the nations ...”). This is again stated in Malachi 3:12 in which the restoration of nature, i.e., of Eretz-Israel (here called בַּגֵּרָה, “a delightful Land”) will cause all nations to call Israel כָּל הָיוֹם (“blessed”).

The Temple will be the site of the demonstration of eschatological restoration to the world. The cultic context of YHWH’s restoration manifestation is stated in Malachi 1:11: הַמַּכּוֹת מְעַט לְעִם מִיִּמְנֹּס וּמִיִּמְנֹּס (“in every place incense is going to be offered to My Name, and a grain offering that is pure ...”). YHWH’s apocalyptic intervention and revelation before the nations will be preceeded by His advent to the Temple to re-consecrate its sancta and cultic personnel. The text announcing this is Malachi 3:1-3:

---

306 The use of this expression for universal manifestation of rule (from east: מַעֲשֶׂה, to west: מַעֲשֶׂה) is found in one of the Amarna letters: “Behold, the king, my lord, has set his name at the rising of the sun and at the setting of the sun,” cf. C. J. Mullo Weir, Documents from Old Testament Times. Edited by D. Winton Thomas (New York: Harper & Row publishers, 1958), pp. 43-44.
Behold, I will send My messenger; he will prepare the way before Me. Then suddenly He will come to His Temple, the Lord you are seeking, the Angel of the Covenant, in Whom you delight. Behold, He comes, says Almighty YHWH. Who can endure the day of His coming? Who can remain upright when He appears? He, Himself [or the day of His coming] is like a refiner’s fire, He is like a launderer’s soap. He sits like a refiner and purifier of silver; He will purify the Levites, He will refine them like gold and silver. Then they will present righteous [culically-correct] offerings to YHWH.”

These verses indicate that YHWH’s Sanctuary must be prepared for His coming. The priestly desecration of the Temple in Malachi apparently foreshadows a future cultic desecration that must be removed prior to YHWH’s apocalyptic advent. Therefore, a’מאלך (“messenger”), probably Elijah (Malachi 3:23 [English, 4:5]), who will prepare for cultic restoration by spiritual restoration via repentance: יִרְשָׁב לְאָנוֹת הָעָלָמִים לְבַל בְּנֵי עַלָּבֹת (“...he will restore the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers ...”), (Malachi 3:24 [English 4:6]). The restoration (שָׁמָּה) here is most likely a restoration to the cultic and social purity of the covenant, as כֹּבֵּחַ (“fathers”) may refer back to the כִּבְרָמִית (“former days”) of verse 4 (cf. Zechariah 1:5-6). Under a theocracy, their was a proper social order, since obedience to covenant brought blessings in every relationship.307

---

307 Some commentators employing a strictly synchronic approach, argue that כִּבְרָמִית refers to a renewal of the social order, as this idea is more consistent with comparative ancient Near Eastern eschatology, cf. A. Jeremias, Babylonisches im Neuen Testament (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905), pp. 97-98. However, as Verhoef has pointed out, op. cit., p. 342, the semantic domain of כִּבְרָמִית is not so much the projected social order but the covenant relationship. Since the reference to כִּבְרָמִית in this context refers to a return to covenant purity via the purification of the Levites to perform a ritually pure service (Malachi 3:3-4), I would suggest that the particular focus of this covenant renewal is cultic.
The terms of purification: נֶפֶר מְכַבֶּטֵל ("refiner’s fire") and מַפְרִי חַּיָּה ("launder’s soap"), and מְכַבֶּטֵל עֲפַרְפֵּר וְפְסִיק ("smelter and purifier of silver"), verses 2-3, reveal the extent of eschatological purification as without (removal of cultic stains, cf. Isaiah 4:4; Ezekiel 22:18; Psalm 66:10), and within (removal of contaminants that affect the quality of purity, cf. Psalm 12:7 [English, 12:6]; Proverbs 17:3). The result would be a restored cultic personnel to offer ritually pure offerings in the Temple (verse 4), as fitting a restoration of theocratic rule (verses 5-6).

The call to practical restoration as a means to obtaining divine, eschatological restoration, is given in the restoration refrain: אֲנִי אָחַזְנָכָה אֲנִי אֵозвращֵנִי ("Return to Me, and I will return to you") as we have already seen in Zechariah 1:3 (cf. II Chronicles 30:6; Jeremiah 31:18; Lamentations 5:21). As Holliday suggests, since אֵозвращֵנִי is a bi-polar verb, it can mean both "repent" and "become apostate."308 The dual thought here with the imperative אֵозвращֵנִי may be to express a turning away from idolatry to turn to YHWH. The result will be in YHWH’s נֶפֶר חַּיָּה ("turning"), the experience of restoration. Thus, the incentive in the prophet’s day to enact cultic and social reform was the promise that such would be followed in the indefinite future ("day of the Lord") by a complete restoration according to the divine design. The explication of this eschatological design revealed in the patchwork of the Restoration prophets will be more closely stitched together in our study of the apocalyptic genre which follows in chapter five.

---

CHAPTER V

THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF
IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

In the preceding chapter the motif of desecration and restoration has been developed through the biblical period. We have seen that the destruction of the Temple was effected by YHWH (through foreign desecrators) as a retributive response to the desecration and defilement incurred through Israel’s religious syncretism and idolatry. In the Torah and historical books we saw that the role of these foreign desecrators emerged through adversarial imagery, namely, pagan human authorities in opposition to YHWH and His people (e.g., Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar). With the desecration and destruction of the Temple, the incursions into sacred space by foreign nations projected an image of earthly autonomy in opposition to divine sovereignty. This ultimate act of desecration (of the Temple and its cultus) raised the question of theodicy, a subject addressed by the prophet’s (and especially Ezekiel’s) application of the restoration motif.

In this chapter we will further examine the development of this image of foreign power usurping the place of divine authority as it is expressed in the concept of the "abomination of desolation" in the Book of Daniel, and its relationship to the desecration/restoration motif.

THE STATUS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL AS BIBLICAL PROPHECY

As is well-known, in the earliest versions of the present Hebrew-Aramaic Bible, the Book of Daniel was placed in the division of the Tanach known as the הָדְרַכָּה ("Writings"). Against the book's own claim to have been written by the
biblical Daniel (12:4), the supposition was that Daniel was a late composition (Maccabean period), written after the close prophetic corpus, which according to the Rabbis ended with the post-exilic period. Passing by the important problem of the date of the book, we want to consider the pertinent question of Daniel's

1This is the majority view today among scholars, based in large measure on the incorporation of Daniel among in the הָגֵזֶה יָוִים. However, Lester L. Grabbe, "The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem: From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years," Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee. Edited by Craig Evans and William Stinespring (Scholars Press, 1987), who holds a Maccabean origin, has suggested that earlier material was incorporated within the book, particularly at Daniel 9:24-27, which he believes is an old oracle representing one of several post-exilic attempts to reconcile the seventy year Jeremiah prophecy with the historical events (e.g., Zechariah 12:1; II Chronicles 36:22-23).

2Cf. I Maccabees 9:27: "Thus there was great trouble in Israel such as had not been since the time when a prophet last appeared among them." This statement implies that long before the time of the Maccabees that the prophetic period had ended. The cessation of the שָׁלֹחַ הַרוֹם ("Holy Spirit") in Israel is sometimes dated by the rabbis from the destruction of the First Temple, from the demise of the last prophets, or as late as the destruction of the Second Temple. However, because of the dicta which said that there were certain things in the First Temple that were not in the Second Temple, and one of these was the שָׁלֹחַ הַרוֹם (i.e. "prophecy"), the Talmud regarded the prophetic spirit to have vanished at the conclusion of the post-exilic (TB, Baba Bathra 121b) In further witness, many Talmudic passages argue that prophecy was replaced by the לְשׁוֹן הַרְפָּע ("heavenly voice") because the Holy Spirit had been removed with the last of the prophets (cf. TB, Yoma 9b; Sotah 48b; Sanhedrin 11a; Midrash Horayoth 3.5; Mishnah Sotah 9:12; Canticles Rabbah 8:11; Tosefta Sotah 13.2). Cf. Arthur Marmorstein, "The Holy Spirit in Rabbinc Legend," Studies in Jewish Theology, ed. J. Rabinowitz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), pp. 122-144 (especially 123-124).

status as a prophet, and whether the use of his predictions by later writers were regarded in the same manner as biblical prophecy. If Daniel was a late post-exilic (post-prophetic) pseudepigraphical work, employing only vaticinia ex eventu prophecy, it might well classify as apocalyptic literature (in which pseudonymity is a trait), but its author could never be considered to rank with the biblical prophets. This was indeed the conclusions drawn by later critics, such as the anti-


4The claim that Daniel also employs this literary device has often been made on the basis of the influence of Akkadian apocalypses on Daniel (seen especially in the parallels between the literary presentation of history using unnamed kings). However, John H. Walton, Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989), pp. 224-225 has shown that while vaticinium ex eventu may have be regarded as a characteristic function of apocalyptic literature in general, particularly to establish an author's credibility, Akkadian apocalypses only employed the device as political propaganda, since its literature contains no element of eschatology, and its audience was therefore situated in the present (i.e., the administration in present power), cf. S. Kaufman, "Prediction, Prophecy and Apocalypse in Light of New Akkadian Texts," Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 1973 (Jerusalem: The World Union of Jewish Studies, 1974), p. 226. On the other hand, Daniel cannot be properly said to be using vaticinium ex eventu with the same purpose as Jewish apocalyptic writers, which use leads to eschatological predictions of cosmic cataclysms, epiphanies, and judicial interventions. By contrast, Daniel's supposed vaticinium ex eventu section (Daniel 11) leads into specific predictions concerning a historical individual. This is quite different from the broad eschatological generalities of other Jewish apocalyptic.

5This appears to have been the conclusion of Maimoide's famous statement as to the consensus of the Jewish Nation on the placement of Daniel in the Hagiographa, Moses Maimoide, The Guide to the Perplexed. Trans. Shlomo Pines (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 400.
Christian Neo-Platonist Porphyry (A.D. 233-305).\textsuperscript{6} Since the exclusion of Daniel from the prophets rank has been in large part based on the book's location in the \textit{ה立てות}, we need to briefly weight the historical evidence for this placement.

**The Evidence for Daniel as a Non-Prophetic Book**

Undisputed evidence for Daniel's location within the Hebrew canon appears to be limited to later Hebrew manuscripts and to statements that may be traced no further back than the early rabbinic period. For example, the oldest available manuscripts of the Tanach which attest to the present canonical order, Codex Leningradensis and the Aleppo-Codex, are only dated to the ninth and tenth-century C.E. The two of the most explicit rabbinic statements in this regard, in the Gemara of (Babylonian Talmud): Baba Bathra 14b (where Daniel appears before Esther and Ezra), and Megilla 3a (where Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi are called prophets, but are distinguished from Daniel), are within material composed in the fifth to eight centuries C.E.

The Jewish tradition, however, is not unanimous in its testimony.\textsuperscript{7} For example, while the oldest manuscript of the Tanach, Codex Cairensis (895 C.E.),

\textsuperscript{6}Porphyry's statement was: \textit{"si quid autem ultra opinatus sit, quia futura nescient, esse mentitum."} His attack on Daniel was motivated by his antitheistic philosophical presuppositions which rejected any predictive element in history as impossible. He sought to discredit Daniel because it was used by Christians as evidence of prophecy, and hence as proof of the existence of God and of His intervention in human history. It should be noted that Porphyry not only rejected the historicity of Daniel, but also of \textit{all} the sacred books of Tanach and the New Testament. For a critique of Porphyry's treatise cf. Erwin Jenkins, \textit{"The Authorship of Daniel"} (Th.M. thesis: Talbot Theological Seminary, 1955), pp. 8-11; M. V. Anastos, \textit{"Porphyry's Attack on the Bible,"} \textit{The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 433-434; and more recently, P.M. Casey, \textit{"Porphyry and the origin of the Book of Daniel,"} \textit{JTS} 27 (1976): 15-33.

\textsuperscript{7}It may be suggestive that early Church Fathers such as Origien (A.D. 250) and Jerome (A.D. 400), both of whom were instructed by rabbis, nevertheless included Daniel in the prophetic division. Perhaps even though they were following the accepted order of the LXX, and all the early Greek uncials, which are consistent with this order, they may bear an indirect witness to a circle of early rabbis who also accepted this view.
does not contain Daniel in its list of the Prophets, Moshe ben Asher, who wrote the manuscript in Tiberias, disregarded canonical order and added his own list of the prophets: "And these are the prophets who prophesied in Babylon when they left Jerusalem: Haggai, Malachi and Daniel. All the prophets from Moses … to Daniel and Malachi number 117."8

While the witness of Ben Sira (c. 180 B.C.E.) is indeed early, his use as evidence in relation to the non-prophetic status of Daniel is questionable. In his list of the "Worthies in Wisdom" (Ecclesiasticus 44-50), he mentions the major and minor Prophets, and of heroes of the Exile, and even the early post-exilic period (e.g., Zerubbabel, Joshua, Nehemiah) but never Daniel. This exclusion, from material which is drawn from the נביאים, where Daniel should have been included, reveals that Ben Sira either was unfamiliar with Daniel (because it was composed too late), or had theological or literary reasons for its exclusion. In either case, we are faced with an argumentum silencio, which cannot be equally valued with the later evidence which makes explicit reference to Daniel.

The Evidence for Daniel as a Prophetic Book

In the Tanach, only one text outside of Daniel, seemed to affirm his prophetic character (Ezekiel 14:20; cf. 28:3) ranking him with Job and Noah as models of righteousness and wisdom to the exilic community.9 While this

---


9 While neither Job nor Noah were technically "prophets" in the later sense of that word, they both functioned in the prophetic role as intercessors to their people (Job 1:5; 42:8-9; Genesis 6:8-9, 14; cf. II Peter 2:5). The arguments that this "Daniel" was not the biblical character, but the much distant figure of Dan'el, the ancient mythical ruler who practiced magical wisdom in the Ugaritic Aqhat epic (ANET 153-154a), cf. J. Day, "The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel," VT 30 (1980): 174-184, are not convincing. The literary links between the accounts are unclear, and verbal parallels are missing, as also with the angel "Daniel" in I Enoch., cf. John E. Goldingay, Daniel. WBC 30 (Waco: Word Books, 1989), pp. 7, 274, who notes the intercessory role of Daniel for "his people," "his city," and "his sanctuary" (Daniel 9:15-20) as agreeing with
reference to Daniel is contested, in the New Testament, Daniel's position among the Prophets was assumed. This is clearly reflected in Jesus' citation of Daniel 9:27 in Matthew 24:15, and his appendix of an attestation of prophetic rank: τὸ ἰηδέν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου ("...spoken of by the prophet Daniel ...").

The synoptic Gospel writers, John and Paul, also either cite or allude to this same text, centered around the Danielic motif "the abomination of desolation" (Daniel 9:27; cf. 11:31; 12:11), either reporting Jesus' words or structuring their own discourses by them. While, they do not explicitly make reference to "Daniel," their dependence on Jesus' statement and their apparent acceptance of his prophetic predictions as divine revelation, indicate that they also may have considered Daniel as a prophet. The primary version of the Tanach for Jesus and the New Testament writers was the LXX, which in all manuscripts clearly placed Daniel among the prophetic writings. This was also followed in all the canonical lists appearing in early patristic literature.  

Jean Paul Audet has also added as testimony a Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek canon list dated tentatively to the second-century C.E. In this list Daniel follows the three other major prophets.  

Josephus (Contra Apion 1, 38-40) wrote of the canon at his time having twenty-two books (five books of Moses + thirteen books of the prophets who succeeded Moses + four of hymns and practical precepts), all "justly believed in," and written "of events that occurred in their own time." Daniel must have been included by Josephus in these thirteen books, since it would could not belong to

that portrayed for the Daniel in Ezekiel 14:20, and the comparable historicity of further references for Daniel's companions in exile as part of the leadership of the post-exilic community (Nehemiah 8:4; 7; 10:2), although admittedly these could be either descendants or unrelated figures who adopted famous names.


any of his other categories. This assumption is supported by Josephus' acclamation of Daniel as one of the greatest prophets in *Antiquities X*, ix. 4.\(^{12}\)

The earliest record of Daniel's prophetic character is preserved at Qumran, where the book and its predictions played a central role in its apocalyptic community, and probably indicated its prophetic canonical status.\(^{13}\) Its significance as prophecy at Qumran is attested by its frequent citation, especially of Daniel 9-12 (e.g., Daniel 11-12 is cited in 4QFlor), and the many pseudopigraphal imitations that have been discovered (e.g., the "Prayer of Nabonidus"), and more recently the collection of apocalyptic fragments in quasi-prophectic form known as Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243-245). Of special interest to our discussion is the explicit reference in 4QFlorilegium 2:3, in which a period of tribulation is predicted "as it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet."

In weighing this evidence, we must conclude with Koch, "that there is no single witness for the exclusion of Daniel from the prophetic corpus in the first half of the first millennium A.D. In all the sources of the first century A.D. - the LXX, Qumran, Josephus, Jesus, and the New Testament writers - Daniel is reckoned among the prophets. In fact the earliest literary evidence of Daniel's inclusion among the *Ketubim* is to be placed somewhere between the fifth and eighth centuries A.D."\(^{14}\) However, to properly conclude this research, we must speculate as to when and why Daniel was excluded from the prophetic corpus.

**Daniel's Exclusion from the Prophetic Corpus**

If the earliest literary evidence for Daniel's inclusion among the *Ketubim* is the fifth-century, we may suppose that it was transferred from the prophetic corpus sometime well before that time. The influence of Daniel upon the religious


and political events of earlier periods has led some scholars, such as Audet and Koch, to propose a second-century date. The reasoning for this conjecture is based upon the use of Danelic predictions by Jewish zealots to instigate and support the first (and possibly second) revolt(s) against Rome. Josephus referred to one such prediction (probably Daniel 7:13-14 or 9:26)\textsuperscript{15} when he wrote in \textit{Jewish War} (VI):

But what more than anything else incited them to war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world. This they understood to mean someone of their own race, and many of their wise men went astray in their interpretation of it. The oracle, however, in reality signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed Emperor on Jewish soil.\textsuperscript{16}

Daniel's influence, however, was not restricted to its own predictions, but extended to the entire prophetic corpus. Its inclusion in the prophetic division in pre-Christian times gave it a position among the prophets, but its uniqueness gave it an \textit{influential} position. This may be demonstrated by the use of Daniel in the Targum Jonathan on the Prophets (c. 50-1 B.C.E.), which reveals that all of the prophets were interpreted along the lines set out in Daniel.\textsuperscript{17} In this regard Koch

\textsuperscript{15}Josephus is thought to have belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, possibly the School of Hillel, to whose canon he probably referred concerning Daniel, cf. Rudolf Meyer, "Bemerkungen zum literargeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Kanontheorie des Josephus," \textit{Festschrift Otto Uschel}. Eds. Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, et. al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974), pp. 285-299. This group considered Daniel as an important prophetic voice, whose visions held the key to the interpretation of world events, especially concerning the Romans. This was also the trend followed by first and second-century rabbis, cf. discussion, R. Nosson Scherman, "Daniel - A Bridge to Eternity," in \textit{Daniel}, by R. Hersh Goldwurm. \textit{ATS}. Eds. Rabbis N. Scherman and M. Zlotowitz (New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1989), pp. xlix - lv. The Jewish use of oracles taken from the Tanach is also recorded by the Roman historian Tacitus (\textit{Historiae} V, 13) and Suetonius (\textit{Divus Vespasianus} 4, 9).


\textsuperscript{17}E.g., the expectation of Gentile domination, Israel's supersession and rule in the coming age is found in the other prophets besides Daniel (see chapter 4), cf. also, J. B. van Zijl, \textit{A Concordance to the Targum of Isaiah}, SBL Aramaic Studies 3 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 142-143.
sees Daniel as a clarifier of the other prophets, e.g., Daniel 9:22-23 reveals the mysteries of Jeremiah’s prophecy, Daniel 2:36-38; 7:1-3 appears to interpret the four horns of Zechariah 2:1-4 by means of four successive terrestrial kingdoms, and Daniel 9:27 discloses the real [eschatological] content of the “decreed end” of Isaiah 10:23.\footnote{K. Koch, op. cit., p. 125. Koch observes that Daniel always employs a two-fold sequence: (1) a vision, dream, or old prophecy is reported (e.g., Daniel 9:2), and (2) a succeeding interpretation (נָבָא) is revealed by an angel to Daniel (e.g., Daniel 9:21-22), or by Daniel, if the vision or dream was that of a king (chs. 2, 4). cf. also Koch, “Vom prophetischen zum apokalyptischen Visionsbericht,” Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), in which he seeks to draw a connection between the genre of Daniel 7-12 and the prophetic visions of Zechariah.} Daniel was viewed as offering the divine interpretive key to the secret of the determined end (יִדְרֵךְ), and thus to all of Israelite prophecy. With Daniel, therefore, the biblical revelation was considered to have reached its final stage,\footnote{Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets,” p. 125 explains the point: There is here revealed an underlying and determinative conception of a two-stage revelation: The prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are indispensable but preliminary spokesmen of the Word of God; it is only with Daniel that the final stage begins.”} and as the ultimate revealer of the heavenly mysteries (cf. Daniel 2:18-19, 27-30), the book offered a concept of prophecy to the other prophetic books, permitting them to also be interpreted as related to the end time.

This use and influence of Daniel as predictive prophecy led the rabbis to regard Daniel as a dangerous book, since the application of an apocalyptic timetable to contemporary events had brought both disappointment and decline to the Nation. By separating it from classical prophecy and grouping it with other narratives of the Exile (e.g., Esther and Ezra), it was removed from exerting a paradigmatic influence on the prophetic corpus. Once it was incorporated among the heroes of the Exile, the accent of the book from was shifted from prophecy to pedagogy.\footnote{This shift may also be representative of an altered approach that came to all of the prophets, in which they were conceived of more as preachers of social and religious repentance and less proclaimers of the Age to Come.} The emphasis was now upon the obedience of Daniel to Torah, rather
than upon his role as an apocalyptic visionary. Perhaps fear of Daniel's eschatological influence also led the rabbis to allow for the allegorical interpretation (סמל) of the Prophets and Hagiographa; an allowance forbidden to the Torah. By permitting the prophecies to be allegorized, the problems of literal interpretation (and application) could be avoided.

We can understand the concern of the rabbis over the misapplication of prophecy, not only because of erroneous interpretation provoking an unfounded confidence in a messianic claimant or inciting a revolutionary movement, but for also for a more basic spiritual reason. Rambam explains in ירحا תנב that the Sages were troubled lest a predicted time come and go without the expected fulfillment. If that were to happen, people of insufficient faith would be induced to believe that the fulfillment would never come. Had Daniel remained in the הנאים, it might have been used as התרצה in the synagogues, but by its

---

21 Cf. for this distinction in סמל interpretation between the Torah and the Prophets/Writings the ל"כ בה מדרת of R. Eleazar b. Jose of Galilee.

22 For failed calculations cf., Rabbi Akiva's proclamation of Bar Kokhba as Messiah in 132 C.E., and the prediction of the "pangs of Messiah," including the War of God and Magog to begin on 14 Nisan 4291 (531 C.E.). As a result, the coming of the Messiah was included among "three things that will come unawares" (Sanhedrin 97a), and strict prohibitions against attempts to calculate or predict the end were included in the Talmud. For example, Kethubim 111a put Jews under an oath "not to make known the end, and not forcibly to hasten the advent of the end," and Sanhedrin 97b warns: "may the bones of those who calculate the end rot." Nevertheless, we still find Sages making such predictions (e.g., R' Saadia Gaon in מסכתא and even Rambam himself!). However, their conditions seemed to warrant apocalyptic polemics, i.e., whenever their generation suffered intense persecution (Christian and Moslem), were infiltration by rival sects such as the Karaites (as was the Gaon), or faced oppressed by imposer Messiah's (such as Rambam with the Jews of Yemen).

23 Cf. Sefer Hasidim, edited by J. Wistinetzki (1924), 76-77, no. 212, which admonishes potential prognosticators: "If you see that a man has prophesied the advent of the Messiah, know that he is engaged either in sorcery or in dealings with devils ... One has to say to such a man: 'Do not talk in this manner ... Eventually he will be the laughingstock of the whole world [italics mine]."
transposition to הָהָלָהָלָה this was effectively prevented. This then may explain why Jonathan ben Uziel was said to have been prevented from extending his Targum of the הָהָלָהָלָה, because it now contained Daniel and the revelation of the End (cf. Megillah 3a).

Nevertheless, the rabbis merely relocated Daniel, rather than excluding it as they had other apocalyptic writings they considered put to revolutionary use (e.g. Enoch and Ecclesiasticus). This was due to the fact that out of all the comparable religious literature of the late Israelite period, they regarded Daniel as divinely inspired (רְמָת הִדְרָדָד). This was in part because the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., and the events subsequent to it, confirmed to the rabbis (as it had to the early Jewish-Christians and Church Fathers), that the interpretation of the fourth monarchy in Daniel 2 and 7 as the Roman empire was correct, and thus, vindicated Daniel's prophetic timetable as accurate. Therefore, Daniel alone, within the canon of Scripture, contained the key for the destruction of the Second Temple and of Israel's future restoration after a further exile (Daniel 9:24-27; 12:1-13).

Our conclusion to this introduction to our study of Daniel is that Daniel is to be regarded as prophetic a book as any other so classified in the Tanach. However saying this, we also affirm that it is different from other prophetic books (e.g., the absence of the characteristic messenger formula: מְּרַם יְהוָה, and divine direct address: יְהוָה יִתְנְשֵׁך, and the extensive use of the wisdom genre²⁴); a difference which separates it from the Prophets by elevating it, as we have noted, to a position as unlocking the mysteries (both as to events and times) of the prophecies they contain. Its relocation by the rabbis was due to genuine concern

---

²⁴I disagree with the form-critical school that has classified Daniel as strictly wisdom genre, and on this basis claimed it was thus included as part of the Wisdom Literature in הָהָלָהָלָה, cf. the theory's first formulation in Georg Hoelscher, "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel," TSK 92 (1919): 113-138, and modern advocacy by Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956) 2: 303-305. However, Daniel does not reveal the form-critical parallels to Wisdom Literature supposed for it, and Daniel's eschatological perspective certainly differs from the lack of such an interest in the wisdom writers.
for its influence upon the prophetic corpus, and all of נֶאֱמָן being interpreted with a view to the End time. If this is so, then the examination of Daniel’s use of the desecration/restoration motif puts it in a pivotal position with respect to both the Tanach and the apocalyptic literature and the New Testament, as we hope to show in the following chapters.

**The Desecration/Restoration Motif in Daniel**

In Daniel, the desecration/restoration motif is found within both historical and apocalyptic/eschatological contexts. Our procedure in this section will be to briefly survey the meaning of desecration in Daniel, focusing on the two terms יִנַּא and מַשְׁפָּט which comprise the Danelic abomination terminology essential to our motif, and to present an analysis of the Danelic expressions for the “Abomination of Desolation.”

**The Meaning of Desecration in Daniel**

Four texts in Daniel all refer to some form of desecration in relation to the cultus of the Temple: Daniel 8:13 (מָשָׁפְּט, לֵוָה), 9:27 (טָפֵי נָבָה לָאָדָם), 11:31 (טָפֵי נָבָה לָאָדָם), and 12:11 (טָפֵי לֵוָה). The last three of these passages use a term for “abomination” built from the root יִנַּא, while the first employs a substitution for יִנַּא with מַשְׁפָּט (“rebellion”). Each are joined to the Pol’el form of the verb מָשָׁפְּת. In chapter three we distinguished the meaning of יִנַּא, demonstrating that both terms, translated in the LXX by βαθέντον γάμα, refer generally to that which is repugnant to both YHWH and men, and specifically, in the first term, to acts considered offensive to the sensibilities, and in the second, to things repulsive to the cult, and which have a contaminating quality of uncleanness.

Our purpose here will be to seek to determine the specific meaning of the variously constructed desecration phrase “abomination of desolation” as it appears in Daniel (offering some explanation for the irregularities in concord between the constructions), and in the New Testament texts which may employ the Danelic references by citation or allusion.
The Meaning of the Phrase “Abomination of Desolation”

It is our contention that the many elements of the desecration of the Temple motif found throughout Tanach, and particularly in the post-exilic prophets, were loaded into a single phrase by Daniel to describe the epitome of desecration (which would assume all the lesser elements of desecration) embodied in an eschatological Desecrator.\textsuperscript{25} In order to follow our argument, it will first be necessary to consider the discussions on the meaning of the phrase “abomination of desolation,” both the Hebrew constructions appearing in the texts of Daniel, and the Greek construction as it appears in the apocryphal book of Maccabees and the New Testament, then to survey the various interpretations of this phrase to historical and/or eschatological events or personages, and finally to draw our own conclusions in light of our study of the general Temple desecration motif.

The Meaning of the Hebrew Phrase

The phrase “abomination of desolation” occurs in Hebrew only in Daniel (9:27; 11:31; 12:11). The term יָפַע is used of any detestable thing (Hosea 9:10; Nahum 3:6), especially of things related to the cult (cf. Zechariah 9:7), but predominately in connection with idolatrous practices. In Jeremiah 7:30-32 the prophet decries the desecration of the Temple by the erection of אֶדֶת צְדָקָה in the Holy Place. Here the reference must be to the images of idols, referred to by hypocatastasis as “detestable, or horrible things.” The use of יָפַע in Daniel may have cult objects, or those who desecrate through their erection, in view, since the use of the term in Maccabees refers to something constructed (a form of the verb ἀκοδομεῖν) on the altar of the Temple, probably after the implication of “setting” or “erecting” (a form of ἀνάπτυχτη) in the Dancel passages.

\textsuperscript{25}Cf. Milton Dutra Amorim, “Desecration and Defilement in the Old Testament,” p. 266 who observes: “As far as the use of יָפַע in Daniel is concerned, the meaning of the “abomination of desolation” seems to go beyond the idea of idol with an eschatological dimension ... To limit its interpretation to Antiochus Epiphanes ... seems to contradict the NT use of the text in an eschatological perspective.”
The nature of גֵּדֶר is described by the Pol’el participle בֹּשֶׁה/בֹשֶׁה, derived from the root בֹּשׁ which has a range of verbal meanings: "devastate, desolate, desert, appall, with nominal derivatives: waste, horror, devastation, appallment. Austel in his study of the term says that "basic to the idea of the root is the desolation caused by some great disaster, usually as a result of divine judgment."\(^{26}\) Uses of בֹּשׁ in contexts outside of Daniel (e.g., Isaiah 49:8, 19; Lamentations 5:18; Ezekiel 33:28; 35:12) refer to desolation that occurs when an area has been devastated as a result of war or natural consequence.\(^{27}\) Perhaps for this reason it has also been used to described an attitude of appalling horror due to criminal and barbaric acts of idolatry.\(^{28}\) The Pol’el here has a causative (or better, factitive) force similar to the use of the Hiphil, except that the Hiphil generally involves a physical devastation, while the Pol’el seems to put more stress on the fact that someone has caused (active) the Sanctuary or altar to be desecrated, thus rendering it unfit for the worship and service of YHWH.

As we move to the context of Daniel, we find that the two nuances of בֹּשׁ, that of "desolation due to war" and "desolation due to idolatry," may be combined in Daniel 8:13, which describes the condition of Jerusalem under foreign domination: מַעְקַרָת וְהַמַּעְקַרָת מְדִינָת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם … עַד הַמַּעְקַרָת מְדִינָת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם ("…How long will be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression that causes desolation so as to permit both the Sanctuary and the sancta to be trampled?").\(^{29}\) This is very similar to the description of Jerusalem in Daniel 12:11


\(^{27}\)This was the verdict of M. J. Lagrange, "La prophétique des soixante-dix semaines de Daniel (Dan. IX, 24-27)," *RB* 39 (1930): 188: "Le verbe בֹּשׁ signifie originairement demeurer stupéfiant à la vue d’une chose horrible, ensuite dévaster désoler."

\(^{28}\)BDB s.v. "בֹּשׁ," pp. 1030-1031.

\(^{29}\)While בֹּשׁ could here be translated as "the transgression that causes horror," expressing the psychological nuance as a result of the idolatrous act, it seems preferable to retain the idea of cultic [or spiritual] "desolation" as a result of
where a foreign invader has both abolished the regular sacrifice and substituted for it sacrifices of an abomination ("an abomination that causes desolation"); ("And from the time that the daily [sacrifice] shall be removed and the abomination that causes desolation set up, [there shall be] 1,290 days"). Perhaps the idea here is of both defilement by conquest and desecration of the cultus, resulting from the dual invasive act of "destroying" the proper cultus (the prescribed sacrifices), and instituting an idolatrous one (pagan sacrifices). H. H. Rowley suggested such a double reference for בְּשַׁמֵּם and בְּשָׁמְךָ, both to the desolation of the Sanctuary [by Antiochus IV] and to the shock this gave the faithful, and also to the madness of the desolator. In Daniel 9:26 the description is of an invasion of Jerusalem by a new leader (נְבֵד), whose people (i.e., army) (םַלְחֵם) will destroy the Sanctuary as an act of war (םַלְחֵם). However, the verse of verse 26 is said to be נְבֵד ("the coming leader"). If the intention had been that the name of verse 26 was the immediate leader who desolated the Temple the text should have read לְפִלְג ("his people"). The "coming leader" will be ethnically identified with the present לְפִלְג, but in verse 26, he serves only as a type of the eschatological Temple Desecrator (previously typified by cultic oppressors). The language of the text, therefore, reserves his act of desolation until verse 27, which we will argue is chronologically subsequent (although grammatically parallel) to verse 26.

The Use of בֶּשָּׂמֶךָ and בֶּשַׁמֵּךָ in the Septuagintal Text

As we have seen, בֶּשַׁמֵּךָ has both the sense of "being desolate," and of "being appalled [due to idolatry]." The LXX and Theodotion opted for the former sense of "desolate" with the verb ἐπηνόη, however, as C. H. Dodd has pointed

idolatry, in keeping with the concept of מְדַמְּכָה as desecration, and allow מְדַמְּכָה to carry the nuance of physical desolation.

out, the Greek phrase is meaningless, and serves no better as an apocalyptic cryptogram. Many modern scholars have opted for the latter sense, translating as “appalling sacrilege.” David Wenham, in a more mediating posture, suggests that it is possible several connotations were intended:

the term may have been a parody of the name of the pagan god, and may have suggested both the desolation brought to the temple (spiritual desolation at least), and the appalling nature of what had taken place …”

He also includes with the above connotations the possible allusion to the alleged madness of Antiochus Epiphanes (ἐπιμανέως) proposed by Rowley, since the root ἔπιμανεω sometimes has this sense in Mishnaic Hebrew.

The Meaning of the Greek Phrase βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐπιμανασσευσ

The Greek term βδέλυγμα is used by the NT four times (Luke 16:15; Revelation 7:4, 5; 21:27), and by the LXX seventeen times, to translate γράφω. βδέλυγμα comes from the root βδέω, “to make foul”, or from βδελύσαω, “to stink.” Thus it has the basic idea of something makes one feel nauseous, and by transference, psychologically or morally abhorrent and detestable. As with the Hebrew meaning in Tanach, the Greek term is applied particularly to idols or associated with idolatrous practices. Foerster confirms this basic idea, noting


33This supposition was derived from the popular poetic pun ἐπιμανεώς (“madman”) on Antiochus IV’s claim to manifest deity with the epithet ἐπιφανεῖς (“manifest one”).


36Cf. BAGD, s.v. “βδέλυγμα,” p. 134: (1) literally, anything that must not be brought before God because it arouses His wrath (cf. LXX Isaiah 1:13; Proverbs
that in the LXX βδέλυγμα is used frequently for the word group γραφή (e.g., 9 times in Leviticus, 20 in the prophets, and 3 times elsewhere). He further notes that idols themselves may be called βδελύγματα (= βασίλεια), especially in the writing prophets, and that there is there an extension which makes the use parallel to ἀνουμιά ("lawlessness"). This point will prove noteworthy as we consider an allusion to the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in II Thessalonians 2:3 which describes the same figure by the phrase ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνουμιάς ("man of lawlessness").37 Also in this regard, βδέλυγμα may be used as an expression of the dualistic antithesis between the divine and human wills, as well as denoting the repugnance of the ungodly to the will of God (cf. LXX Proverbs 29:27; Ecclesiasticus 1:25; 13:20). Conversely, in Luke 16:15, βδέλυγμα is used of the repugnance of God to human pride (i.e., to things highly esteemed by men, which is tantamount to idolatry).38

The second member of our expression, ἐρημώσεως, is the genitive feminine singular of ἐρημώσεως from ἐρημῶ. This term may not as closely represent the Hebrew הָעְרָה, as βδέλυγμα did γραφή. This will become clearer as we consider the meaning of ἐρημώσεως without reference to its Hebrew "equivalent." The lexical form ἐρημῶ signifies "to lay waste, make desolate, bring to ruin" (cf. Matthew 12:25; Luke 11:17; Revelation 17:16; 18:17, 19). The only occurrence of the ἐρημώσεως construction is in relation to the phrase βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14), and the parallel passage in Luke 21:20.

37W. Foerster, "βδέλυγμα," TDNT 1 (1964): 598. His references for the βδελύγματα are: (LXX Jeremiah 13:27; 39:35; 51:22; Ezekiel 5:9, 11; 6:9, etc.), and for the parallel with ἀνουμιά: (LXX Jeremiah 4:1; Ezekiel 11:18; 20:30; Amos 6:8; Psalm 5:7; 13:1; 52:1; 118:163; Job 15:16).

An adjectival form, ἐρυμος, as well as the substantival form ἡ ἐρμος, is well attested in Classical literature with the meaning “abandonment.” It usually describes a condition, e.g., of a place (“abandoned city”) or person (“abandoned wife”), but can also be used of “waste” in the sense that a thing is unprofitable, and of a state of being “left alone” (cf. Luke 15:4, where the shepherd leaves the 99 sheep ἐν τῇ ἐρμῳ). A city or country may also be described as ἐρμος (“devastated”) as the result of an attack by foreign enemies (cf. Matthew 12:25: ἐρμοῦται, “brought to desolation”). In the LXX it serves chiefly in prophetic passages to denote the result of divine wrath (cf. Isaiah 6:11; Lamentations 5:18; Ezekiel 6:6), a use also appearing in the New Testament (cf. Matthew 23:38; Revelation 17:16). Returning to the ἐρμωστὶ ἐρμῶσες construction, it is used most commonly in the LXX for דָּשֵׁם or its cognates (cf. Leviticus 26:34, 35; Psalm 72 [73]: 19; II Chronicles 30:7; 36:21; Jeremiah 4:7), generally of the condition of desolation of the Land as a result of desecration and exile. It is this sense that is most likely in the background of the LXX of Daniel 9:27.

Theories for the Anomalous Construction דָּשֵׁם כִּפְצֵי

When we seek to understand the variant forms of the phrase that combines these two terms, we are faced with a number of grammatical anomalies. In Daniel 8:13 and 11:31 the form is the substantive with the article and the participle without it: דָּשֵׁם כִּפְצֵי, while in Daniel 9:27 the form combines a plural noun with a singular participle: דָּשֵׁם כִּפְצֵי. All of these forms are oddities, but Daniel 9:27 is considered a linguistic impossibility. The only grammatically correct construct form is that of Daniel 12:11: דָּשֵׁם כִּפְצֵי.

The Theory of Textual Emendation

One theory which has been advanced in an attempt to explain the difficulty of this construction has been made to amend the Massoretic Text of Daniel 9:27. This has been done by “re-establishing” the singular כִּפְצֵי, on the

---

basis that the plural כפץ is the result of a dittography with the first letter of the following word. This would reconcile the expression with the other forms in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11 and to its own singular predicate. If a performative מ can be conjectured to have dropped out of Daniel 8:13 and 12:11, then these forms could also be taken as פול’el participles, rather than Qal participles, furthering the agreement. Ginsberg seeks to resolve the difficulty by disregarding the definite article at Daniel 9:27 and 11:31, but without justification.40

While the proposed emendation is plausible, we must point out that this common recourse for reconciliation of lexical difficulties it is not advisable here, since not only has the MT preserved these forms, but also the Greek (LXX, Theodotion) and Latin (Vulgate), as well as most of the ancient versions.41 If the phrases were considered grammatically incorrect, why did I Maccabees or Matthew and Mark in the New Testament not seek to correct the error in their use of the term? Lococque suggests that the plural כפץ could be maintained if it were a substitute for אלהים (“God”), single word, which though quasi-plural in form still governs a singular verb or predicate.42 In this theory, an idol pretends to be אלהים, but is in fact only: it pretends to represent Israel’s אלהים, but is instead כפץ, “horrifying, terrifying, destructive,” in the image of its author, “the devastator.”

The Theory of Consonantal Substitution

The most widely accepted theory to explain the form כפץ in Daniel 9:27 is that first advanced by E. Nestle in 1884 in a brief grammatical note.


41The Massoretes viewed the Hebrew text as inviolable, yet in their tradition of trying to smooth out grammatical and lexical difficulties, they attempted to resolve the problem in Daniel 9:27 by attaching כפץ to the preceding singular word כפץ (“wing”).

in the German journal *Zeitschrift für Altestament Wissenschaft.* His theory is based on the practice in Tanach (especially the writing prophets) and in Jewish apocalyptic literature of substituting other terms, often parodies or puns, for the titles of pagan deities in order to avoid referring to them directly (Exodus 23:13). A similar euphemistic approach is argued by Nestle for מָכָּה מְפִית הַקָּשִׁים as


44Cf. e.g. such deliberate vocalic alteration as at II Samuel 4:1, 4; Jeremiah 7:31-32 (cf. 32:35) where the Aramaic term סָפָרָה (“fireplace”), referring to the site of ritual child-sacrifice in the Hinnom valley, is pointed סָפָרָה in Hebrew, apparently after the pointing of סָפָרָה (“shame”). The same vocalic substitution was also made for סָפָרָה as סָפָרָה. Micah 1:10-16 offers an example of assonance word play. For other examples cf. Hosea 9:10; Jeremiah 3:24; 11:13; II Samuel 2:8/I Chronicles 7:33. This method of parody substitution was not only used for foreign deities, but for people who were detestable because of ethical or covenantal violations, e.g., the close relative of Boaz and Ruth is not referred to by name, but is called מַלְיָה מַלְיָה (“such a one”), because he refused to honor his obligation to serve as a בָּרָא in leverite marriage (Ruth 4:2, 6).
taking it as a cacophemisthic distortion for the official designation of בָּלָה or Ze'rus Ὠλύμπος, ("lord of heaven"). In this case, בָּלָה serves as a parodic substitute for בְּלֵל ("Ba'al") or Syrian Zeus ("Zeus") and בְּלֵל as an allophonic substitute for the consonantly similar בָּלָה ("heaven"). The title “lord of heaven” was a foreign (Canaanite and Syrian) epithet for the principal deity, or head of the pantheon, אלהים ("God Most High") was commonly used to express this idea, but a parallel expression אֶלִיוֹן ("God of heaven") appears in Persian period texts (Ezra 1:2; 6:10; 7:12, 21; Nehemiah 1:5; 2:4), and as Aramaic מִלָּה in Daniel 2:18. While this latter expression appears to have avoided in pre-exilic Israel, it may have been used polemically because of the popular influence of Zoroastrianism in the Persian period. On similar grounds, if this cacophemism is correct, then בָּלָה, and related expressions, had a derogatory or polemical purpose, serving as a theological evaluation of the act/and or actor of desecration.

When Nestle proposed his theory he added that it did not resolve fully the grammatical irregularities, e.g., the unnecessary article on בָּלָה. More recently these grammatical abnormalities appearing in Daniel 8-12 may have been traced to a specific cause. Daube, citing the rabbinic tradition of attaching significance to

45 Apparently "lord of heaven" became a technical term for Ze'rus Ὠλύμπος αὐξήσει this is the title Antiochus gave to the god to whom he re-dedicated the Jerusalem Temple (II Maccabees 6:2). We must disagree with B. Hasslberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis: Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Daniel 8 und 10-12 (St. Ottilien: Eos, 1977), p. 343, that מִלָּה was of recent creation, apparently not having a fixed form, on the basis of its use by Abraham in Genesis 24:7 and cf. in one of the Hallel psalms (Psalm 136:26). In these cases, and perhaps also in the Persian period and in Daniel, מִלָּה may simply be a reverential substitute for מִלָּה, as it became, with other terms, "Name," "Throne," etc. in the rabbinic period. There is, however, evidence for this substitution even earlier, cf. Elsear 94-95; OTP 2 (1983-1985); 499.


expressions in the original that hint at mystery by irregularity of form, suggests that the article have been used early as an intentional device to distinguish something or someone special.\footnote{48} He points out that the unusual form of this expression in the Greek text of Mark 13 must be explained by a dependence on Daniel 9:27, "with the article in Midrashic fashion interpreted as singling out a particular individual - the Antichrist, a heathen god, the Emperor or his statue ..."\footnote{49} If Daube's suggestion is correct, then this may offer an explanation, both for the anomalous forms, and for the technical usage of the expression.

**The Theory of Influence from Jeremiah and Ezekiel**

Another explanation for the expression comes from the literary and theological linkage of both נָרַס וּסְכִּים in the prominent prophetic writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.\footnote{50} These texts, especially with their promise of a resolution of the dilemma for the Temple, which in part governed Daniel's concern, may well have influenced this anomalous construction. A brief survey of the usage of these terms in Jeremiah and Ezekiel will help us examine this possibility.

In these books, which treat extensively the desecration and defilement of the Temple, frequent mention is made in pertinent contexts of pagan profanation of the Sanctuary of both "abominations" and "desolations" (Jeremiah 4:1, 27; 7:10; 44:22; Ezekiel 5:11, 14-15; 7:20)\footnote{51} and of idolatry that having desecrated

---


\footnote{49*Ibid.*


\footnote{51}I have restricted my examples to those passages employing only the term נָרַס, however, the number of references could be doubled if we included those containing the synonym וְנָרֵעַ.
the Holy Place, will call forth foreign invaders who will further desecrate and destroy the Temple (cf. Jeremiah 4:6-8; Ezekiel 6:11; 7:20-23). Jeremiah 44:22 in particular, though using הַעֲבָדָה, rather than שֵׁקָר, states that Israel’s “abominations” have caused the desolation (חֵרֵב) of the Land and made it נְשָׁמָה ("an object of horror"). Ezekiel 5:11, 15 link שֵׁקָר and נְשָׁמָה in a cause-effect relationship: שֵׁקָר ("abominations") cause the Land (and Nation) to become נְשָׁמָה ("an object of horror").

Ezekiel 7 is the climax to the first series of Ezekiel’s messages concerning Temple desecration. The context is one of judgment, with terms such as הָסֵכָר ("the end"), סכֹם ("judgment"), חַיָּה מָרָה ("abominations"), חַיָּה כְּהָנִית ("day of tumult"), חַיָּה כְּכֶרֶת ("fury"), חַיָּה מַגֶּשׁ ("smiting"), רִזֹּר ("My wrath"), הַיּוֹם נֶבֶרֶת ("the day of YHWH’s wrath"), הָסֵכָר ("defile"), and נְשָׁמָה ("desolation") being in frequent repetition. In particular, Ezekiel 7:20-24 links נְשָׁמָה וְסִכֹּר with especially חַיָּה, with reference to the desecration of the Temple (called here זֵמָה ("My secret [place]") and מָכָר ("Holy Place").

As we saw in our review of these early chapters of Ezekiel in chapter four, the movement from this point is to the departure of the Shekinah in chapters 10-11 as a prelude to defilement and destruction. In Ezekiel 9:8 the severe judgments leveled against Jerusalem in the form of war, pestilence, and famine are such that Ezekiel fears that the whole remnant of Israel will utterly perish. Similar scenes are mirrored in Jeremiah (cf. e.g., 7:32-34), Lamentations (cf. e.g., 1:4-5, 8-10, 16; 2:6-10, 20; 5:18), and some of the Psalms (cf. e.g., 74:1-7; 79:1-7), and were reinforced by the historical and theological reviews and warnings of the post-exilic prophets, who likewise rehearsed the eschatological battle to come against Jerusalem (cf. Zechariah 14:2).

We have sought to make a point of the desecration motifs in these prophetic texts, because it will be our argument that Jesus saw his message as a

---

52The actual term in the text (verse 24) is מקדשים ("their holy places"), however, we take this with reference to the single Temple with its many courts and compartments.
continuation of the biblical prophets, and thus his eschatological discourses should be seen in the prophetic context. The frequent citations from Jeremiah and Zechariah make it certain that Jesus and the disciples were evaluating their generation in light of these prophecies, and interpreting the events affecting the city and Temple as desecrations, spoke of Jerusalem’s future in like terms. As we will see in Jesus’ “cleansing of the Temple” pericope, the background for the action is most likely Jeremiah’s Temple sermon, and it is in this context that Jesus makes his predictions about the destruction of the city and Temple. The Olivet discourse contains striking resemblance’s to the prophetic judgment passages of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. If these are then linked with the citation from Daniel, we see a pattern of dependence upon collections of prophetic texts that were themselves dependent upon one another.

As we have seen in our survey of the desecration motif in the prophets, and especially in these texts which include Jeremiah’s Temple sermon and the desecration background to its theological exposition in Ezekiel 36:19-21, desecration by foreign invaders as a result of Israelite violations of covenant and cult form the materia prima of their discourses. If Daniel is indeed a sixth-century composition by a member of the exilic community, then both the writings of Ezekiel, and Jeremiah would have greatly affected his thinking. This fact is supported by the internal evidence of the book when we find Daniel studying Jeremiah’s prophecy in order to determine the end of the desolations (Daniel 9:2). As the most prominent of our expressions is in this chapter, it lends weight to the argument that the association of יָפַק and עָבָדָה in Jeremiah and Ezekiel influenced Daniel’s construction of מָתָר וּמָכַבֶּה. If this is so, then Daniel may be attempting to load a theological summation of desecration into this expression, to convey in a single thought the entire corpus of prophetic doctrine touching on any future events earmarked by this phrase. This may be helpful in explaining why Jesus in the Olivet Discourse (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14a) used this expression to denote the signal event which would serve as warning of the arrival of apocalyptic fulfillment (Matthew 24:16-31; Mark 13:14b-27).
Before proceeding to examine the use of מִסְרָאָה as a Temple desecration motif in Daniel 9:27, we must consider the possible influence of desecration typology in assigning this expression to an individual (cast in the form of an eschatological Temple Desecrator) who commits desolation by virtue of invasion into the realm of the holy.

The Figure of the Temple Desecrator in Daniel

In the historical survey of desecration, our brief introduction to the figure of the Pharaoh as an opponent of the divine purpose, if not of YHWH Himself, will find a renewed application in the figure of Nebuchadnezzar as the self-sovereign par excellence (Daniel 4:30; cf. Habakkuk 1:7, 11). , and to again briefly consider the literary importance of Nebuchadnezzar as a forerunner of the eschatological desecrator of Daniel 9:27 as interpreted by the apocalypticists and in the New Testament.

Nebuchadnezzar as a Type of Eschatological Desecrator

Just as in the Pentateuch Egypt was a type of the pagan world set in opposition to YHWH and His people, and Pharaoh was its representative opponent, so in the historical books, Babylon assumes the role of the wicked empire, and its ruler, Nebuchadnezzar, inherits the mantle of YHWH’s adversary.\(^{53}\) The two figures are alike in their relationship to YHWH. In both

\(^{53}\)“Nebuchadnezzar”, or preferably “Nebuchadrezzar “ (on the basis of the Akkadian nabu-kudurri-usur) means “Nabu has guarded my boundary-stone,” is chosen over other figures who invaded the Land at this time, e.g., Sennacherib, Shalmanezer III, because they are of Assyrian origin, and Assyria did not successfully desecrate the Temple, and also because Assyria is not presented as the embodiment of opposition as is Babylon, but is even promised a distinct future in the restoration as “YHWH’s people” (Isaiah ). It might be argued that this would also be true of Egypt, since they are named with Assyria in this passage, but Egypt is not consistently pictured as a place of opposition (although of idolatrous influence) - it often served as a place of [usually, illegitimate] refuge (and especially in the exilic period, Jeremiah 43-45), rather it is the Pharaoh who is the embodiment of such opposition. Babylon, by contrast, both in Tanach and in the New Testament, is pictured as an evil system, beginning with Babel (Genesis 11:1-9) and reappearing as an economic (Revelation 18:1-19) and evil
cases, they represent themselves as fiercely independent of YHWH, acknowledging only their autonomous authority and that of their gods, while at the same time they are presented as instruments of YHWH’s divine purpose. Pharaoh was “hardened” to allow YHWH to demonstrate His sovereignty and incomparability through the plagues, Nebuchadnezzar is summoned from his place to serve as the rod of YHWH’s anger (Jeremiah 25:9, 11; cf. 43:10). Each receive a personal demonstration of YHWH’s power, and each are humbled and must grudgingly (or perhaps with Nebuchadnezzar, repentantly) acknowledge YHWH’s sole sovereignty.

While with Pharaoh we saw a human desecrating Israel by disallowing the cult to function (the worship in the wilderness), and especially by preventing the people from returning to their own Land, the only legitimate refuge from defilement (since contact with idolatry or idolatrous places renders one unclean). With Nebuchadnezzar we see desecration in full form, as he makes physical contact with the Temple and sancta, and discontinues the operation of the cult. In this he sets the pattern for all future desecrators, whether Greek (Alexander), Seleucid (Antiochus IV Epiphanes), Roman (Pompey, Vespasian, Titus, Hadrian, or Caligula) or the eschatological “desolator” who demonstrates his character as such by Temple desecration (Daniel 9:27).

As we have seen, Daniel is an apocalyptic work (Daniel 10:14; cf. 2:45) and a characteristic of apocalypses is the use of historical and geographical names symbolically to set forth a revelation. In this regard William Sanford LaSor remarks:

Thus “Babylon” in Rev. 17-18 …was meant to symbolize any tyrannical and satanic anti-God system. “Nebuchadnezzar” can be similarly interpreted as the splendid head of a great world kingdom that was given several opportunities to recognize the kingdom of God…but repeatedly indicated a lack of true repentance; cf. Danl. 2:29; 4:34-37 [MT 31-34].

spiritual power (cf. Revelation 14:8; 16:19; 17:5). Nebuchadnezzar had the distinction of being the only Babylonian ruler to invade Judah and desecrate its Temple.

In Daniel 2:38, Nebuchadnezzar is depicted as the head of gold in a visionary statue that foretold the successive kingdoms to follow that of Babylon, and ultimately the kingdom of God. Rather than acknowledge that YHWH was sovereign over all these revealed kingdoms, and that He had bestowed the present rulership of Babylon to Nebuchadnezzar, he arrogantly assumed to himself autonomy and incomparability. This was first demonstrated by his construction of an immense (90-foot) image of gold, apparently in an attempt at self-fulfillment of the prophecy himself, forcing all worshippers of YHWH to bow to the idol (Daniel 3:1-12). Second, this was seen in Nebuchadnezzar’s self-glorification (Daniel 4:29-30) one year after a prophetic warning by Daniel to abandon his deportism and self-aggrandizement (Daniel 4:19-27). In this attitude of independent opposition to the people and purpose of YHWH, and the attempt to thwart the establishment of the divine kingdom by human means, Nebuchadnezzar became epitomized as an evil leader whose role in the divine scheme was to serve as a desolator.

This image of Nebuchadnezzar, like that of Pharaoh, finds support in the Aggadaic literature. He is frequently referred to as “the wicked one” (Ber. 57b; Shab. 149b) as well as “wicked slave” and “hater and adversary” of God (Lam. R.; Proem 23). He is also depicted as a cruel conqueror (Ned. 65a; Lam. R. 2:10, no. 14) who tortured his victims (Lev. R. 19:6) and killed large numbers of Judean exiles (Sanh. 92b), as well as being a sexual deviant (Shab. 149b). According to the Midrash, Nebuchadnezzar’s only hesitation in destroying Jerusalem and the Temple was political expediency (Lam. R. Proems 23, 30), but since he left the burning of the Temple to Nebuzaradan, he is assailed for attempting to force the Jewish exiles to worship idols. Nevertheless, the Roman emperor Caligula, who attempted to place his image in the Sanctuary in 40 C.E., was stated to be a madman like Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Josephus, Antiquities 18. 261-309; Wars 21. 184-203; Tacitus, Historiae 5.9; Philo, In Flaccum 31; Leg. Gai. 29-43).

Therefore, we may find in the imagery of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel a fitting type for the desolator of Daniel 8:13; 9:27; 11:31; and 12:11 without
resorting to a Maccabean figure, who undoubtedly, in Antiochus IV Epiphanes, followed the paradigm of the desolator, but did not completely fulfill the details of the type as presented in the seventy weeks (e.g., ratifying the covenant, destroying the Temple). For this reason, the desecration figure of an eschatological desolator remains to be fulfilled in an opponent to the divine purpose who will himself be destroyed by a direct intervention of YHWH at the eschaton.

We now turn to a study of the "abomination of desolation" within the context of Daniel, with special attention to Daniel 9:27 and its eschatological interpretation. Based upon an exegetical and theological examination of the use of this expression in the argument of the chapter, we will be prepared to argue for its use as an eschatological motif which serves as the source for New Testament explication.

**The "Abomination of Desolation" in Daniel 9:27**

We have already stated the importance of Daniel 9:27 as the basis for the teaching of the eschatological desecration of Jerusalem and the Temple, both in the application of this concept to historical figures in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, and in the New Testament’s use in the Synoptic Gospels and 2 Thessalonians 2. The problems regarding the exegesis of Daniel 9:24-27 concern the difficulty of the text and the multiplicity of the interpretations raised. It will not be our procedure to exegete the entire prophecy, nor to engage ourselves with the various conflicting interpretations offered to explain the passage, rather, we will focus on verse 27 in order to explicate its concept of the “abomination of desolation,” and the nature of the verse as post-eventu prophecy.

**The Context of Daniel 9:27**

This passage is set within the context of the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” (verses 24-27). While it would be helpful to be able to establish the terminus ad quem of the prophecy, i.e., מִרְכָּבָה רַבָּה תְּלֻשְׁו לָבַת יְהוָה יִרְשָׁד ("the going forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem," verse 25), it is of greater significance for us to
establish the *terminus a quo*, which has even more diverse views, but determines the eschatological interpretation of the last division of the book.

There is general agreement among scholars that Daniel should be divided as: Daniel 1-6, consisting primarily of historical narration, and Daniel 7-12, consisting of visions concerning the future kingdoms of the world and of YHWH.\(^{55}\) Daniel 9:27 is part of the prophetic section (verses 24-27) concluding the ninth chapter known as the prophecy of the “seventy weeks.” The reference to the “seventy weeks” and their predicted fulfillment in this text, points to the purpose for Daniel 9:24-27 in relation to the prayer of Daniel (Daniel 9:3-19) following his observation of the “seventy years” prophecy in Jeremiah 25:11-12; 29:10 (Daniel 9:2). The “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” in Daniel 9:24-27 is preceded in verses 20-23 by a visitation of the divine messenger Gabriel in response to his prayer.

Since the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” appears as a divine answer to Daniel’s prayer we should notice concerning this prayer that:

1. Daniel’s prayer centers on a request for divine clemency toward the desolated Sanctuary (verse 18), the people and city (verse 19), in each case because they are YHWH’s possession and are called by His Name.

2. The prayer uses a number of terms that will be developed in verses 24-27: מָצְרוּת (“desolations”), verse 17-18, מָרָד (“transgressions”), verse 17, נִשְׁעַת (“iniquity”), verses 5, 13, 16, מָאָס (“sin”), verses 5, 8, 11, 20, מְדִינָה (“Sanctuary”), verse 17 (cf. verse 20), מִדְרָשׁ (“city”), verse 19, מָעָה (“people”), verses 19-20, and “covenant” = מַסֵּכָה (“Law of Moses”), verses 11, 13.

3. The prayer contains vocabulary reminiscent of Jeremiah and Ezekiel’s desecration passages: (a) departure of Israel from covenant (verses 5, 10-11, 13, 14-15), (b) judgment of the curses written in the Law (verses 11, 13), (c) refusal to hear the prophets (verses 6, 10), (d) the sins of the fathers (verses 6, 8, 16), (e) identification with holy Name (verse

19), (f) exile due to cultic rebellion (verse 7), (g) the reproach from the nations caused by Israel's exile (verse 16). This point is significant, in that the concern of Jeremiah was idolatry and desecration, the very problem faced by Daniel as a captive in exile.

The Relationship of Daniel 9 to Jeremiah's Prophecy

Daniel's prayer helps us to especially draw a link between the desecration/restoration context of Jeremiah's prophecy and that of Daniel's Seventy Weeks.\textsuperscript{56} Just as Jeremiah's prophecy was a reaction to desecration, with the promise of resultant judgment on all foreign desecrators, so was Daniel's. Just as the consequence of this judgment of the nations was to result in Israel's restoration (spiritually and nationally), Jeremiah 30-33, so also in Daniel (cf. chapters 11-12, which are prefaced by a declaration of their eschatological in 10:14). This answers to Daniel's petition for Israel's restoration based on divine election (verses 17-19; cf. Ezekiel 36:22-23). What is significant here, is that Daniel 9:3-19 places the prophecy of verses 24-27 in an historical context as an extension of Jeremiah's historical prophecy.\textsuperscript{57} Therefore, as Jacques Doukhan has pointed out: "The seventy weeks' prophecy must be interpreted with regard to history in as realistic a way as Daniel did for the prophecy of Jeremiah."\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56}For the argument against Daniel 9:4-20 as a late interpolation and in support of the unity of chapter 9, including the prayer and the Seventy Weeks Prophecy, cf. B. W. Jones, "The Prayer in Daniel 9," \textit{Vetus Testamentum} 18 (1968): 488.

\textsuperscript{57}The Jewish commentators Abarbanel and Malbim understood the reference of the seventy weeks as an additional interpretation of the seventy years of Jeremiah (thus, seventy weeks were meant as seventy weeks of years). The Malbim adds that Jeremiah's prophecy had a dual meaning: first, the 70 year exile had satisfied the punishment for the desecration of the seventy sabbatical years (Leviticus 26:34; 2 Chronicles 36:21), but, second, other sins in addition to the violation of the sabbatical law (e.g., idolatry, bloodshed, licentiousness, cf. Yoma 96), would require the full period of 490 years for atonement as prescribed in Daniel 9:24.

This prayer, then, helps us to establish a connection between the
desecration context of Jeremiah and the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy,” and the
answer it contains with respect to the restoration promised in those contexts and
requested at the end of Daniel’s prayer (verse 17-19). This recognition led
Lester Grabbe to conclude that “the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” of Daniel 9:24-
27 is explicitly an interpretation of the Seventy Years Prophecy of Jeremiah and is
a good example of the hermeneutical process already attested in the canonical text
itself.”

Though the Jeremiah prophecy may be recognized as the source for the
Danic prophecy, this recognition in itself is not entirely helpful, since already in
post-exilic times Jeremiah’s seventy years had become a hermeneutical problem
(cf. Zechariah 1:12; II Chronicles 36:22-23). This observation led Grabbe to
suggest that Daniel 9:24-27 may have represented an old oracle adapted by
Daniel. Whether or not we accept this suggestion, the prayer in verses 3-19
places the prophecy of verses 24-27 in an historical context as an extension of
Jeremiah’s historical prophecy. If Jeremiah’s prophecy is to be interpreted with
regard to history in a realistic manner, so too, must Daniel’s “Seventy Weeks
Prophecy.”

---

59 Cf. for the argument against Daniel 9:4-20 as a late interpolation and in support
of the unity of chapter 9, including the prayer and the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy,”

60 Lester Grabbe, op. cit., p. 72.

61 Ibid., pp. 67-71. Grabbe makes this suggestion for several reasons: (1) linguistic
non-parallels with chapters 8-12, e.g. “covenant,” “many,” “anointed,” (2) a
similar non-canonical oracle cited by Josephus, and (3) the incongruous nature of
this prophecy with the supposed historical context of the Maccabean period. For
this last reason Grabbe would see the prophecy as post-eventum prophecy as
opposed to the rest of Daniel which he sees as largely ex-eventu prophecy.

Andrews University Seminary Studies 17 (Spring, 1979): 8.
An Exegesis of Daniel 9:27

The text of Daniel 9:27 reads: מְשַׁמֵּחַ תְּרוּפָה הַיָּמִים שָׁלֹשָׁה שָׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים וְיָמָן יָמִים לַעֲשֹׂר יָמִים נְתוֹנִי הפּוֹקְדֵהוּ ("And he will confirm a covenant with the many for one week, but in the middle of the week he will cause the sacrifice and grain offering to cease. And on the wing of abominations will come the desolating one; until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out upon the desolating one.")

In surveying the Hebrew text of verse 27, a number of exegetical questions arise: (1) who is the implied רוֹד in רֹדֶךְ דַּבָּר, verse 27a?, (2) what is the meaning of דַּבָּר in verse 27a?, (3) what is the meaning of הטֵיקוֹן אֲרֵי and the referent of הטֵיקוֹן אֲרֵי in verse 27b?, (4) what is the interpretation of בָּעֵר, verse 27c?, (5) what is the function of הקָפָן? Is it a genitive linked with הקָפָן, or a subject?, (6) what interpretation is to be given to הקָפָן in verse 27c-d: "appalling," or "desolate"/Qal participle: "desolate one," or Pol'el participle: "desolator"?, (7) what is the temporal referent of הרָכָל לְכָלָה in verse 27d? We will attempt to address the majority of these questions in our exegesis.

The Interpretation of the Phrase דַּבָּר

The phrase דַּבָּר תְּרוּפָה לַעֲשֹׂר ("And he will confirm a covenant with the many") has two areas of difficulty: the identification of the subject (implied רוֹד) of דַּבָּר, and the meaning of the idiomatic expression תְּרוּפָה. If the רוֹד is taken as impersonal ("it"), then the subject would be the phrase הטֵיקוֹן אֲרֵי ("one week"). However, this poetic use is without support as Bevan has pointed out, "to speak of time as 'making a covenant' ... would be quite without analogy."63 It is also preferable to have a definite, personal subject who effects the covenant to complement the personal object (הלֵבָעָה) with whom it is effected. In this case, the subject may be inferred from the previous verse (26), either as הלֵבָעָה ("the anointed one," "messiah") or as בְּנֵי חָנֹן ("the coming leader/prince"). Of these

63A. A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1892), p. 159.
two options, יָדְוָ יִשָּׁבֵא is the nearer antecedent, and therefore, grammatically preferable.\textsuperscript{64} It may also be the more suitable subject if it is identified with מְסֶלֶךְ (“the desolator”) in the present verse, since יֶעַרְפָּא (“the people of the prince”) in verse 26 were the agents of the destruction of the Temple. There has, of course, been considerable debate over the interpretation of the יָדְוָ יִשָּׁבֵא, however, the identification of the implied יָדְוָ יִשָּׁבֵא in the expression יָדְוָ יִשָּׁבֵא is crucial to the interpretation of the text.

In the expression יָדְוָ יִשָּׁבֵא ברית, the verb is from the root נָרָא “to be strong, mighty,” and in the Hiphil (perfect + waw consecutive) it can mean “to strengthen,” with the resulting translation (taking ברית as the object) being: “to confirm a covenant” (either a new or an existing one), or “to make a strong/firm covenant.”\textsuperscript{65} Support for the former translation, “confirm,” may be had from a comparative use in the Qumran literature (1QH 8.35). Goldingay prefers the translation “prevail,” taking ברית as the subject, based on a similar usage in Psalm 12:5; cf. 1QH 2.24.\textsuperscript{66} The referent of ברית is most likely that given for the context of the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” in the introductory destination of the prophecy (verse 24): יָסְכַּנְעַ יָסְכַּנְעַ נַגְּדָר עָלָּי (‘Seventy weeks are appointed


\textsuperscript{65} Among those adopting a literal interpretation of the prophecy, if a previously ratified covenant is in view, suggested concerning its identity have ranged from the Abrahamic Covenant (Genesis 15:18-21) to a Palestinian Covenant (Deuteronomy 29:1-30:20), to a covenant of peace that follows the War of Gog and Magog (Ezekiel 37:26; cf. Isaiah 55:3). If a new covenant, the thought is of a counterfeit New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31-34; cf. Isaiah 59:21), made by a counterfeit messiah (Antichrist and his false prophet). In either case, the supposed result would be the rebuilding of the Temple (cf. Jeremiah 31:38-40; Ezekiel 37:26-28) which would seem to inaugurate the promised Age of Redemption, confirmed through supernatural demonstrations (cf. Revelation 13:1-10; 11-18).

\textsuperscript{66} John Goldingay, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 230 (n. 27.a.).
for your people [i.e., the people of Israel],” cf. Isaiah 52:14; 53:12). The Interpretation of the Chronological Referent

The term שֵׁמֶר (“one week”) refers to the final or seventieth week of the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy.” In verse 24 the שֵׁמֶר (“seventy weeks”) was introduced without division, but here it is divided between sixty-nine weeks and a seventieth week, which itself will be further divided into two additional periods of time (יָמִים נִצְחָן). Before proceeding farther, the meaning of שֵׁמֶר in Daniel must be determined. While a symbolic usage for may be attested in the ancient Near East, the normal biblical usage of שֵׁמֶר is “week” (of days), as is attested by every appearance of the noun by itself in Tanach. However, an exception to this use is thought to be found in Daniel, where שֵׁמֶר can mean “week” of years. This usage is found in the apocalyptic literature (e.g., the “Apocalypse of Weeks,” I Enoch 91-104), however, it may have precedent in Daniel, since much of I Enoch draws its thematic material from Daniel. Whitcomb has demonstrated the validity of this usage on the basis of analogous

67 שֵׁמֶר certainly refers to a part (“many”) rather than the whole (“all”), and to a definite group (note the definite article), which may be either the Israelite “remnant,” or better, in conformity with דָּיוֹן (“leader”), verse 26 (and by inference, verse 27a), the Israeli “leadership.”


69 Cf. Genesis 29:27, 28; Exodus 34:22; Leviticus 12:5; Numbers 28:26; Deuteronomy 16:9 (2x), 10, 16; II Chronicles 8:13; Jeremiah 5:24; Ezekiel 45:21.

Hebrew usage, comparative chronology, and the prophetic context. A brief summarization of his evidence reveals the following:

1) **Analogous Hebrew Usage:** בְּשָׁנָה may be compared to בְּשָׁנָה, usually translated “ten days,” but in Psalm 33:2; 92:4 [English, verse 3]; 144:9 must be translated “ten strings” or “ten-stringed instrument.” This indicates that בְּשָׁנָה means literally a “decad” or “unit of ten,” and that the distinction in numerical measure must be derived from the context. In like manner, בָּשָׁטִים literally means a “heptad”, or “unit of seven,” and has no intrinsic reference to time periods of any sort. Support for this may be seen in three appearances of בָּשָׁטִים with יָמִים (“days”), the addition indicating that alone was not sufficient to show that a period of seven days was meant (cf. Ezekiel 45:21; Daniel 10:2, 3). The fact that two of these three combinations occur in Daniel 10, immediately following the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy”, may be a signal to the reader that a different sense of בָּשָׁטִים is now intended.

2) **Comparative Chronology:** If the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” refers to weeks (sevens) of years, then בָּשָׁטִים indicates a time-span of seventy sevens of years, or 490 years (70x7 years). The comparative chronology for this determination are those given in the biblical texts which explain the duration of the captivity as a sevenfold judgment based on the covenantal stipulation of exilic curse in Leviticus 26:34-35, 43; cf. 25:2-5 (Jeremiah 25:11; 29:10 and II Chronicles 36:21). The time period given in these explanatory passages for the violation of Levitical Sabbath-rest years is 490 years. Since Daniel was studying Jeremiah to determine the conclusion of the captivity, and there he learned that 490 years of Sabbath-rest violations had resulted in 70 years of punishment (captivity), would

---


not the announcement of another corresponding period of “seventy sevens” be 490 years, rather than 490 days? Certainly the announcement of another destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, only a year and a half after the end of the Exile could have been of little comfort, and of course, the Persian period texts reveal that the city was not rebuilt within this period of time.

(3) The Context of Biblical Prophecy: In Daniel 7:25; 12:7 we read the prediction of a wicked person who will commit abominable acts נאשך יבש מִשְׁרָת עַל אֹתָהּ (“for a time, times, and half a time”). This phrase is also used in the New Testament apocalypse (Revelation 12:14), where in verse 6 it is paralleled with the phrase ἡμέρας χιλιας διακοσιας ἐξήκοντα (“one thousand two hundred and sixty days”), cf. Revelation 11:3 (also 1,260 days length). This same period is mentioned in Revelation 11:2; 13:5 as being μηνας τεσσαράκοντα [kal] δύο (“forty [and] two months”). Thus, “a time, times, and half a time,” according to the New Testament apocalypse, = 1,260 days = 42 months, or in other words = “a year and two years and a half a year” (31/2 years). We have a similar measurement of time given in Daniel 9:27 as עכבת ידוה בחק (“one week” ... “half or middle of the week”). If we interpret עכבת as a “week of years,” then דְּבָכָה (“one week”) = 7 years, and דְּבָכָה (“half of the week”) = 31/2 years, which agrees with the New Testament interpretation of the phrase ἡμέρας χιλιας διακοσιας ἐξήκοντα as being μηνας τεσσαράκοντα [kal] δύο.

The covenant having commenced the last seven years, the cultic interruption at the middle of this period is the result of a desecration described as יִנָּה וְעִנָּה (“he will make the sacrifice and grain offering to cease”).73 The Hiphil, יְנָה from the root יְנָה (“cease, desist, rest”), here has a causative nuance

---

73 In order for such sacrifices to be interrupted, they must have begun prior to the middle of the week, all of which necessitates a rebuilding of the Temple and a reinstitution of the cultus somewhere near the beginning or shortly after the covenant is confirmed.
meaning “cause to cease, put an end to.” This act obviously is a violation of the covenant, and not only ends the covenant/sacrificial period, but inaugurates a period defined by the clause כל תינך שמשקציות ממלכת, which according to Judah Slotki is “one of the most baffling passages in the Book.”

Here we must, nevertheless, attempt to interpret the meaning of כל תינך שמשקציות ממלכת in relation to this particular prophecy and the larger context of Daniel.

The Interpretation of the Phrase על כל תינך שמשקציות ממלכת

The term כל (literally “wing”) has been the subject of extensive controversy and fanciful interpretation, whether in ancient commentaries or modern. For example, among Jewish commentators we find that Abarbanel in Daniel 10:6 simply translated כל as "because" (leaving the derivation of the term unexplained), thereby applying שמשקציות to the sins of the Jewish Nation: "because of the abomination of the Jews, the city and the Temple are desolate (ממלכת)." On the other hand, R’ Avraham bar Chiya in במסכת ממלכת attributes the cause of "abomination" and "desolation" to the Gentile nations, taking כל like רד כנף (ר"ד כנף ממלכת "to the corners of the world," and rendering the phrase ממלכת: "to the corners of the world they [the nations ruling the world after the destruction of the Temple] will spread abomination and desolation." In a similar fashion, Radak (ласт שורשים s.v. כל) interprets the term metaphorically as "spread" (after the imagery of "wings," cf. e.g. Ruth 2:12 with 3:9), but applies it loosely, avoiding interpreting the cause of "abomination" and "desolation," and so translates the phrase כל שמשקציות ממלכת: "the spread of abominations will cause people to be astonished (ממלכת)."

Christian scholars have exhibited no less diversity in their explanations for the form על כל, suggesting emendations to read על כל ("and in its place,"

---


75 R. Hersh Goldwurm, Daniel, ATS (New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1989), p. 266 supposes that he has followed the ממלכת mentioned in ממלכת that this is one of nine places where כל is understood like רד.
or “on their base”) or בֵּֽעַל קֳנֹה (“lord of wing,” i.e., “winged one” on the model of בֵּֽעַל אֲדֹנִים, “horned one,” cf. Daniel 8:6, 20, a title of the Syrian god of heaven). Other interpretations have ranged from the poetic “rapid flight” (cf. נִפְרְדָה, “wings of the dawn,” Psalm 139:9), 77 “shall rise up,” taking as figurative of an image of an eagle which was placed above, 78 and “over spreading” (KJV), to the literal “pinnacle [of Temple],” “horns [of the altar],” or “winged [statute or solar disk].”

If we accept Nestle’s theory that with בֵּֽעַל קֳנֹה we have a word play on a foreign deity, it would be consistent to see קֳנֹה having a similar connotation. In this regard several variations on the reference of קֳנֹה have been offered. Lacocque followed M. Delcor seeing in קֳנֹה an equivalent of פֶּרֶך. suggests that the “horns” of the Jewish altar had to be demolished “in order to install another ‘abominable’ stage on it (cf. Judith 9.8).” 79 Goldingay suggests that the substitution of פֶּרֶך for פֶּרֶךְ is probably because “winged one” or “lord of wing,” is a title of Ba’al. 80

Another suggestion proposed by Bentzen, is that of “winged” statues or emblems, following the example of winged solar disks as emblems of Zeus, 81 or

76If this latter emendation to the absolute with ב substituted for י were accepted, it would make בֵּֽעַל קֳנֹה the subject of נִפְרְדָה (“cause to cease”).


with G.R. Beasley-Murray, who finds in the Syriac as an addition to βδέλυγμα, the term σημεῖον = ︴, “standard” or “emblem,” which he compares with Josephus’ usage to refer to the Roman standards to which were affixed images of the emperor.82 The Ugaritic B’l Kn ("lord of wing") may support this since the image of the Syrian Ba’al Shamin was generally represented on monuments in the form of an eagle.

Along this line of interpretation it may be suggested that חַגֵר might refer to the actual place of the erection or presence of the הַכְּתָבִים, which if it were the Sanctum Sanctorum, might suggest the winged cherubim of the Ark of the Covenant. While חַגֵר has been taken on the basis of πτερύγιον (see below) to refer to the “pinnacle” of the Temple, the reference to the altar within the Temple has been adopted by most scholars, since it had wing-like projections, and direct cultic association with sacrifices (previously mentioned in our verse). However, if this were so, would not the Ark serve as an even more ideal location for such desecration? If II Thessalonians 2:4 is accepted as alluding to this context, then its statement of the “desolator” seating himself in the Temple as an attempt at self-deification, may reflect the blasphemous approximation of the divine Presence position above the cherubim, i.e., self-enthronement in the place of YHWH.83

The LXX and the Vulgate translate חַגֵר by πτερύγιον to designate any projecting extremity, although the New Testament (Matthew 4:5; Luke 4:9) uses the term to refer to a high point on the Temple complex, i.e., the pinnacle of the Temple. Montgomery also agrees with this idea, but sees in πτερύγιον the idea of “elevation” as opposed to “extension”, and therefore posits the erection of an


83 This theory requires that the prophecy be interpreted post-eventu, since there is no direct evidence that the Ark existed in Second Temple times within the Holy of Holies. Therefore an eschatological reappearance of the Ark (possibly suggested by Jeremiah 3:16; cf. Revelation 11:19 with 11:1-2), may be consistent with an eschatological rebuilding and desecration of the Temple.
acroterion upon the pediment of the porch of the Temple (or more likely, the southwestern corner of the Temple enclosure). However, I Maccabees 1:54 (cf. II Maccabees 6:2) uses πτερύγιον of the altar of burnt offerings within the Temple, where Antiochus had constructed an altar or statue to Zeus Olympios.

Our conclusion with respect to הָעָלָם is that it most likely refers to the place where the “desolating abomination” will take place in relation to the Temple. It may with relate with פֶּסֶחִים to an idolatrous image, possibly of “the desolator,” or have a technical reference to his identification with divinity, especially YHWH, who like this usurper made a covenant with Israel.

The final clause of verse 27: אֵלֶיוּ אֵלֶּה הָעָלָם יִדְרֶשׁ ("namely, that which is determined shall be poured out on the desolator") concerns the appointed destruction of ("the desolator"). We have taken the וָע as pleonastic ("namely"), and הָעָלָם as a hendiadys, so that the idea is of a decreed or appointed end (Niphal of יָדַם = "things determined") for הָעָלָם ("the desolator").

This predicted judgment for the one who desecrates and attempts to destroy the holy Temple and holy city, accords with an element in desecration motifs which have YHWH announcing the punishment of His instruments of judgment for their arrogance and self-actuated intent to destroy what is holy. Such an end was decreed for the Assyrian invaders (Isaiah 10:23-26), and was repeated in more detail in Daniel 11:36, a text which displays both the arrogance (verses 36-38) and aggression (verse 39) of the desolator.

---

84J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 387.

85Cf. Elias Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer (Berlin, 1937), p. 105 who argues that the installation of a new cultus presupposes the prior destruction of the former altar (Judges 6:25; I Maccabees 14:32), and therefore a new altar is required by the new cultus.

86Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 5. 4 who notes that Antiochus had built an idol upon the altar.

We have already commented upon our preference for יָסֵר as a Pol’el rather than Qal participle, translating it therefore the same as יָסֵר. If the Qal were here, the translation would be “desolate one,” and the reference would be ambiguous. Those, like Goldingay, who argue for an intransitive use here, following the pattern of verses 18, 26, nevertheless must admit that the transitive use appears in 8:13 and 12:11 for יָסֵר like יָסֵר. We believe that it is better to see a figure of a desolator, which finds general agreement with the apocalyptic evil world ruler (and specifically with pseudo-Daniel) who having brought about desolation, is himself the object of desolation. This, again, fits with the retributive idea within the desecration texts.

**The Eschatological Interpretation of Daniel 9**

Our exegetical section has provided the textual support for an eschatological interpretation of the events of Daniel 9:27. Here we want to expand the argument for the eschatological interpretation within the historical context of the book. Our procedure will be to first survey the various interpretations offered for the historical setting (terminus a quo) of the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy,” and then to consider the argument for the eschatological view from both Jewish and Christian perspectives.

**The Historical Setting of Daniel 9:27**

We have intentionally by-passed the debate concerning the commencement, or terminus ad quem, of the prophecy found in the opening words of verse 25: מְרָם רָדַֽק וְרָפַת לַעֲשׂוֹת רַפָּת (“from the going forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem”). In order to focus on the conclusion, or terminus a

88 The reference could still be to an imagined “desolator,” but the context would have to determine this application. Most who adopt the Qal see this as a reference to Jerusalem, which must remain desolate until God’s purpose in its judgment is finished.

89 The debate over the terminus ad quem of the prophecy concerns both the date of historical decree itself, and the extent of restoration to which it referred, or which was accomplished. As to the first issue the various positions are: (1) The first year


quo. of the prophecy. Our purpose here will be to consider the three possible schools of historical interpretation that each seek to understand the time of the fulfillment of the seventieth week.

Of significance to the interpretation of the conclusion to the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 is the fact that no specific answer to the exact time of the end of captivity was given to Daniel, even though this was the very thing that he was attempting to “understand” (דברות), verse 2 (cf. 8:17; 9:23), and the motivation behind his prayer (cf. verse 19: אָלֹהָי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֶשֶׁךָ אֶלֹהֵי אֵלֹהֵי אַרְעָא...do not delay for Your own Name’s sake, O my God...[i.e., the end of captivity]).

In the year that the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” was given, Cyrus freed the Jews, ending their captivity and their unavoidable contact to idolatry and desecration. Just as Jeremiah’s seventy years prophecy had predicted an end to idolatry, so the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” predicted an end to all transgression in Israel when the people and the city of Jerusalem, including the Temple, would be YHWH’s possession. In order to understand the historical setting of this prophecy, we must first consider the various proposals made in order to satisfy the chronological notations given in Daniel 9:24-27 and the texts in Jeremiah and Chronicles.

The "Terminus ad Quo" of the Seventy Weeks Prophecy

The views concerning the determination of the terminus ad quem of the "Seventy Weeks Prophecy" have usually been divided into three schools of interpretation based upon the time the prophecy is seen as fulfilled: The Maccabean, the Roman, the Hasmoncean, and the Eschatological.

(1) The Maccabean Interpretation. The majority scholarly opinion is that Daniel represents ex eventu prophecy and that the events themselves are a record of what transpired during the Maccabean period, i.e., the persecutions of Antiochus IV Ephiphanes (170-164 B.C.E.). The "anointed one" (הַמָּשֶׁהָ) who begins the first period of 7 weeks, the period of the Exile, is usually identified as Cyrus, Zerubbabel (Haggai 1:1), or Joshua (Zechariah 3:1), although figures such as Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander, and Seleucus Philopater have also been suggested.90 A different "anointed one," in this view, Onias III, ends a second period of sixty-two weeks by being "cut off" (מָכָה, verse 26a), i.e., "murdered," by Antiochus in 175 B.C.E. at the instigation of his brother Jason. In this interpretation, the phrase in verse 26b: יִזְכֶר ("and will have nothing") refers to Onias loss of the control of the city of Jerusalem.91 The mention in verse 26 to a destruction of the city and Temple is interpreted as a reference to the plundering of the Temple in 169 B.C.E. (cf. I Maccabees 1:20-28; II Maccabees 5:11-15) or 167 B.C.E. (I Maccabees 1:29-35; II Maccabees 5:22-26).92


The "seventieth week" is taken as a reference to Antiochus and the renegade Jews who followed him in his attempt to Hellenize Judea (171/170 - 164 B.C.E.). In this case, Daniel 9:27 would be historically parallel to the events recorded in Daniel 7:7-8, 23-26; 8:8-25; 11:28-39 (cf. I Maccabees 1:10-15). The middle point of the week is seen as Antiochus' attempt to proscribe the cultus. The cessation of the sacrificial rites was accompanied by the erection of a statue or an altar dedicated to Zeus Olympus placed on a high porch of the Temple, thus desecrating it (cf. I Maccabees 1:54-59; II Maccabees 6:1-2), which was supposed to last 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) years.\(^{93}\)

(2) **Roman Interpretation.** The view that the events predicted in Daniel took place in the Roman period is divided between early Jewish and Christian schools of interpretation. Braverman has articulated the early Jewish position which is preserved in Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel*.\(^{94}\) His research shows that the early Jewish interpretation rejected the idea that the fulfillment of the seventy weeks followed the order of the text, but that a sum total of the recorded "weeks" were accepted as 490 years, and served as a basis for historical application. The *terminus ad quem* of the entire seventy-week period is emperor Hadrian's establishment of Aelia Capitolina upon the ruins of the Bar-Kokhba city and Temple (?), and the plowing of the city with salt by Hadrian's general Tinus Rufus.\(^{95}\) Part of the Hadrianic persecutions included the erection of an equestrian statue of the emperor at or overlooking the Holy of Holies, and of a temple built to


\(^{95}\)Ibid., pp. 105-106.
Jupiter at the southern court of the Temple complex. This may have been interpreted as the “abomination of desolation,” however, Jerome’s text is not specific.

(3) The Hasmonean Interpretation. This view, though not widely held, is a recent attempt to satisfy the weaknesses found in the previously interpretations. Here, the terminus a quo is the time of the issuance of Jeremiah’s prophecy of the seventy years (605 B.C.), and the terminus ad quem is the end of the Hasmonean dynasty under Alexander Jannaeus (88 B.C.).

The Christian interpretation is generally the same as the Jewish in terms of finding some portion of the “Seventy Weeks” fulfilled in the Roman period, except that it views Daniel’s predictions concerning “the anointed one” as having reference to Jesus as “Messiah.” In this view, the events of Daniel 9:24-27 include the crucifixion of Jesus and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70. Here, some take the יַעֲדָה of verse 26 as Jesus, and those that destroy the Temple, by their

96 Cf. Ronald W. Pierce, “Spiritual Failure, Postponement, and Daniel 9,” *TrJ* 10 NS (1989): 211-222. The argument of this interpretation is based on retaining the Massoretic accentuation (i.e., the disjunctive accent at verse 25) and finding a literal fulfillment of all three segments of the prophecy as follows: 7 weeks (from 605 B.C. to 536 B.C.), 62 weeks (536 B.C. to 104/103 B.C., the reign of Aristobulus I, the first Hasmonean king), and the one week (94-88 B.C., the persecution under Alexander Jannaeus). Postponement of the actual destruction of the city is until the Roman period (A.D. 70), because it is argued that a gracious re-offer of another “anointed,” i.e., Jesus, was made to gauge the spiritual responsiveness of the people, upon which restoration was conditioned. With this failure (rejection of the Messiah), the postponed judgment was effected. It should be noted that this proposal, made by an evangelical with a dispensational background (Talbot School of Theology) and published in a journal of the premillennial position, disallows both a christological and eschatological interpretation for this text, claiming the old canard of “theological bias” for dispensationalists who would argue otherwise (pp. 215, 222). One must ask if there is not a “theological bias” in the assumption that the literal fulfillment for the city was postponed to A.D. 70, even though 88 B.C. is the terminus ad quem of the prophecy?
iniquity, are the Jews ("the [ethnic] people of the דִּבְרֵי"), however, most in this school interpret the דִּבְרֵי as the Roman general Titus. The דִּבְרֵי ("end"), verse 27, is either that of the city or the דִּבְרֵי. In this interpretation, verse 27 is parallel to verse 26, serving as an explanatory addition to show how long after the sixty-nine weeks the "cutting off" of Messiah in verse 26 will occur. Thus, it is Messiah that causes the covenant to "prevail," and his death causes "sacrifice and grain offering to cease," i.e., he ends the worship system under the old economy. The "abomination of desolation" is taken either as a reference to Titus or to an eschatological judgment.

(3) The Eschatological Interpretation. This view is called eschatological because it interprets at least part of the seventieth week to have its fulfillment at the eschaton. This interpretive method may be divided into two variant groups: a symbolic (or schematic) approach, and an apotelesmatic approach (see below). The first view takes the seventieth week as

---


98Cf. Desmond Ford, op. cit., p. 233, who suggests that the Hebrew is intentionally ambiguous in order to encompass both the city, and then later, the דִּבְרֵי.


100Cf. Desmond Ford, op. cit., pp. 201-202; M. Kline, op. cit., p. 489.

101Texts are identified as apotelesmatic where later historical interpretation warrants an interpretation of earlier prophecies as requiring temporal intervals for their ultimate fulfillment. This technical expression for delay in the fulfillment of the prophecy is derived from the Greek verb ἐποτέλω meaning "to bring to completion, finish," BAGD, p. 100.1 The usual sense of τέλος as "end" or "goal" may here have the more technical idea of "the consummation that comes to
heptads of time that are to be understood symbolically (the numbers 7 and 10 = perfection and completion) and which will only be experienced at the consummation of all things. This view sees three divisions of the seventy weeks: the 7 heptad: in which the decree of Cyrus returns the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem and Messiah appears, the 62 heptads: in which a spiritual Jerusalem is rebuilt, i.e., the Christian Church, the 1 heptad: in which the messianic purpose for the Church appears to fail, since worship of Messiah is “cut off,” due to the influence of Antichrist, who is destined to be destroyed. Here, Daniel 9:27 ends the third period.

In the first two interpretations the seventieth week follows almost immediately the sixty-ninth week, with the events described in Daniel 9:27 having been already fulfilled (with events in verse 26 already considered part of the seventieth week). In contrast, the eschatological interpretation, by definition, argues that the nature of the events in Daniel 9:27, which take place only in the seventieth week, have not yet been consummated, but await literal fulfilment in harmony with the eschatological context of verses 2 and 24, the Olivet Discourse, and parallel passages in Revelation. If one takes the Maccabean, Hasmonean, or Roman view one must either conclude that the prophecy of Daniel has failed in

prophecies when they are fulfilled” (Luke 22:37), cf. BAGD, p. 819.1. Therefore, with the prefix ἀπό, which basically has the connotation of “separation from something,” the idea is of a delay or interruption in the completion of the prophetic program. Cf. further, J. Randall Price, "Prophetic Postponement in Daniel 9 and Other Texts," chapter 7 in Current Issues in Dispensationalism, eds. C. C. Ryrie, J. Master, and W. Willis (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994 forthcoming).


terms of precise historical fulfillment, or that it was intended to be fulfilled other than in a strictly literal fashion. Because of the chronological difficulties, S. R. Driver declared at the turn of the century: "the prophecy admits no explanation, consistent with history, whatever..." Lester Grabbe, has recently written: "...much of 9:24-27 does not clearly and easily fit the known historical context. This is highlighted by practically all the major [critical] commentaries which resort to a great deal of emendation in order to make the statements correspond with history." 

---


106 Lester L. Grabbe, "The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem: From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years," *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Ed. C. Evans and W. Stinespring (Scholars Press, 1987), p. 69. Grabbe in recognizing this difficulty proposes a compromise interpretation which still argues for a Maccabean setting, but contends that Daniel 9:24-27 has made use of an older pre-existing oracle, and
In like manner, because the historical events do not fit with any known history, amillennial and postmillennial interpreters have sought to find a symbolical or spiritual fulfillment within the uninterrupted scope of the seventy weeks (i.e., the first-century). Employing a hermeneutic of replacement (of national Israel by the Church), they argue for a christological fulfillment within the ministry of Jesus, or, at the latest, at the time of the first preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. However, John Collins has observed in this regard that the book of Daniel is presented on two axes: the horizontal axis of chronology and the vertical spatial axis of imagery (contrasting heaven and earth). This latter axis figures prominently in every vision of the book except chapter 9, where the chronological axis, with a clearly future reference, is prominent. This indicates that the focus of Daniel 9 is not in relation to heavenly mysteries, but is concerned with historically identifiable events that will transpire on earth. Therefore, any

therefore represents one of several post-exilic attempts to reconcile the seventy year Jeremiah prophecy with the historical events (e.g., Zechariah 12:1; 2 Chronicles 36:22-23). In this way he attempts to reconcile the disparate Maccabean historical references, which are considered as post eventum, yet appear in Daniel to as ex eventu prophecy. For this reason, those who hold to the Hasmoncean interpretation must postpone the destructive events of the seventieth week (verse 26) to the Roman period, even though they contend it was chronologically fulfilled earlier. This is also a problem for those who attempt to interpret “weeks” as “sabbatical-cycles,” and make events fit the Maccabean period. Wacholder admits: “More problematical, however, is the inconsistency of the date of the placement of the “abomination” in the Temple... Although the difference between the two datings is only about fifteen or sixteen months, it does present a serious objection to the calculation, as it is too large an error for contemporaneous chronology.” He adds concerning his approach: “...This method would reduce Daniel’s departure from the historical date to ten months, perhaps a permissible deviation in a chronomessianic book,” Ben Zion Wacholder, “Chronomessianism: The Timing of Messianic Movements and the Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles,” Hebrew Union College Annual 46 (1975): 208-209.

approach that seeks to deal with this text, must do so on literal contextual-grammatical-historical terms.

The Argument for the Eschatological Interpretation

A difficulty with all non-eschatological interpretations is the fact that in the conclusion to the prophecy in Daniel 9:27 no specific answer to the time of the end of captivity was given to Daniel. It was this was very thing that Daniel was attempting to “understand” (verse 2a; cf. 8:17; 9:23), and the motivation behind his prayer (verse 19). Non-eschatological views must find an end to exile in a temporary Jewish revolts, all which were unsuccessful and ultimately led to the destruction of the City, the Temple and further exile. This, of course, offers no solution to Daniel’s specific petition for his people’s restoration (which included a return to Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the Temple, verses 16-19). However, what we do find in verse 27 are eschatological time markers, such as תיב ("end"), יבש ("cause to cease"), and לולא ("end"), עד ("until"), and צרה (“appointed/decreed [end]”). These terms indicate that this section belongs to the eschatological period, qualified later in Daniel as תיב (“the end time”), cf. Daniel 12:4, 9, 13.108 This identification is enhanced by the presence parallel concepts between the two chapters (e.g., prayer for understanding, 9:2; 12:8; desolation of Jewish people, 9:27; 12:7; three and one-half year period, 9:27; 12:7, 11; the abolition of sacrifice, 9:27; 12:11; and the abomination of desolation, 9:27; 12:11). Thus, Daniel’s prayer for an end to exile will be fulfilled in the eschatological age when all of the elements of his petition will be realized.

The Eschatological Interpretation and Jewish Interpretation

The eschatological interpretation of Daniel 9:26-27 finds further corroboration in view of Jewish apocalyptic literature. In this literature, probably

108Interestingly, the Jewish commentator, Rashi, says that “the end of the Romans who destroyed Jerusalem will be a total destruction through the promised Messiah,” and that the “desolation decreed” for the City is “after the final wars waged by the Messianic king and the war of Gog and Magog.” cf. Daniel. Artscroll Tanach Series, 264.
influenced in part by Daniel's seventy weeks, are found the themes of an end-time Jewish persecution and war on Israel (especially Jerusalem), cf. 1 Enoch 56: 91-104, an Antichrist figure (Belial/Beliar) who serves as a portent of the imminent conclusion of the age and its cataclysmic end (cf. Sibylline Oracles 635-636; IV Esdras 13:31; Testament (T) of Joseph 20:2; T. Simeon 5:3; T. Naphali 2:6; T. Issachar 6:1; 7:7; T. Reuben 2:1; T. Dan 5:10; T. Levi 18:12; T. Judah 25:3), an avenging Messiah who is sent by God and fights for Israel (cf. T. Dan 5:10; cf. 5:3-7),\textsuperscript{109} and casts 'the Antichrist' into eternal punishment (cf. T. Dan 5:10; T. Issachar 6:1; T. Levi 18:12; T. Judah 25:3).\textsuperscript{110} At Qumran, many texts present an eschatological conflict similar to that depicted in Daniel\textsuperscript{111} and especially Pseudo-Daniel, which contains similar eschatological interpretations. Of course, primary support is given by the New Testament eschatological texts already mentioned (Matthew 25:15; Mark 13:14; 2 Thessalonians 2:4-5), which interpret the events of the seventieth week as future to their time. Even if one considers that the events predicted in the Olivet discourse were fulfilled in A.D. 70, the fact that they were viewed as future at least dismisses the Maccabean interpretation. The challenge to those who accept A.D. 70 as the \textit{terminus ad quem} of the seventy weeks is to explain the details of the prophecy in the events of Roman history, a task of harmonization which will require as significant a degree of re-working the text, as required for the Maccabean interpretation.

\textbf{The Eschatological Interpretation and Christian Interpretation}

In further support of the eschatological interpretation, it may be noted that the earliest recorded patristic interpretations of Daniel 9:24-27 advocated this


\textsuperscript{110}See further, Eugene E. Carpenter, "The Eschatology of Daniel Compared with the Eschatology of Selected Intertestamental Documents" (Ph.D. dissertation: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1978).

approach. Most of these interpreters maintained a futurist perspective (though not all), which was consonant with Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic interpretation (cf. the Seder Olam Rabbah ch. 28, the oldest tradition for interpreting the seventy weeks). Among modern Christian interpreters who hold the eschatological approach, several variations exist:

(1) The Sabbatical Year view, in which weeks are not years, but sabbatical cycles, the final sabbatical cycle being future. The interval is based on the reference to the destruction of the Temple in verse 26, but the cessation of on-going sacrifices in verse 27, pre-supposing a rebuilt Temple in between.

112 The views of these early church fathers are preserved in Jerome’s commentary. Representing the apotelesmatic approach are: Africanus, Hippolytus, Appollinarius of Laodicea, Eusebius, and Tertullian. The earliest recorded futurist teaching on this text is that by Irenaeus (c. 180), who was the teacher of Hippolytus, cf. Against Heresies 5, xxiv. 4 in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, Reprint, 1985), I: 554.


113 Eusebius, for example, an opponent of the futurist interpretation who believed that the events of the 70th week were fulfilled during the life of Christ, nevertheless held that the 70th week did not consecutively follow the 69th week, but was postponed for an “indeterminate space of time” in which the events of verse 26 were being fulfilled.


115 In this work by Rabbi Jose, the first seven weeks are related to the exile and return, the next sixty-two weeks are in the Land, and the final week predicts a period partially spent in the Land and partially spent in exile.

(2) The Double Internal view, in which a parenthesis occurs after both the first and second division of the seventy weeks. The first interval occurs after the return of the Jews to rebuild the Temple and city till about 436 B.C.E. The second interval follows the “cutting off” of Messiah, verse 26, until the appearance of the Antichrist, verse 27. This is the final week and it is eschatological.\textsuperscript{117}

(3) The Solar Year and the Prophetic Year views. These views will be considered together inasmuch as they are essentially the same except for the type of year used in calculating the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy,” (i.e., a 365-day “solar year” versus a 360-day “prophetic year”). Both views reject the pointing of the MT on the grounds that it is a tenth-century addition, the \textit{athnach} is often put where it is unexpected, and does not always indicate a principal break in the sentence (Numbers 28:19; cf. Genesis 7:13; 25:20; Exodus 35:23; Leviticus 16:2; Isaiah 49:21; 66:19), and the understanding of passage is made more complicated (e.g., the “plaza and moat” of verse 25 would appear to take 434 years to build!). The events from the beginning of the sixty-nine weeks till its close include the career of Messiah up to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70. The seventieth week is then final and eschatological.

While it is beyond the purview of his study to enter into a critique of each these positions,\textsuperscript{118} we suggest from our study of the eschatological desecration/restoration motif in Tanach, that the eschatological interpretation of Daniel’s “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” best harmonizes with our findings. It also serves as the best vehicle to further the development of the latent image of an eschatological desecrator, carried by various opponents of the divine purpose in

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. as a representative of this view, Allan A. MacRae, “The Seventy Weeks of Daniel” (Paper delivered at the Evangelical Theological Society, Deerfield, Illinois, 1978), pp. 1-9. MacRae claims support for this view based on the pointing of the MT which separates three time intervals and two “anointed ones.”

\textsuperscript{118} Such a critique may be briefly had in Paul D. Feinberg, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 196-216.
the historical books, and for the explanation of the fulfillment of the restoration promises concerning Jerusalem and the Temple contained in the Prophets. In support of this position in relation to Daniel’s “Seventy Weeks Prophecy,” let us present some basic evidence:

(1) The goals of the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” have not yet been fulfilled historically. Six goals are given for fulfillment in verse 24: ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים בֵּעָלֶיךָ ("Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city...")

   (a) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to finish the transgression")
   (b) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to make an end of sins")
   (c) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to make atonement for iniquity")
   (d) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to bring in everlasting righteousness")
   (e) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to seal up the vision and prophecy")
   (f) ́יִשְׁלֹמָה הַשֶּׁנִים ("to anoint the most holy [place]")

   If one takes the Maccabean or Roman view one must either conclude that the prophecy of Daniel has failed,119 or that it was intended to be fulfilled other than in a literal fashion (i.e., in the Christian Church).

   The first conclusion is problematic if one holds to a continuity in the divine purpose, the second does violence to the basis for the “Seventy Weeks Prophecy” in the text of Jeremiah, which was itself fulfilled literally.

(2) The eschatological view follows closest to the Seder Olam Rabbah (chapter 28), the oldest tradition for interpreting the seventy weeks. In this work by Rabbi Jose, the first seven weeks are related to the exile and return, the next sixty-two weeks are in the Land, and the final week predicts a period partially spent in the Land and partially spent in exile. This interpretation

119 This was indeed the conclusion drawn by Porteous, op. cit., p. 144: “…the end predicted by the author of the book of Daniel did not come true …” The more objective reason for rejecting the Maccabean interpretation is that the events of that period simply do not fit Daniel’s description. The Temple was not destroyed nor was a covenant made between Antiochus and the Jews (even renegade Jews).
also finds corroboration from Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel*, the oldest Christian interpretation of the seventy weeks.

(3) *The Jewish apocalyptic literature and especially the New Testament interpreted the seventieth week as future to their time.*\(^{120}\) Even if one considers that the events predicted in the Olivet discourse were fulfilled in A.D. 70, the fact that they were viewed as future at least dismisses the Maccabean interpretation. The challenge to those who accept A.D. 70 as the *terminus ad quem* of the seventy weeks is to explain the details of the prophecy in the events of Roman history, a task of harmonization which will require as significant a degree of re-working the text or outright spiritualization of the text, as the Maccabean interpretation.

(4) *Apotelesmatic passages appear regularly in the Book of Daniel.* In apotelesmatic texts (see discussion below), the length of the interval is inconsequential to the fulfillment of the prediction, as can be seen from past historical predictions that encompassed many centuries (e.g., the prophecy of the exodus and establishment in the Land, Genesis 15:13-16). In addition, the idea of an interval can also be seen between Daniel 2:40 and 41; 7:23 and 24, 8:22 and 23, and 11:35 and 36, which would support its occurrence between verses 26 and 27 in Daniel 9.

To complete this general discussion of the eschatological interpretation, let us add a final study on the more specific apotelesmatic approach, which we have adopted as that view best supported by our research.

**The Apotelesmatic Eschatological Interpretation**

In eschatological interpretation, the *apotelesmatic* or prophetic postponement phenomena may be recognized in many texts dealing with Israel's ideal future in the Tanach, but especially in the Prophets.\(^{121}\) In our exegesis we

\(^{120}\) Cf. in the apocalyptic literature especially I Enoch 91-104; Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243-245), and in the New Testament especially Matthew 25:15; Mark 13:14; II Thessalonians 2:4-5.

\(^{121}\) Prophetic postponement has been identified in those texts concerned with Israel's judicial hardening (e.g., Isaiah 6:9-13; Zechariah 7:11-12), and exile (e.g.,
noted that in the opening word of verse 27, that the was the waw consecutive. As the waw consecutive indicates a close consequential relationship to a preceding verb, this use indicates that the events of verse 27 are subsequent to those of verse 26. The apotelesmatic or prophetic postponement approach to this passage would argue that a chronological parenthesis or intercalation, of indeterminant length, is thereby created between the sixty-ninth week (verse 26) and the seventieth week (verse 27), cf. figure 18. Since Jesus in his citation of the passage apparently considers it yet unfilled from his vantage point, this period of time may include the eschatological events predicted in his Olivet discourse. While it is beyond the scope of this study to adequately interact with the various positions that compete

Deuteronomy 4:27-30; 28:36-37, 49-50, 64-68), a condition, which according to the New Testament, was not fully revealed until the revelation of Messiah (John 12:37-40; Acts 28:25-28; Romans 11:25-26). However, the apostle Paul explained that this postponement of the realization of the goal of Israelite heilsgeschichte is not so much an interruption of redemption as an extension of predicted hardening (Romans 11:7-10). The exile, which was a punishment for national disobedience, has therefore been prolonged during the present age until the appointed time for Israel’s national (including spiritual) restoration (cf. Acts 1:7; 3:21; Romans 11:25-27). Examples of passages traditionally classified as apotelesmatic are those which include a near historical fulfillment, and a far “Day of the Lord” fulfillment in the same context: Obadiah 1-14 (far fulfillment), 15-21 (near fulfillment); Joel 2:1, 11 (near), 2:31 (far); Isaiah 13:6 (near), 13:9 (far); Zephaniah 1:7 (near), 1:14 (far), as well as many texts in Christian interpretation which distinguish between an historical and eschatological messianic advent: Isaiah 61:1-2a (historical - in light of Luke 4:16-19; cf. 7:22), 61:2b-11 (eschatological); Isaiah 9:1-6 (historical; cf. Matthew 4:16; Luke 1:79), 9:7 (eschatological); Joel 2:28 (in light of Acts 2:17); Micah 5:2-3 (historical), 5:4-15 (eschatological). Many of the restoration texts in the pre-/exilic and post-exilic prophets may bear this distinction, with a partial (near) fulfillment in the return to the Land and the rebuilding of the Temple and city, and an ultimate/eschatological (far) fulfillment at the eschaton or “Days of the Messiah.” Cf. for chart of these and other passages, J. Randall Price, “Prophetic Postponement in Daniel 9 and Other Texts,” chapter 7 in Current Issues in Dispensationalism., (forthcoming). For older proponents of this view cf. Alva J. McClain, “The Parenthesis of Time Between the Sixty-Ninth and Seventieth Weeks,” Daniel’s Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), pp. 23-40, J. Dwight Pentecost, Things to Come (Grand Rapids: Dunham, 1958), pp. 246-250; John F. Walvoord, Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), pp. 228-237, and H. A. Ironsides, The Great Parenthesis (Our Hope, 1939), pp. 15-131.
with the apotelesmatic approach, the following arguments compare this interpretation in light of problem connected with the division of the "Seventy Weeks."

**The Structural Divisions of the Seventy Weeks Prophecy**

The crucial issue for eschatological interpreters of this prophecy is the resolution of the structural divisions of the seventy weeks. Both conservative and critical scholarship have agreed that Gabriel’s revelation to Daniel announced an extension of the seventy years of Jeremiah’s prophecy to seventy weeks of years. At the outset let us notice that this extension of the seventy years is itself an example of prophetic postponement. If then we have a postponement of the restoration promised Jeremiah until after the seventy years (because of the past spiritual condition of the exiles, cf. Daniel 9:5-14; Jeremiah 14:21-23; Esther), can we not allow for a further postponement of the fulfillment of the restoration until after the seventieth week (in view of the present spiritual condition of the remnant, cf. Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah), not to mention those who remained in the Diaspora?¹²² In this light, Grelot argues that the 490 years were a “probationary period,” granted to Israel to complete the process of restoration from desolation.¹²³ Though a partial Judean restoration was effected on the physical level during this period (the rebuilding of the Temple and the City), Israel failed in its spiritual obligation to recognize and accept their Messiah. Thus, the period of desolation was continued (to the present with the A.D. 70 destruction), and ultimate restoration (which depends upon repentance toward Messiah) was further postponed until the events of the seventieth week could be

¹²²Though the term for restoration was conditioned on the Mosaic covenant (Deuteronomy 4:23-29; Jeremiah 29:13-14), the effecting of the restoration was based on the unconditional Abrahamic covenant (Deuteronomy 4:30-31; Genesis 17:7-8). The theological resolution is found in the national regeneration of Israel to spiritually fulfill these conditions (Ezekiel 36:24-31; 37:13-14, 23).

realized historically. Let us now proceed to the support for this view from the structural divisions of verses 25-27.

The Principal Interpretive Problems

The major interpretive questions concern:
(1) the division of the “seven weeks and sixty-two weeks” of verse 25,
(2) the placement of the events they describe (the building of the City, the appearance of the Messiah) as occurring prior to the conclusion of these weeks, (3) the discernment of an interval in fulfillment between the sixty-ninth (verse 26) and seventieth week (verse 27).

The first part of the problem is whether the division of the seven and sixty-two weeks should be understood as one unit of sixty-nine weeks or divided into two separate sections, and then whether the events should be placed in the first section of seven weeks or in the second section of sixty-two weeks. The second part of the problem is whether the seventieth week follows immediately after the sixty-ninth week or if it should be treated separately with respect to postponement and future chronological fulfillment.

The Question of the Division of the Seven and Sixty-two Weeks

The resolution of the question of the division for the “seven weeks and sixty-two weeks” depends in part on the matter of the Masoretic accentuation. The Masoretes placed a disjunctive accent (athnach) under the word “seven,” which might indicate that they interpreted the two sections as separate divisions. If so, three distinct periods of time are marked off, and the punctuation would

---

124 The Masoretic accents, דיבר , (“meanings,” from דיבר , “taste, understanding”) are written signs designed to preserve the oral tradition of accentuation, which originally could not be introduced into the written text of the Bible itself (since it would be considered an addition to the sacred text), but later were incorporated into the text when it was transmitted in the form of a codex (a copy of the Bible not in scroll form), between the sixth to the ninth centuries A.D. The accents are helpful as musical notations (which indicated logical pauses), for punctuation, and as interpretive commentary, cf. further Aron Dotan, “Masorah,” Encyclopedia Judaica 16:1402-1482.
125 This view, called "the double internal view," was first proposed by Allan MacRae in a paper delivered at the 1978 meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in Deerfield, Illinois. Dr. MacRae had planned to further develop the position in an article, however, acquaintances have informed me that no such work was completed, and attempts to secure a copy of the original lecture have proved unfruitful. For a published overview of the view cf. Paul D. Feinberg, "An Exegetical and Theological Study of Daniel 9:24-27," Tradition and Testament, 210-211.

126 Masoretic accentuation is interpretive, based either on a personal view, or previous knowledge of a traditional reading, informed by earlier commentary. While an important aid in historical interpretation, it should not be elevated above the opinions of early commentators, which it reflects.

127 Cf. William Wickes, Two Treaties on the Accentuation of the Old Testament. The Library of Biblical Studies. Ed. Harry Orlinsky (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Reprint, 1970), 2:40 states: "In cases of specification, we often find the proper logical or syntactical division - particularly the latter - neglected, and the main musical pause introduced between the details or particulars given. Distinctness of enunciation, and emphasis (where necessary), were thus secured. The pause was introduced where it seemed likely to be most effective. Thus, logical division is disregarded ... Syntactical clauses are treated in the same way, and subject, object, &c. are cut in two - or members that belong together, separated - by dichotomy. (A logical pause may occur in the verse or not.)"
division of three negatives + three positives.\textsuperscript{128} In addition, the fact that this rabbinic commentary spans a period to a millennium after Christ, when the Jewish/Christian disputations were well advanced, invites the suspicion of an anti-Christian bias, especially in such a famous messianic apologetic text as Daniel 9.\textsuperscript{129} Indeed, if one accepts the athnah as legitimate here, the christological interpretation of the passage is in put in doubt.\textsuperscript{130}

(2) \textit{The earlier textual traditions.} The Greek - LXX Theodotion, Latin Vulgate, and Syriac Peshitta all testify to an ancient reading that combines the numerical elements seven and sixty-two to equal one unit (i.e., sixty-nine).\textsuperscript{131} These versions may well preserve a pre-Masoretic reading of the text or an early Jewish or Christian oral tradition concerning the seventy weeks.

\textsuperscript{128}Other examples include Genesis 7:13; 25:20; Exodus 35:23; Leviticus 16:2 Numbers 28:19; Isaiah 49:21; 66:19.

\textsuperscript{129}Cf. Thomas E. McComiskey, "The Seventy 'Weeks' of Daniel Against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Literature," \textit{Westminster Theological Journal} 47 (1958): 19. It is known that early rabbinic interpretation of Daniel 9 was messianic (e.g., Ibn Ezra's statement: "...there is a clear account given of the Messiah in the prophecy of Daniel"), and this was followed even by later mediaeval commentators (cf. Maimonides, \textit{Igeret Teiman}, 3. 24. Cf. further, Risto Santala, \textit{The Messiah in the Old Testament in the Light of Rabbinical Writings}. Translated by William Kinnaird (Jerusalem: Keren Ahvah Meshihiit, 1992), 95-107.

\textsuperscript{130}Rashi, for example, breaks down the seventy weeks as follows: seven weeks before the reign of the anointed prince; sixty-two full weeks from his accession to the throne, and one divided week, part before and part after his accession.

(3) *The retention of the 70th week complicates the logic of the passage.* For instance, it would appear that it took the entire period of the sixty-two weeks (434 years) was required to build the plaza and the moat (verse 25), and that the “anointed one” (verse 26) appears after the seven weeks (49 years), but is not killed until after the sixty-two weeks (434 years later).\footnote{Cf. Jacques Doukhan, “The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study,” p. 17.} Of course, this later event could be possible if two different “anointed” were intended, however, the chiastic structure of the passage argues for only one “anointed”.\footnote{Ibid., p. 14.}

(4) *Structural analysis indicates a disjuncture between the sixty-nine and seventieth week.* William Shea contends that his analysis of the poetic form of Daniel 9:24-27, on the basis of syllable and metrical count, demands that the units of seven weeks and sixty-two weeks be one epoch of time. Any other arrangement would disrupt the structural parallelism and poetic balance of the passage.\footnote{Cf. William H. Shea, “Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Daniel 9:25,” Andrews University Seminary Studies 18:1 (1980): 59-63.}

Therefore, it seems preferable to accept the alternative to the Masoretic accentuation dividing the seven and the sixty-two weeks, i.e. sixty-nine weeks, and to place the events as follows: the first unit of seven weeks (49 years) comprises the period of the rebuilding of the Temple and the City (verse 25a); the second unit of sixty-two weeks (434 years) is the time period prior to the coming of the Messiah (verse 25b). After the sixty-two weeks He is killed and the Temple and the City are destroyed in A.D. 70 (verse 26).\footnote{We have followed the general consensus of interpreters who would see verse 26 depicting the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Temple in A.D. 70 and verse 27 depicting an eschatological desecration of the Third Temple. However, since both of these events take place after the sixty-ninth week, it is possible to interpret both as eschatological. This position is defended, e.g., by G. H. Lang, *The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel}
week (7 years) comprises the period of the covenant (the first half of the 7 years),
its violation with the desecration of the Temple (the midpoint of the 7 years), and
the final destruction of the Desecrator (the last half of the seven years), verse
27.\textsuperscript{136}

\textbf{The Question of the Division Between the Sixty-Ninth and Seventieth Week}

The second problem, which directly concerns the apotelesmatic interpretation, is whether there is justification for a temporal interval after the sixty-ninth week, constituting a parenthetical postponement in fulfillment of the events of the seventieth week.\textsuperscript{137} Lest the concept of postponement be construed as alien to the book at this point, let it be remembered that Gabriel has already announced a postponement of Jeremiah's seventy year fulfillment in Daniel's seventy weeks of years. All commentators accept this postponement - it is simply a question of the length of time. Moreover, temporal intervals have already

\begin{quote}
Publications, 1973), 135-138. He argues that the A.D. 70 event would not have
taken place within the 490 year period, and that the destruction of the city in verse
26 agrees more favorably with such references as Zechariah 14:1-2 which
describe the armies of Antichrist, who is the Desecrator in verse 27. This would
give a 'more natural force to the term' the people of the coming prince' [in verse
26]. Consistent with this view, Lang would also deny a reference to the A.D. 70
destruction in the Olivet Discourses of the synoptic gospels.

\textsuperscript{136}Klaus Koch has argued cogently for these three divisions, and especially for the
eschatological interpretation of the final one week in light of intertestamental
Judaism and apocalyptic literature, cf. "Die Weltreiche im Danielbuch,"
\textit{Theologische Literaturzeitung} 85 (1960): 892-832; "Spätisraelitisches
Geschichtsdenken am Beispiel des Buches Daniel," \textit{Historische Zeitschrift} 193

\textsuperscript{137}For a study of earlier classical dispensational discussions of this concept, cf.
Alva J. McClain, "The Parenthesis of Time between the Sixty-Ninth and
Seventieth Weeks," \textit{Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks} (Grand Rapids:
Parenthesis} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1940); J. Dwight Pentecost, \textit{Things to
Come} (Grand Rapids: Dunham, 1958), 246-250; John F. Walvoord, \textit{Daniel: The
Key to Prophetic Revelation} (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), 228-237.

appeared in chapters 2, 7, 8, and will again in chapter 11. In this light, one might expect to find a similar occurrence in chapter 9.

It has been argued that if there was no division between the seven and sixty-two weeks that there should not be one between the sixty-ninth and seventieth week. We have noted, however, that the sixty-ninth week has already been set off as a distinct unit comprised of the seven and sixty-two weeks. This would imply in itself that the events of the seventieth week are to be treated separately. Further, the events in verse 26: “the cutting off of Messiah,” and of people of the prince,” are stated to occur after the sixty-nine weeks. If this was intended to occur in the seventieth week, the text would have read here “during” or “in the midst of” (cf. Daniel’s use of רוחב (“in the middle of”), verse 27. This language implies that these events precede the seventieth week, but do not immediately follow the sixty-ninth. Therefore, a temporal interval separates the two.\(^{138}\) It is also important to note that the opening word of verse 27 (וּלְכַּבֵּד) is prefixed by awaw consecutive, a grammatical connective which indicates a close consequential relationship to a preceding verb. This use indicates that the events of verse 27 are considered to be subsequent to those of verse 26.

The Interpretation in Light of the Chiastic Structure of verses 26-27

It has been objected that since the events in verse 27 are grammatically parallel to those in verse 26, due to the chiastic structure, only the Second Temple period is in view. However, chiasm is simply a literary device recognizing the inversion of associated words or ideas, and does not by itself govern the timing of the fulfillment of the events expressed.\(^{139}\) In literary terms there may be parallelism, but this does not require that the historical events described be continuous without interruption. For instance, the דַּעַן in verse 26, as we have pointed out, is qualified as כֹּהַן (“one who is to come”), i.e., one who was previously introduced to Daniel’s audience in 7:8, 23-24 as being from the fourth


\(^{139}\) The whole book of Daniel may be patterned on an A:B:A (Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew) chiasm centered around the theme of the judgment of proud rulers.
kingdom - Rome. This identification is confirmed in this verse by his association with the people who destroyed the Second Temple, i.e., the Romans. The reference to this “prince” at his coming must be made with the “he” of verse 27a, because it is the nearest antecedent,\(^\text{140}\) and the basic idea is the same - he will desecrate the Temple (cf. 7:25). However, historically, no known Roman leader ever “made a covenant”\(^\text{141}\) with the יהודים ("the Jewish leaders," literally, “the many”), for seven years, and if this is to be fulfilled literally and historically this passage must await a future fulfillment when the seventieth week commences.\(^\text{142}\)

**Jesus’ Description of the Seventy Weeks**

Finally, the interpretation of Daniel 9:27 in light of the synoptic eschatological discourses implied an understanding of prophetic postponement. Jesus’ interpretation of the order of the events of the seventieth week in the context of


\(^{141}\)The verb נştırma (from the root נרש "to be strong, mighty") is in the Hiphil and can mean "to strengthen," with the resulting translation (taking בָּדַי as the object) being: “to confirm a covenant” (either a new or an existing one), or “to make a strong/firm covenant,” cf. H. Kosmala, s.v. "נדרוש," *TDOT*. Eds. Botterweck and Ringgren (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975) 2: 368. Support for the former translation, “confirm,” may be had from a comparative use in the Qumran literature (1QH 8.35). Goldingay, 226, 228, prefers the translation “prevail,” taking בָּדַי as the subject, based on a similar usage in Psalm 12:5; cf. 1QH 2.24. If this is the case, then the Antichrist ratifies the Abrahamic Covenant by giving the Jews uncontested sovereignty over the Land (especially Jerusalem), with the rebuilding of the Temple being the verification of this independence. On the other hand, if this is a new covenant made with the Antichrist, then it may be in relation to the rebuilding of the Temple, since it is through his desecration of the Temple that it is broken.

\(^{142}\)It has been argued that a temporary "covenant" was struck with the Romans during the last years of the rebellion in order to transport goods and sacrificial animals in and out of the City, and that this pact was broken at a time prior to the final destruction of the Temple. However, there is no evidence that this would have had the prophetic significance Daniel attached to it, for no idol was erected in the Temple precincts, nor can it be shown that this agreement was for three-and-one-half years as the text here specifies.
prophetic history appears to confirm an eschatological interpretation for Daniel 9:27. In Matthew 24:7-14 it is predicted that persecution, suffering, and wars would continue to the end of the age, climaxing in a time of unparalleled distress, verses 21-22 (i.e., “the time of Jacob’s distress,” cf. Daniel 12:1; Jeremiah 30:7). Only after these events does Jesus make reference to Daniel 9:27 (verse 15) concerning the signal event of this time of tribulation, “the desolating abomination.” If the seventy weeks were to run sequentially, without interruption, then why does Jesus place this intervening period before the fulfillment of the events of the seventieth week? The text of Matthew in particular reveals that Jesus’ preview of the future was to answer His disciple’s questions concerning His [second] coming, and the end of the age (Matthew 24:3). Jesus here explains why His coming is necessary (for divine intervention and national repentance, verses 27-31; cf. Zechariah 12:9-10) and when it will occur (“after the tribulation of those days”, verse 29). According to Matthew, the events described in this period prior to the Messianic advent could not have been fulfilled in A.D. 70 with the destruction of Jerusalem, since these events usher in and terminate with the coming of Messiah.

**The Use of Daniel 9:27 in the New Testament**

The previously discussed associations between the prophetic writings and Daniel revealed causative linkage between idolatry and the desecration of the Sanctuary and the Land. The Temple and the Land were desolated because of Israel’s abominations caused an abandonment of the Holy Place by the Shekinah, and thereby prepared it for further defilement by Gentile invaders. It is significant

---

143 Luke’s omission of this signal event is one of the reasons it is believed that at this point in his narrative he is presenting the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. rather than the eschatological end of the age.

144 For this reason consistent preterists must interpret Christ’s coming as having occurred in A.D. 70. To do so, however, requires the employment of a non-literal and historical hermeneutic, since the events cannot be reconciled with either the literal interpretation of the Old Testament citations and allusions in the Olivet Discourse or the actual events of the destruction.
that only in Daniel 9:27 is the הָאֵשׁ בַּרְזֵן connected to a desecration of the Temple and a destruction of Jerusalem.

Rigaux in studying these relationships believed that the LXX and Theodotion were influenced by these many references to desolation of the Land, and they in turn influenced the translators of I Maccabees and Mark’s Gospel. He therefore sees Daniel 9:27 as underlying Daniel 11:31 and 12:11. Hendriksen also observes the prior dependence upon Daniel 9:27, but goes further to demonstrate that it is upon the first reference to הָאֵשׁ in Daniel 8:13-14 that all later passages in Daniel and the New Testament are based.\footnote{Cf. William Hendriksen, \textit{I & II Thessalonians}. \textit{Hendriksen New Testament Commentaries} (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 176.}

Ford contends that Daniel 9:27 is therefore the source for Matthew and Mark, and makes the deciding factor the parallels between Daniel 7-9, 11-12, rather than on purely philological grounds (since linguistically, Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 are closer to Daniel 11:31 and 12:11). He also suggests that Jesus’ use of Daniel 9:27 (especially in Mark 13:14) may have in view a summary statement of the “abomination” material, and therefore include all of the parallel Danelic passages, including Daniel 8:13-14 (since Luke 21:24 cites this passage).

When we consider the use of βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως or allusions to this phrase, in the eschatological discourses of the New Testament (both by Jesus and Paul), it is important to note that in the respective contexts each speaker assumes that his readers are familiar with both this phrase and the concept it represents. It would not be possible for these speakers to issue a call for action based on the understanding of this phrase if the interpretation was unclear. The only way that a first-century audience would be able to understand the predictions of Jesus and Paul would have been with reference to Daniel. Daniel in turn must have been interpreted in light of the terminology of the historical books, the writing prophets, especially Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Micah, and Zephaniah, the post-exilic prophets, and the Psalms. More will be said concerning the New Testament’s use of “abomination of desolation” passages in chapter seven.
The Identification of the Abomination of Desolation

From our introductory discussion we rejected a Maccabean origin for Daniel, however, this does not mean that events in the Maccabean period were not foretold by Daniel. Indeed, there is in the figure and activities of Antiochus IV Epiphanes much that is typical of the description of the “little horn” of Daniel 8:8-13 and the agent of destruction in Daniel 11:31, however, if we are seeking complete fulfillment in these events we have no historical support for our identification. 146 Rather, we have seen in Antiochus another figure in a succession of anti-theocratic rulers whose acts of desecration project the vision forward of a coming eschaton when righteousness will reign and the cultus will be beyond defilement.

Further, our study of the term מטמא תקיפא and the term יבגנ in our exegetical section, we have concluded that the “Abomination of Desolation” was an image of the desolator or described the desolator himself in relation to his desecration of the Temple. It remains for us to briefly survey the various interpretations given to the Greek term βδελυγμα της ἐρημωσεως147 and to draw a conclusion for its use based on its use in Daniel and the New Testament.

1) The Statue of Titus erected on the side of the desolated Temple. This view was popular in Patristic times (cf. Theophylact, Euthymius, Zigabena, Chrysostom), however, there is no substantial evidence that such occurred. More likely it is a tradition that developed from the memory of Roman standards erected in the Temple area by order of Titus.

2) Statues erected by Pilate and Hadrian. Jerome records that Pilate placed an image of the emperor Tiberius Caesar in the Temple, and that Hadrian


erected an equestrian statue of the Capitoline Jupiter on the site of the demolished Temple. All we know for certain is that Pilate brought Roman standards into the Temple, which had medallions with an image of the emperor. As to the site of the equestrian statue, John Wilkinson argues that it would not have been at the site of the Temple itself, but that this area would have remained free of such objects so that the site could later be rebuilt by the Jews as a show of Roman benevolence.\footnote{\textit{148}John Wilkinson, "Christian Pilgrims in Jerusalem During the Byzantine Period," \textit{PEQ} 108 (1976): 77.}

(3) \textit{Caligula’s attempted desecration.} The events of A.D. 33-40 were believed to create the fear that where Caligula had attempted to erect a pagan statue in the Temple and failed, another might succeed. While Caligula was not the \textit{βδέλγυμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως}, a future emperor who succeeded him was expected to be. Some Christian exegetes have suggested an allusion to this in Mark 13:14, however, Beasley-Murray has shown that the whole theory is implausible on textual and historical grounds.

(4) \textit{The invading Roman army of A.D. 70.} Mark 13:14 refers to an invading army as \textit{ἐρήμωσις}, i.e., a “desolating army,” but the interpretation of this text to the Roman army will depend on whether one has a futurist or a preterist orientation. Beasley-Murray seeks to connect the previously discussed idea of the \textit{βδέλγυμα} in connection with \textit{σημεῖον = ὅ} , “ensign,” which bore images of the emperor, as an allusion to the Dardic phrase, however, this connection of \textit{βδέλγυμα} with \textit{σημεῖον} is a reconstruction from a Syriac Sinaitic Peshitta text, which is then construed as the original saying of Jesus.

Even if such could be proved, it would not necessarily bear any allusion to \textit{ἡς} in Daniel 9:27c, since \textit{ἡς} probably does not mean anything like \textit{ὅ}. If the Roman invasion, which did desecrate and destroy the Temple, was the fulfillment of the “Abomination of Desolation,” there still is lacking the complete correspondence with Daniel 9:27, for both the
covenant is missing and the destruction of the desolator would have to be construed differently in order to be said to be “complete.”

(5) An eschatological desolator. The most popular view historically has been that of an eschatological desolator, identified as the Anti-messiah or Antichrist. The construction ad sensum in the masculine partciple ἔστηκότα linked to the neuter Βδέλυγα and the obvious parallel found in Matthew 24:15 and II Thessalonians 2:3-8, constitute primary evidence for this interpretation. Almost all of the details of Daniel 9:27 are explicitly or implicitly alluded to in II Thessalonians 2, and Jesus cites Daniel 9:27 directly in Matthew 24:15; cf. Mark 13:14.

The question again is one of eschatological perspective, whether futurist or preterist. The issue may not find resolution on strictly exegetical grounds, but from the developmental pattern of the descerator/desolator figure throughout Tanach, the eschatological far view fulfillment of the desecration/restoration motif, i.e., an apocalyptic intervention and the establishment of a Temple according to the divine ideal, along with the New Testament’s use of the Antichrist and the desecration of Jerusalem/ Temple imagery from Daniel and Zechariah, this view of the seems to have the strongest support.

With all other views, except the eschatological, we are left with unresolved details that either must be harmonized by reading the text in other than a literal, historical, manner, or by dismissing details altogether. The eschatological view has the precedence of types that await an antitype which will fulfill them in an ideal or ultimate manner, just as other details of the desecration/restoration motif await fulfillment.
CHAPTER VI

THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF
IN JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

In this chapter we move from the budding of the desecration/restoration motif in the תּוֹרָה ("Torah," Pentateuch), and the הָרְאָבִים ("Writings"), and its blossoming in the הָדָסִים ("Prophets"), and especially Daniel, to its appearance in full flower in the apocalyptic literature. The apocalyptic literature is often referred to as the intertestamental literature because it historically fills the gap, and theologically forms a link, between the Tanach and the New Testament. Our approach to this literature will be to study our motifs in terms the dominant imagery that has emerged within our research thus far: that of typological desecrator(s), which project the desecration motif and consequently the restoration motif, into the eschatological realm. It will be our purpose to trace our motif through this imagery and selected apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts with a special concentration on the Qumran literature.¹

¹We mean by this term all of the apocalyptic-styled documents of the Dead Sea Community. We have refrained from referring to this group as "the Essenes" (except in citation by others) simply because at this writing the debate over the origin of the scrolls is still undecided. At present, a Sadducean hypothesis has challenged the predominate view of the Qumran-Essenes hypothesis. This theory holds that the scrolls represent scribal copies of mainstream Second Temple Judaism literary works, and that they were smuggled out of Jerusalem libraries in order to be buried in the Judean desert to preserve them from the imminent Roman onslaught. This theory has received particular attention in the forthcoming book by Norman Golb, Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Meaning of the Qumran Manuscripts (New York: Macmillan Company, 1994). His Jerusalem-origin theory is based on numerous pieces of evidence: (1) the absence of any demonstrable sectarian bias, (2) the conflicting doctrinal viewpoints present in the scrolls, (3) the small amount of halakhic material that
In our approach to Jewish apocalyptic literature, will assume the definition (with its addendum) proposed by the SBL Apocalyptic Group (see chapter one). Our selective focus will concern two apocalyptic motifs which express the motif of desecration/restoration. The first will be that of the figure of an apocalyptic desecrator in the image of “Beliar/Belial,” and the second will be a consideration of the various views of the Temple in selective apocalyptic texts, primarily those of Qumran, since it stands nearest to both the time and social setting of the New Testament. Our approach will be first to survey the attitude toward the Second Temple which precipitated apocalyptic Temple interpretations, examining the views of an eschatological Temple and its eschatological Desecrator, and then considering in much the same order this treatment of our subject in the literature of Qumran.

THE CONCEPT OF THE TEMPLE IN APOCALYPSTIC LITERATURE

During the years of exile when the Jews were without a Temple, the prophets had sought to assure them that they were not without YHWH’s presence (Ezekiel 11:16). Nevertheless, without an earthly Temple, or an outward symbol of God’s presence, men looked heavenward, and began to develop the form of the heavenly Temple that had been resident in motif form from the Pentateuch onwards.2 As the concept began to be formulated new eschatological hopes were developed with respect to the new form of the Temple. Jewish apocalyptic did not seem to develop as the result of any single movement, rather social, political,

might be considered as "Essenic," (4) the Jerusalem connection indicated by the "Angelic Liturgy" text, (5) the comparative example of the defenders of Masada’s removal and preservation of documents from Jerusalem, (6) the Copper Scroll’s catalogue of Temple treasures and scrolls from Jerusalem (indicating Sadducean or others, since the Essenes eschewed wealth), (7) the lack of discovery of any scribe artifacts (styluses, line-makers, parchment fragments, etc.) in the so-called Scriptorium, (8) the fortress-like nature of Qumran which saw military conflict (the Essenes were not soldiers), and (9) the sheer mass of literary compositions (800 works by at least 500 different scribes), all copies, which indicate removal from a library.

religious, and historical events of crisis proportion precipitated each work, though at times historical continuity may be assumed for a cluster of authors. The struggles that surrounded the Second Temple: political intrigue, religious reversals, and social upheavals, all contributed to the eruption of apocalyptic writings that looked beyond the pale of a conquered people and anticipated the imminent overthrow of world empires and the divine establishment of a holy order. At the center of this struggle, and of hope, lay the Temple, both the cause of exile and judgment for some, and the source of refuge and blessing for others. In this section we will briefly survey the views concerning the apocalyptic attitude toward the Second Temple, from which developed interpretations of an earthly Third Temple, eschatological Temple, and heavenly Temple.

The Apocalyptic Attitude toward the Second Temple

As we remember from the post-exilic prophets, the beginning of the Second Temple was surrounded in controversy. The Temple was not on the same scale as the former, the promises of restoration did not come true, and the presence of God had not appeared to return to glorify His house. In I Enoch 89:73 reference is made to a pollution of the Temple, implying that the Shekinah was absent from the site. The Temple comes under intense scrutiny as political power is transferred to the priesthood, and changes are made arbitrarily in the cultic calendar or in the sacrificial system. For example, in the Assumption of Moses (6:1) there is a polemic against the Hasmoneans who “assuredly work iniquity in the Holy of Holies.” In the Apocalypse of Abraham, the Temple is said to have been destroyed because young boys were slaughtered on the altar by a corrupt priesthood (25:4-6). Yet, at the same time the Temple is questioned, a mythology of Temple indestructibility emerged. In Jubilees 1:27 (cf. 25:21), the Temple is

---


considered eternal, while in Sibylline oracles 3:657ff an attack on the Temple is pictures as repulsed by supernatural means.

The destruction of the Temple created a new batch of apocalypses, and in particular the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. In this apocalypse, the eschatological promises are linked to the destruction of the Temple. In 6:7 and 80:1 an angel secures the Temple vessels for the day of restoration, yet in chapter 16 the atmosphere is one of despair and finality. The end will come, but for now the important thing is to concentrate on the Law as the guiding principle and maintain relationships (cf. 83:3).

The Apocalyptic Concept of the Eschatological Temple

The statement of Zechariah 6:12 that a messiah would rebuild the Temple is given new direction with Sibylline Oracles 5:424f which declares that the Messiah will himself build the new restoration Temple. In Jubilees 4:26 there is the clear connection between the central role of Mount Zion, hence the rebuilding of the Temple, and the consequent renewal of creation (i.e. the Temple will be a sanctification for all the earth). In the Apocalypse of Weeks (I Enoch 91:13), after an apostate generation has arisen, a time of blessing comes to Israel in which at its close the Temple will be rebuilt for the Great King, forever. In Adam and Eve 29:7 the building of the Temple will be better than the old, and in Tobit 13:16 (c. 250 B.C.E.) their is a prediction of building the Temple again with "sapphire, emerald, and precious stone." The Animal Apocalypse in I Enoch the eschatological Temple is restored, only after the judgment of the nations and the admission by the Gentiles of Israelite supremacy (I Enoch 90:28-29). In Syriac Baruch 29:3 and 39:7 there is both a reference to the revelation of the Messiah

and to the Messianic Kingdom, each with some association with the Temple (either in rebuilding or in reigning in a restored Temple).

The belief in the need to rebuild the earthly Temple by apocalyptic thinkers may have actually fostered ancient attempts to rebuild, such as that under Bar Kokhba brief reign. This is the claim of John Gunther, who would see apocalyptic aspirations as the agents for attempted rebuilding during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, and that the Epistle of Barnabas actually recorded a planned rebuilding of the Temple.⁶

The Book of Ezekiel, especially the latter division concerning the restoration of a Remnant (33-39), and the rebuilding of the Temple (40-48), also had a marked influence on the Qumran Community. Cothenet observes that in the Qumran text "Description of the New Jerusalem," the author claims to have had a vision in which he was shown the measurements of its buildings and streets, and that this vision is modeled on Ezekiel's own vision of the eschatological Temple.⁷ The New Jerusalem text's visionary could not have used either the First or Second Temple as his pattern, because of the gigantic dimensions of the city he reported. Such a description could only have been influenced by the ideal Temple of Ezekiel 40-48.⁸

**The Apocalyptic Concept of the Heavenly Temple**

The heavenly counterpart of the Temple, the מִלְתִּיָּה, is the focus of a text in 2 Baruch 4:2-6 meant to console those who were concerned over the Temple's desecration. In this text the proto-type of the Temple is said to have been communicated in a revelatory manner to Adam, Abraham, and Moses:

---


Do you think that this is that city of which I said, ‘On the palms of my hands I have graven you’? This building which is now built in your midst is not that which is revealed to me, that which was prepared beforehand here from the time I took counsel to make paradise, and showed it to Adam before he sinned, but when he transgressed the commandment, it was removed from him, as also paradise. And after these things I showed it to my servant Abraham by night among the portions of the victims. And again I showed it to Moses on Mount Sinai, when I showed him the likeness of the Tabernacle and all its vessels. And now, behold it is preserved with me, as also paradise.

In T. Levi 3:6 a description of the heavenly Temple is given, with God dwelling in the celestial Holy of Holies and archangels offer sacrifices to YHWH. There is perhaps here too, a heavenly altar of incense, since the Lord is said to smell a pleasing odor from the propitiatory sacrifices offered by His celestial attendants. In TB Hagigah 12b there is a statement that in the fourth heaven, the heavenly Jerusalem and the heavenly Temple and the altar is built. Perhaps one of the earliest\(^9\) and most unusual accounts of the heavenly Temple is that given in I Enoch 14:8-35. In this vision of an ascent to the heavens, the visionary sees a Temple of fire, or of glory, in terms much like that of Ezekiel’s theophanic vision by the River Chebar (Ezekiel 1:1-21). Important here is the observation by Rowland that the description of heaven here appears to follow the geography of the cult,\(^10\) perhaps linking with the thought once again of the archetypal Temple and the הַר הַגִּדְרָן. After the destruction of the Temple apocalyptic ascent to the heavenly Temple increases in the visionary accounts of apocalyptic writers. One of the insights offered from researchers of these accounts is that of Martha Himmelfarb who writes: “It seems reasonable to assume that describing heaven as


a temple is associated with a positive attitude toward the temple institution, although often not toward the actuality of the temple.\textsuperscript{11}

What we have found in the apocalyptic literature thus far, is a reaction to a crisis, either of exile or of the profanation of the Temple, or of the destruction of the Temple as a catalyst for the production of apocalyptic fervor. The desecration motif was continued in the figures of desecration/desolation that have now grown to oppose God directly and to be shown to be the last object of conquest before complete restoration can come to Temple and Land. The restoration motif has grown through the struggles to adjust to life with a Temple in a state of flux, but has energized with a positive hope that the Temple can be rebuilt at some favorable point in time, and that in the meanwhile, the heavenly Temple remains beyond the reach of earthly invaders and cultic defilement, and offers assurance that the original pattern for holiness is in safe-keeping, the heavenly cult continues unabated, and that the day is coming when heaven will again invade earth and God will fulfill His promise of restoration.

\textbf{THE CONCEPT OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DESERATOR IN APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE}

Because of the dualism that developed in apocalyptic a complex cosmic scene of opponents, the eschaton was considered more in terms of a final battle with evil than of a divine deliverance for restoration from YHWH. Evil in the world and in men was attributed to fallen angels who corrupt mens’ wills (I Enoch 6:1-6; 7:1; 10:8-9; Jubilees 5:1-2). I Enoch described an end-time assault by Gentile forces against God’s elect in which demonic spirits, or fallen angels, incite the nations to war against Israel (cf. I Enoch 56:5-8). In I Enoch 90:13-15, God gives Israel the power to defend herself against her enemies, however, an increase in violence and wickedness must be endured (I Enoch 91:5-7) before the reign of righteousness can begin in the eighth week (I Enoch 91:12-13). The

general condition of these times are one of unbelief and wickedness (T. Levi 4:1). Of special note is the mention in T. Levi 17:7-11 of the defilement of the priesthood. Great confusion will also come upon the Gentiles before the final judgment, and they will slaughter one another (I Enoch 100:4). This describes the general setting for the eschatological drama to be played out on the large stage by God (Michael, and the angels) and Beliar (and his demons), and on the small stage by the righteous (Israel) and the unrighteous (Gentiles).

**Beliar as an Apocalyptic Desecrator**

In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the figure of Beliar serves as a portent of the imminent conclusion of the age and its cataclysmic end (cf. T. Joseph 20:2; T. Simeon 5:3; T. Naphali 2:6; T. Issachar 6:1; 7:7; T. Reuben 2:1; T. Dan 5:10; T. Levi 18:12; T. Judah 25:3). According to Rowley,\(^\text{12}\) Beliar is the incarnation or personification of evil, for all beings and for all times (cf. T. Simeon 5:3), treated as a superhuman entity. He is the antagonist of God, though not His equal opponent, for he is destined to doom. The deliverance that is expected cannot be obtained without the ultimate defeat and destruction of Beliar. As the comparable figure at Qumran, Beliar is characterized as: ὁ βελιάρ ἐν σκότει ἐσται μετὰ τῶν ἁγιωτῶν (“the Lord of Darkness who went before the Egyptians”), T. Joseph 20:2.

Not only does he lead astray, but whoever sins is said to be doing the works of Beliar (T. Naphali 2:8). He is attended by a contingent of seven evil spirits that comprise his unholy court (cf. T. Reuben 2:1; T. Issachar 7:7), and these spirits will in the last days be joined by a large company of men (cf. T. Issachar 6:1). His defeat comes from the Lord from Levi and from the Messiah (T. Dan 5:10; cf. 5:3-7),\(^\text{13}\) who will fight with him and finally cast him into eternal

---


punishment (T. Dan 5:10; T. Issachar 6:1; T. Levi 18:12; T. Judah 25:3). In the Oracles of Hystaspes, we read of another desolating figure: "...another king shall arise out of Syria, born from an evil spirit, the overthrower and destroyer of the human race ... that king will not only be the most disgraceful in himself, but he will also be a prophet of lies, and he will constitute, and call himself God and will order himself to be worshipped as the son of God" (*Lactantius Divinae Institutiones* VII 17: 2-4).

Here we have a description of an unidentified figure who will not only seek to conquer the world, but will demand divine honors for himself. This accords well with our image of the "Abomination of Desolation," which is connected with sacrilege in respect to the Temple cultus. Beliar, also in his universal evil influence, as well as his ambition against Israel, joins with this figure to depict an apocalyptic Anti-Messiah or Antichrist. Many of these same concepts will be also found in the New Testament, particularly in the Pauline epistle of II Thessalonians 2.

In the Sibylline Oracles, whose basic concern is eschatological, Beliar is again prominent. Though sometimes he appears symbolic in character, in lines 63-74 he is depicted as a human being. In classic desecration motif form, the Assumption of Moses portrays God descending in apocalyptic judgment to take vengeance on all the nations and to destroy their idols (10:7). Again, there is drawn a connection, inherited from the biblical Prophets, but influenced by the Holiness Code, between desecration/defilement via idolatry, and the coming of YHWH in judgment. This is a pattern that can be traced throughout both Tanach, apocalyptic literature, and the New Testament: human desecration of the holy (the Temple) brings a divine response for correction, first by judgment, then by restoration (purification and rebuilding). In the Sibylline Oracles we also see this restoration, coming after divine intervention, in the form of the establishment of God’s kingdom (10:1).
Beliar's Comparison with Daniel's "Little Horn" Desecrator

While our examples have been few, a general background has been sketched of the eschatological program and the place of the eschatological desecrator in it. We will now become more specific with a comparison between Daniel's figure of the "Little Horn" and the concept of Belial, which corresponds to rather cryptic prophetic character. The figure of the "Little Horn" in Daniel is a quasi-human-kingly entity who gains dominion over the other nations of the world and then turn against Israel. Historically he is equated with Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who, as we have seen in our study in Daniel, acted as a Temple desecrator and became an eschatological type of the coming Antichrist.

One passage which reveals the dual persona of this "Little Horn," who is clearly portrayed here as an individual, is Daniel 7:25, where he is seen both as a blasphemer against God and a desecrator of the cult, and an enemy of man, especially the righteous. (And he will speak out against the Most High and wear down the saints of the Highest One, and he will intend to make alterations in times and in law ...”). In the actions of the "Little Horn" in this verse we can see something of his nature as a divine opponent, nevertheless, he is still a man, as the Aramaic term הֲלָלָל ("wear out") implies. This word in Hebrew and Akkadian, belium, are used to refer to human beings, which consequently means that הֲלָלָל ("holy ones of the Most High") are also men, rather than angelic or celestial beings.

The true nature of the "Little Horn" will best be displayed by a list of his attributes and activities in Daniel 7:8, 11, 20-26. The "Little Horn" is one who is a royal figure (verses 24-25), who is earthy and shameful (verses 8, 11, 20-21, 25-26), is a negative symbol of man (verse 13), arises in violence (verse 11), but has a temporary reign (verse 26), yet blasphemers God (verse 25), attacks the righteous (verse 25), and attempts to alter the cultic calendar (verse 25). The role of the "Little Horn" as an anti-messianic figure, or Antichrist, is seen by a comparison of its descriptive imagery against that of its messianic counterpart - the "Son of
Man"- in this same context (Daniel 7:9-14). We may chart this comparison as follows:

Figure 10: Antithetical Comparison of the "Little Horn" and the "Son of Man" in Daniel 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Little Horn&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Son of Man&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Figure (vss. 8, 11, 20-21, 24-25)</td>
<td>Passive Figure (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion is taken from him (vs. 26)</td>
<td>Dominion is given to him (vs. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Figure of the Fourth Kingdom (vss. 8, 24-25)</td>
<td>Royal Figure of the Heavenly Kingdom (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes from the Earth (vs. 8)</td>
<td>Comes with the Clouds (vs. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a fleeting dominion (vs. 26)</td>
<td>Has an everlasting dominion (vs. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative symbol of Man (vss. 4, 8, 13)</td>
<td>Positive symbol of Man (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Subjection to God (vs. 13)</td>
<td>Rebels against God (vs. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks, but is put to shame (vss. 8, 11, 20-21, 25-26)</td>
<td>Silent, but is honored (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None serve him in the end (vs. 26)</td>
<td>All serve him in the end (vs. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-God Figure (vs. 25)</td>
<td>Pro-God Figure (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to wear out the saints (vs. 25)</td>
<td>Represents the saints (vss. 18, 22, 25, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alters prescribed worship (vs. 25)</td>
<td>Accepts what is given him (vss. 9-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overthrows others as comes in (vs. 8)</td>
<td>Others usher him in (vs. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arises in ignominy (vss. 8, 11)</td>
<td>Arrives in splendor (vs. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthly &amp; shameful (vss. 11, 20-21, 25-26)</td>
<td>Heavenly and glorious (vss. 13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate connection with Fourth Beast (vs. 11)</td>
<td>Intimate connection with final Kingdom (vss. 13-14, 18, 22, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like a man, but more (vs. 13)</td>
<td>Eyes like a man, but like a horn (vs. 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these contrasts, we may observe the antithesis between the fourth Kingdom and the fifth heavenly Kingdom and the comparisons between the relationships of the fourth Beast and the “Little Horn” and the “Son of Man” and the saints of the Most High. These comparisons should be sufficient to demonstrate the apocalyptic application of this figure to Beliar, or the son of Beliar/Belial, who in continuity with the Danelic image as both human and more than human is suited to attack both man and God as he seeks to usurp the authority and ascriptions of God.

We will now move to the community at Qumran to consider this exceptional sect and to test whether the development of the eschatological desecrator will bear continuity with these separatists by the sea. Since we have considered apocalyptic literature in general, but not the apocalyptic literature unique to the Qumran Community, an introduction to our use of this material in this chapter is warranted.

THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE OF QUMRAN

Among the works discovered at Qumran are commentaries on the books of the Prophets and the Psalms which scholars refer to as יסודם, because this noun is used frequently in the scrolls themselves for the “interpretation” of a ד, an Aramaic term for “mystery.” The Qumran יסודם developed, as we will see below, through the prophetic influence of Daniel, (especially chapters 9-11) as a special means of reconstructing the hidden history revealed to the prophets concerning the end of time, but reserved in mystery form for the generation upon whom the end would come. Qumran’s pesher literature’s apocalyptic vision is derived from its understanding of human history as being built up in stages determined by God and linked together to move toward an inevitable goal, the eschaton. John Collins referred to this as patterns projected into the eschatological future which

disclosed the dominance of the hostile order of Belial (desecration motif) and the affirmation of an alternative order (restoration motif), at present eclipsed, though practically experienced by the Elect, but yet to be completely revealed in the future.\textsuperscript{15} David Flusser more fully describes the nature of these stages as follows:

This is not an evolutionary approach containing the concept of progress, for in this view, it is precisely before the end that the worst time will come, troubles of a kind not seen since the beginning of the world. History and its stages have been predetermined, one after another, by God. And after the final crisis (the War of Gog and Magog, or an invasion of monstrous enemies, or ...of a terrible and wicked king, who corresponds with the Christian Antichrist), after all this, the final peace will come; men will live a thousand generations, evil will be destroyed, and an ideal world will come about.\textsuperscript{16}

In concluding his study of the use of the Tanach at Qumran, which primarily consisted of the תורה (Torah) and הנביאים ("Prophets")\textsuperscript{17} George Brooke has shown that one cannot approach this usage without presupposing that such use was guided by an overall eschatological perspective.\textsuperscript{18} This eschatological perspective was drawn from the Book of Daniel, whose pervasive influence on the community needs to be briefly considered.


\textsuperscript{17}CD 16:2 speaks of the Torah as that wherein "all things are strictly defined," and 1QS 1:1-3 outlines the aim of the covenanteers as "to seek God with a whole heart and soul, and to do wth is good and right before Him, as He commanded by the hand of Moses and all His servants the Prophets." We have also seen(above) how 1QHab. 7:4-5 declares that the "Teacher of Righteousness" can interpret all the words of the Prophets.

The Influence of the Book of Daniel on Qumran

Noel David Freedman has pointed out: "From Daniel it is a relatively short distance to Qumran. Not only was the book admired or at least copied and preserved in the Essene community ... but there may be an historical link between the book and the community."19 The Aramaic cognate of תַּפּוֹן appears thirty-one times in Daniel (along with רד) in reference to Daniel's "interpretation" of dreams.20 Indeed, the Qumran Community appear to have believed that the visions of Daniel, which had not been completely fulfilled in the horrible events surrounding the persecutions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, were imminently to be fulfilled in their own day. In this light, they saw themselves as the embodiment of the מַלְכִּים ("discerning teachers") and of Daniel's כֶּסֶף ("holy ones"), who sat on high and watched over Israel, announcing and interpreting the events of the End-time.21

In keeping with Daniel, in the Qumran pesher literature, both מַלְכִּים and רד are given by divine revelation, however, רד is the first stage of the revelation (that imparted to the biblical writer), which remained "hidden" until the second stage, מַלְכִּים the (usually imparted to the "Teacher of Righteousness"). One of the clearest explanations of this occurs in 1QpHab. 7:1-5 on Habakkuk 2:1-2 (cf. Daniel 9:10) which says:

And God told Habakkuk to write down the things that will happen to the last generation, but the consummation of time He did not make known to him ... The interpretation of [Habakkuk 2:2] concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the secrets of His servants the prophets.


20In Daniel, several words (דָּעַ צֲלָל, רוֹעֵשׁ, בִּתְיָו) are also used to convey the same notion as מַלְכִּים. The noun only appears once in Hebrew, in Qohelet 8:21: פָּשַׁל לָבֶר ("who knows the interpretation of a matter?").

The crucial touch point for the Qumran Community is seen in the clause "all the mysteries of the words of His servants, the prophets," for with this statement the history of the present community was joined with that of the past, and a prophetic continuum was established through divine revelation to the "Teacher of Righteousness," the supposed founder of the sect. This fundamental principle of Jewish interpretation of a perceived relationship between the past and the present forms the basis of Dancetic exposition in explaining the mysteries of past divine revelation with a view to historic interpretation. In other words, not until the two parts of the revelation: מִשְׁר and דַּר are joined is the meaning made plain, a revelation which is predominately concerned with the end days, the eschaton.

Just as we have seen Daniel reinterpret Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy-year exile (Jeremiah 25:1) to mean "seventy weeks of years" (Daniel 9:24-27), in a similar manner the "Teacher of Righteousness" reinterprets various prophetic passages from Tanach by recapplying them to the situation of his day which he believed was on the threshold of the eschaton. In keeping with this expository method of applying the prophetic texts to themselves, we may note how they particularly applied Daniel 9:24-27 to their Community, even

\[\text{22Cf. Kurt Elliger, Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1953), pp. 118-164.}
\]

\]

\]
expecting from this passage (vss. 25-26) the arrival of the Messiah between 3 B.C.E. and 2 C.E.25

With the apocalyptic framework of Qumran in view, we now will proceed to consider in the apocalyptic genre the subjects of the Temple: the attitude of the Qumran Community toward the Temple, the teaching concerning the eschatological Desecrator, and the Temple's expected eschatological restoration.

The Attitude Toward the Second Temple at Qumran

There has been considerable debate concerning the attitude of the Qumran Community toward the Second Temple. In the same manner as references to the Christian community as a "temple" have been interpreted as a rejection and replacement of the Jerusalem Temple, references in the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Qumran Community as a "temple." Görtner is among those who make this mistake, interpreting passages referring to the community as a temple to mean the community is the Temple.26 Indeed, some texts (e.g., 4QpIsa and the new text 4Q285) bear allusions to the destruction of the Second Temple or the priesthood in references to "the falling of the cedars of Lebanon," or "Lebanon being felled by a Mighty One."27


27 The Lebanon allusion for the Temple is drawn from the "whitening" imagery implicit in the root יְשֵׁנָה. This is played upon to produce the exegesis, either to the Temple (because the priests wore white linen there) or to the Community Council (presumably for the same reason). This is similar to the rabbinic interpretation (Gittin 56a) of Isaiah 10:33-34 which tied this metaphor to the 70 C.E. fall of the Temple.
However, nomenclature referring to the Qumran Community as "new" temple," is questioned by E. S. Fiorenza on the grounds of the anti-cultic implications of the term "new." He prefers rather to speak of the concept at Qumran as that of "transference" or "reinterpretation." 28 Other scholars have used terms such as a "spiritualization of temple," or a "spiritualized temple," 29 however, these terms also fail to understand the full-orbed concept of the Temple as it existed at Qumran. We prefer to speak of the Community as a "symbolic" temple, since in our opinion, they did not think in terms of replacing the sacred distinction held by Jerusalem and the Temple Mount, rather, but conversely derived their own concepts of their Community as a holy priesthood from the implicit sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple.

A positive example of the Community's esteem for the Second Temple may be had from several lines in the document called "The First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness" (4Q394-398). In this text we read:

line Part 2: Legal Issues

(34) אֲנַהְיָהוּ וְהָשְׁבִיתִים לִשְׁמַרְיָהוּ [םַעֲנָן מֶעֲרוֹן זַדְוָא לַיוֹרָשְׁלָא[ו]]
(35) מַחְנֶה זַדְוָא מַחְנֶה [זַדְוָא מַחְנֶה לַיוֹרָשְׁלָא] זַדְוָא מַחְנֶה
(38) [בֵּרֹּנָה] בֵּרֹּנָה מַעֲרָם לִשְׁמַרְיָהוּ זַדְוָא מַעֲרָם
(68) יִרְשָׁלָיָא יִרְשָׁלָיָא מַחְנֶה יִרְשָׁלָיָא יִרְשָׁלָיָא
(69) מַעֲרָם יִרְשָׁלָיָא יִרְשָׁלָיָא יִרְשָׁלָיָא יִרְשָׁלָיָא
(70) ... מַעֲרָם יִרְשָׁלָיָא

(34) -"We reckon that the Temple [is 'the Tent of Witness,' while] Jerusalem- (35) is the 'camp' 'Outside the camp' [means 'outside


Jerusalem'] (It refers to) the 'camp... (38) - [He chose] from among all the tribes of Israel, to establish His Name there as a dwelling...].... Because (from 67) - (68) Jerusalem is the Holy 'camp' - the place (69) that He chose from among all the tribes of Israel. Thus Jerusalem is the foremost of - (70) the 'ca[m]ps of Israel'.") ... 

From this text we can see that the Temple was considered to retain the distinction of sanctifying Jerusalem as the place where YHWH's Name had been caused to dwell. If this is so, then the Qumran Community only drew an analogous relationship from the imagery of the Temple to express their role as an elect remnant. Nevertheless, the Community did criticize the existing polluted state of the Temple and priesthood, and positioned itself outside Jerusalem. Furthermore, it is clear that the Community intended to construct its own purified Temple once the final battle between the "Sons of Darkness" and the "Sons of Light" was concluded. However, this does not indicate an abandonment of the sanctity of the Second Temple, since God had chosen Jerusalem and the Temple Mount, rather, in answer to the present corruption of the cultic institution it demonstrates their high view of this election. The only replacement of the Temple they envisioned was with a new purified Temple; not with their Community as a "spiritual temple."

*The Eschatological Desecrator at Qumran*

The image of eschatological desecration, as well as eschatological desecrators (less specific) and an eschatological desecrator (more specific) are portrayed in Dead Sea apocalyptic. The sect saw a cosmic dualism\(^30\) between the רוח האמת/רו"ש ("Angel/Spirit of Truth/Holiness")/Prince of Light”).

\(^30\)This dualism most likely may be traced to the division of light from darkness in Genesis 1:3-5.
hence the members of the sect were the בנין אוראמה ("sons of light"). 1QS; 1QM or ("sons of truth"), 1QS; 1QH; 1QM, and the מלאכי הת perpetrות ("Angel of Darkness/Spirit of Perversity/of the Pit"), hence, their opponents, בנין חסכן ("sons of darkness"), 1QS; 1QM or ("sons of perversity"), 1QS; 1QH, or even ("sons of the Pit"), CD. This conflict between the forces of light (good) and darkness (evil) has been declared by J. Daniélou as "nothing else but the leitmotif of Qumran." These cosmic eschatological desecrators were mirrored by the conflict between the sect and two figures: the "Wicked Priest/priests," and the "Man of Lies." We will first consider this earthly dualism and then proceed to the negative element of this cosmic dualism.

**The Wicked Priest and the Man of Lies**

Neither the "Wicked Priest/priests" nor the "Man of Lies" are identified by name, like the "Teacher of Righteousness" with whom they principally contend, however, the "Wicked Priest" was apparently a non-Zadokite High Priest (or a group of Hasmonean priests), who were considered illegitimate priests, while

---


32J. Daniélou, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1963), p. 107. This motif however, is a unique paradigm to Qumran, and its contrast with other sects of Judaism, e.g. Christianity, has been demonstrated by H. Kosmala, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward in the Light of Qumran," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute.* Edited by H. Kosmala (Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1964) 3: 114-121.

the "Man of Lies" was seemingly a traitor who was formerly an ally of the Zadokite "Teacher" (the legitimate priests), but subsequently betrayed him. J. Murphy-O'Connor has suggested that the "Man of Lies" became the opponent of the "Teacher" as the result of a schism within the sect in Jerusalem that forced the covenanteers to withdraw to Qumran.34 As a non-Zadokite, he was not only considered an illegitimate priest(s), but was also said to be guilty of terrible desecrations of the Temple. According to the Pesher Habakkuk 8:12-13 and 12:7-9, the "Wicked Priest" instituted (הַעֲלֹת) practices of defilement in the Temple (ŉךָּדֶּמ) of God (12:9) as well as profaned (through violence) the Land (יִרְブランド), (12:9; cf. 2:17).35

Other censures listed for the "Wicked Priest" are his abuse of power, his drunkenness, his violence and arrogance, his greed (in the accumulation of wealth), and especially, his persecution of the "Teacher." The "Wicked Priest" also violated the divine order by substituting a lunar for a solar calendar. Since the calendrical order was a rule expressive of divine creation and the preservation of the universe, regulating the festivals and normal Jewish life, to alter or modify it was a crime against the cult.36 The "Teacher" and the Qumran sect believed that


the dates on which the festivals were held at the Jerusalem Temple were “those in which all Israel was in error” (CD 3:14), while to them were revealed the true times of “the Sabbath of His holiness and the festivals of His glory” (CD 3:15-16). Thus, the “Wicked Priest” in the Habakkuk Commentary was basically a rebel against God, who was due divine punishment. These figures prepare us for their cosmic counterparts around whom the predestined end-time conflict will revolve: the “Angel of Darkness” and “Belial.”

The Angel of Darkness

There is still debate as to whether the “Angel of Darkness” and “Belial” are one figure or two. Many scholars have assumed this is the case and have identified Belial with the “Devil,” as the Angel of Darkness, opposed to Michael, the “Angel of Light.” On the other hand, while the consensus of scholarly


38The noun בֶּלְיָאָל ("Belial") is entirely absent from early compositions such as the Hodayot, though it is peculiar to later texts. For example, “Belial” occurs as a nomen proprium in the Damascus Document six times, and since this scroll was composed later than the earliest portion of the rule, it is thought that “Belial” is a substitute for “Angel of Darkness.” In the War Scroll, the term appears twelve times, and since it is the latest of the major sectarian scrolls, it strengthens the probability of the term becoming a surrogate for “Angel of Darkness.” Further, “Belial” is found only in the preface (1Q5 1:18, 24; 2:5, 19) and the concluding hymn (1Q5 10:21) of the Rule, again, sections probably added at a later date.

39The primary motive for this association has been the Christian tradition of Lucifer as the leader of the fallen angels and the arch angel Michael as the leader of the Elect angels, although this idea was certainly influenced by Tanach (cf. Daniel 10:13, 21; 12:1) and the apocalyptic literature (cf. I Enoch 6:1-6; 7:1; 10:8-9; Jubilees 5:1-2).
opinion has been that IQS 3:13-4:26 (the most representative text for the dualism concept and the possible influence for other such texts) reveals an eschatological cosmic conflict of two warring spiritual forces, it has been contended that at times this dualism approaches the "psychological" arena.40

The arguments in favor of this position have been predicated on the use of הר in Tanach, where it is thought the idea of incorporeal entities are never meant. However, A. A. Anderson has correctly pointed out that in the scrolls, הר is used frequently to denote supernatural beings or angels, as an apocalyptic development in comparison with the usage in the Tanach.41 Therefore, what approaches the "psychological" may be simply a reflection of the ethereal power exerted by these beings, a thought certainly in harmony with the predestinarian idea scrolls.42 Further, the distinctions drawn between מלח and הר,


41Cf. A. A. Anderson, “The Use of ‘Ruah’ in IQS, 1QH and 1QMI,” JSJ 7 (1962): 298. He argues that where this terminology differs, it is the result of differences in authorship, date, and nature of the writings. It also appears that the Johannine meaning of the terms πνεῦμα τὸ ἀληθινὸ (“Spirit of Truth”), John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13, and ἕνοικοι φωτός (“sons of light”), John 12:36, have been read back into the Qumran text. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Studies (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), p. 213, has noted: “The “Spirit of Truth” in IQS is an angelic creature who is at a greater distance from God than the “Spirit of Truth,” who in John is God’s own Spirit.”

42The source of evil in IQS is external to men and not as Wernberg-Møller has suggested “created by God to dwell in man.” Rather, in IQS 3:18 the text says that God allotted the spirits unto man” (לְיַעַן אָנָן). Furthermore, IQS suggests that men are divided into two mutually exclusive camps (“sons of light” or “sons of darkness”). W. D. Davies, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins,” RL 26 (1957): 246-264, has pointed this out saying, “that these spirits are not merely inherent properties of man, as such, emerges from the use of the term “angel” to describe the two spirits: this preserves the ‘otherness’ of the two spirits even when they appear to be immanent.” Therefore, U. Simon, Heaven in the Christian Tradition (London, 1958), p. 173, concludes: “The struggle in the heart of man is inseparable from the cosmic array of powers (IQS 4:18).”
as well as statements (e.g., 1QS 3:24) depicting the spirits under the command of (in this case) the single Angel of Darkness, seems to make the equivocation of Angel with spirit impossible.\textsuperscript{43}

The influence of the Angel of Darkness was explained as one that had produced desecration historically, and would continue to do so until the final conflict. The language of cultic pollution, and particularly Temple pollution, runs throughout the whole of Qumran literature (e.g., the Damascus Document), and one means of assuring the eventual restoration of the Temple and the Remnant to a purified state was to see this as the resolution to a cosmic enmity that was greater than any one religious sect or political regime. It appears that the author of 1QS 3:13-4:26 felt that the recognition of the existence of an “Angel of Darkness” resolved the problem of the failure of the post-exilic community to attain proper purification and holiness and to receive the promised restoration: “And through the Angel of Darkness all the sons of righteousness stray and all their sins, their faults, their defilements and their acts of disobedience are caused by his rule,” (1QS 3:22). Thus, if the problem of desecration was part of a predestined plan (under the rule of evil forces), so must also the resolution through restoration (under godly forces) be the expected climax of that plan. In this theology, therefore, greed, falsehood, pride, deceit, hypocrisy, lust, and all other evils in the world were seen to be caused by this entity, also called appropriately, the “Spirit of Perversity.”

Since a similar role of seduction to evil is given to Belial (see below) we perhaps should not distinguish the two, however, it may be possible that the Angel of Darkness functions primarily as a pervasive evil influence,\textsuperscript{44} much like the

\textsuperscript{43}Cf. A. R. C. Leaney, \textit{The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning} (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966): 43 notes: “The tendency to personify as angels the powers which control the stars and to identify God himself with the \textit{Urlicht} may be paralleled by the identification of the two spirits with personal supernatural beings.”

\textsuperscript{44}However, if these two are one entity, then the Angel of Darkness may be construed as the deceptive functioning of Satan, much as in the New Testament,
Angels of Mastemoth, in conjunction with Belial, whose figure has supernatural proportions, but is better defined as an evil adversary to the Community and their Teacher of Righteousness, and ultimately Messiah (probably = Satan).

One of the primary characteristics of Qumran dualism is the eschatological dimension, and we must always keep these figures of desecration and destruction in the eschatological perspective. Indeed, the oldest form of dualism found at Qumran is represented by the War Scroll which has as its emphasis the imminent eschatological combat (Endkampfdualismus). The decisive apocalyptic intervention of God and the triumph of the “sons of light” was always a future act. In this context, the ultimate outcome for the Angel of Darkness as well as for Belial and the “sons of darkness,” is “destruction” or “annihilation” in a final battle at the eschaton (the final judgment): "עדר מעיד משמא 헤רהו" ("until the time of decreed judgment"), 1QS 4:14, 19b-20a; cf. 1QM 1:4-7.

The Figure of Belial

The figure of "Belial" (בליל, "worthlessness") in the New Testament has been considered a cognomen of Satan (cf. II Corinthians 6:15; II Peter 2:15; Jude 11; Revelation 2:14), and on this parallel usage the term has been said to be used for the figure of the Devil at Qumran. Since Temple pollution is one of the three "nets of Belial" according to the Damascus Document (column iv), this figure is as central in the use of the desecration motif at Qumran as it was in other apocalyptic literature (e.g., III Sibyline Oracles 63-74).

As with the influence of the Angel of Darkness over the post-exilic community, so the rule of Belial was in accord with the predestined plan of God which included his evil actions in bringing about the sin of Israel. This is evident from the statement in 1QM 13:9-11: "And from former times You [YHWH] appointed the Prince of Light to help us ... and You made Belial to corrupt ..." We also find that the desecration of the cultus by religious syncretism and violations of the purification laws were the result of Belial’s corruption of the

---

cf. Satan "appearing as an angel of light," (II Corinthians 11:14), and "deceiving the whole world" (Revelation 12:9; 13:14; 20:3).
Nation: “And the Levites shall recite the iniquities of the sons of Israel and all their guilty rebellions and their sins, accomplished under the power of Belial” (1QS 1:22-24). Conversely, the righteous man is the one who resists the power of Belial, and thereby will be rewarded at the Restoration. For example, we read in a Qumranic psalm called "The Second Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness" (4Q397-399): „רעה דנפ לבליא תשל חוכמת באורית חכמה ... ראה דניק ספנ מושב ... ("...and to keep you far from evil thoughts and the counsel of Belial. Then you will rejoice at the End Time ...), lines 32-33. Thus, the desecration of the Temple, Land, and exile was part of the cosmic conflict, with the movement being toward an eschatological restoration at the eschaton, the day of deliverance for the righteous, yet both positively and negatively with reference to the rule of Belial.

Belial also follows in the developmental progression of typical desecrators, begun in our study with Pharaoh. For example, in CD 5:17f Belial is portrayed as a ruling angel in opposition to the Law of God: “At the beginning Moses and Aaron arose through the hand of the prince of light, but Belial, in his wickedness, raised up Jannes and his brother ...” Notice that in this instance, Belial is equated with Pharaoh as a type of divine opponent as an oppressor of God’s agents (hence God Himself). Also in the Damascus Document we read that the “Prince of Lights” is directly opposed by Belial (cf. CD 5:18). Thus, the adversarial position of Belial places him in continuity with the types of desecrators we have seen displayed in the Tanach.

The “Antichrist” at Qumran

While Belial may be generally equated with the image of Satan, his role as an evil spiritual influence appears in many texts to become focused in the temporal sphere as an end-time human Desecrator. In some texts there appear a contrasting pair of figures: “Melchizedek” and “Malkiresha,” the latter of which fits this description as an evil human oppressor. Consequently, this figure has been identified by some as a depiction of the Antichrist. However, more significant comparisons appear in Second Ezekiel (4Q385-389), where reference is made to both a בֶּן בַּלֵּיא ("son of Belial") and a
("blasphemous/boastful king") who will arise and oppress the Jewish People. These terms occur in texts (both in fragmentary form) which are within a context alluding to the national regathering and restoration of Israel from the vision of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel 37:4-6, which is immediately followed by a prayer concerning the time of this end-time regathering.\footnote{This is certainly the case for the term בֵּן בֵּיתוּל (the more significant term) which occurs immediately following this context in column 3, while the term נְפָרָם מִלָּה occurs in fragments which are thought to follow this context.} The lines which follow and describe the הִקְמִית מִלָּה and בֵּן בֵּיתוּל, may give the answer as a time during which this individual desecrator functions. At any rate, the description of this individual reveals significant details of his role in desecration:

Fragment 3

column 2
line
(3) יְאָמְרוּ דִּבְּרֹתָן בֵּן בֵּיתוּל יִשְׁפָּךְ לְעַתָּה אָחֵנוֹ
(4) ולא אֵין גֶּלֶן מְשָׁלָה לַאֲדֹם הַמְּסַמֵּר לָא יְשַׁמֵּר

(3 - "And YHWH said: 'A son of Belial will plan to oppress My People, 4- but I will not allow him to do so. His rule shall not come to pass, but he will cause a multitude to be defiled [and] there will be no seed left").

Fragments 4-6

column 2
line
(9) בְּרֵאשָׁי עֵחֲדָה יִשְׁמַח מֶלֶךְ לְעִיזֹּם נְפָרָם מִלָּה
(10) וּנְפָרָם מִלָּה מַעַּמֵּר אֲמָלֹם אֲמָלֹם

(9 - "[In] those [days] a blasphemous king will arise among the Gentiles, and do evil things [ 10 - Israel from [being] a People. In his days I will break the Kingdom")
From these lines we can see that this one will be future Gentile king who will seek to so oppress the People of Israel that they are annihilated completely, will be destroyed by God. In the same context are references to Babylon, to God’s hiding His face until Israel has filled up the measure of its sins, and of a period of apostasy, characterized by breaking the Abrahamic Covenant. There is also the interesting comment concerning the wicked before they are taken in judgment: “Just as they will say, ‘Peace and quiet is ours, so they will say ‘The Land rests quietly.’” All of this is reminiscent of passages concerning the זָרָה of Daniel 9:26-27 (cf. Revelation, the deceptive security) before the War of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38:8-16 (cf. Jeremiah 6:14; 8:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:3). In addition, Eisenman and Wise suggest that these terms may have parallels in Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243-245) in the terms (“Kings of the Peoples”) and (“Kingdom of the Peoples”), which appear in a similar context during which time אֲרָמָא רָמָא רָמָא ("[Ev]i[Il] has led astray ...") and דְּרוֹי הָיֹתֵן קִרְאָא ("the called ones will be gathered"), lines (33-34), cf. line (51-55).46

Other texts at Qumran also appear to be referring to this "son of Belial" by different descriptive terms. In CD 6:10; 1QpHab 5: 7-8, texts which depict a period of great spiritual declension on the part of Israel, this apostasy is said to be spearheaded by a figure called נַבְרָא אוֹשֵׂה ("son/man of sin"), cf. CD 6:15; 13:14; 1QS 9:16; 10:19. This expression is quite similar to the Greek ὄψις τῆς ἀνωτέρας ("the son of destruction"), an expression found in the Pauline description of the eschatological desecrator, the Antichrist, in II Thessalonians 2:3b. It is complemented by another term: נָבַר לוֹ ("son of iniquity") in 1QS 3:21, which is also comparable to another phrase in this New Testament reference, δ ἀνθρωπός τῆς ἁνωματής ("the man of lawlessness"). In addition, one of the New Testament hapax legomena, μυστήριον τῆς ἁνωματής ("the mystery of lawlessness"), found only at II Thessalonians 2:7, the Pauline Antichrist context, has an almost identical corresponding expression at Qumran: רִאש מֵאָדָה (1QH 5:36;

46Eisenman and Wise, DSSU, p. 65.
50:5). Some scholars have also claimed to have found another parallel in הָנֹן
(‘detain’), (1Q27 1:7) to this passage and especially to the cryptic term κατέχων
(‘restrains’), 1 Thessalonians 2:6, 7. Though the sense of “hold back” may not be
exactly represented by , Dupont-Sommer, on the basis of this comparison,
nevertheless translated the complete line of the text: “And all of those who detain
[unjustly] the marvelous mysteries…”

David Flusser claimed to identify another Qumran "Antichrist text" in a
late first--century B.C.E. pseudo-Daniel fragment in Aramaic. He has argued
that it describes the superhuman hubris of the Antichrist, and therefore reveals
that the idea of an anti-messiah is Jewish and pre-Christian. Here we may have a
remarkable, though contested, allusion to Daniel 9:27, which may have served as
the original seedbed for apocalyptic Antichrist imagery. This text, formerly
classified with the 4Q Pseudo-Daniel fragments, the document has now gained its

47Cf. Joseph Coppens, ‘‘Mystery’ in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels
at Qumran,” Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor

48A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by Geza

49This fragment from Cave IV was bought from Kando the antiquities dealer on
July 9, 1958 and officially assigned to J. T. Milik of Harvard. Milik’s failure to
publish the text or his translation motivated the Jesuit priest Joseph A. Fitzmyer to
publish an unauthorized translation of part of the text in “The Contribution of
394. First credit for full publication goes to Emile Puech, “Fragment d’une
apocalypse en arameén (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan) et le ’royaume de Dieu’”, RB 99
Following the release of a photograph of the text by the Huntington Library of
San Marino, California, Fitzmyer published his own complete translation with

50David Flusser, “The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from
own signification as "The 'Son of God'" (4Q246). This new title in part reflects the current opinion concerning the central actor in this end-time drama, who now is viewed positively as a messianic, rather than negatively (e.g., with Flusser) as an anti-messianic figure. Let us first consider the text and its translation, and then the arguments of Flusser and his opponents concerning the interpretation of this controversial text. We have selected only the most pertinent lines from this two column (originally three) text of nine lines each (in which the first part of each line of column 1 is missing):

Column 1
line
(7) עֹרֶבֶל לֶחָזִים עָלָיו אָרָנָה
(8) בְּנֵךְ מַלְכֶּם כָּלָה שֶׁלֶם יְשַׁבֶּדֶנָּהוּ כָּלָהָם סְפָרָּה
(9) הָלָּה הָאָרָה כָּלָה רַכֵּב תָּכֵּרָה וְסְפָרָּה יָכֹּּנְה

Column 2
line
(1) בֵּרֵה דָּי אֲלִילֵב וּכְרֵף לְעָלִין יְכָרְכֵּי כְּדֶקָא
(2) רְדִינָא מִמְמַלְכֶּה יַחָוָה תֵּאְנֹּר מִלְפָּנֶה עָלָּיָה
(3) אַרְאֵא כָּלָה יֵשְׁנוּ שְׁמִי הַלָּמְכֶּה וְמְרִיָּה לֶמְזָרְיָה
guarantee (4) וּרְדִינָא מִמְמַלְכִּי אֵלָה יִקְוָא וְאֶלֶּה יָכִּּנְה vacat
(5) מִמְמַלְכֶּה מִלְפָּנֶה כָּלָה אֲרִיָּה בָּקְשֶׁשֶּׁה יִדְיָו
(6) אַרְאֵא בָּקְשֶׁשֶּׁה כָּלָה יֵנֵרָה לֶמֲכָה אֶלְּבֶּרֶךְ וְאִלְּמַרְּאֵי יִקָּשֵּׁנֶּה
(7) כָּלָה מְרֹנָה לֶהָאָרָה יַכְּרֵף אֲלָה יָכִּּנְה
(8) וּאֵלֵּה יֵנֵרָה לֶהָאָרָה יְכָרְכֵּי יָכֹּּנְה

51It was originally entitled Pseudo-Daniel, with the sigla 4Q psDanAa or Dan209, because of the mention of "Daniel" in column 1, line 2, although this Daniel only appeared as a man falling before the throne, yet there was also an allusion to the eternal Kingdom of Daniel 2:44, which warranted this signification. However, the exceptional appearance of the term "רְדִינָא" ("S/son of God") and the interpretation of this text as an allusion to Daniel 7:13, has become the basis for the title and sigla.
("1:7- [ ...] will be great on earth 8-[ ...] will make, and all will serve 9- [ ...] will be called [gr]eat, and by his name will be called/2:1 - Son of God he will be called and Son of the Most High they will name him. Like a shooting stars that you saw, 2- so shall be their kingdom. They shall reign for [some] years on 3 - earth and will trample all. One nation [or people] shall trample on another nation and one province on another province 4 - [vacat] until the people of God shall arise and all will desist from the sword. 5 - His Kingdom will be an eternal kingdom and its/its ways will be in righteousness; He will [jud]ge 6 - the earth in righteousness, and all will have/make peace; The sword will cease from the earth 7 - and every nation will submit to/worship him. The great God will be his help. 8 - He will make war for him, and he will give all peoples into his power").

This account reveals common apocalyptic traits. A seer, probably Daniel, interprets for the king a mystery concerning the last days, which he has received either in a dream or a vision. The vision is of a time of wars and great distress during which a wicked kingdom will rule over the world. This end-time condition is described as “one nation shall trample another …” (cf. Sibylline Oracles 635-636: “nations ravage nations;” IV Esdras 13:31: “city against city … kingdom against kingdom”); and Matthew 24:7; Mark 13:8; Luke 21:10: “nation shall rise against nation”) sets the tone for this text of a conflict between opposing kingdoms and a militant, nationalist king who is extremely war-like.52 This ruler will be served by all nations and he will claim to be the son of the Most High. His reign will continue until Israel (“the people of God”) will be restored (“rise”), cf. column 1, line 6; column 2, line 4. Then all war will end and universal peace will be established. In concert with biblical prophetic literature and Jewish apocalyptic, the wicked are deposed by divine intervention, and Israel is exalted in the Messianic Kingdom. It should also be noted that this peace will come only after the cataclysmic [Messianic] war, indicating the tone of conflict that characterizes this text.

What Flusser sees here is the self-enthronement of a wicked ruler to be worshipped (יְהֹוָה) as, in some-sense, divine. He argues that we should identify

52Cf. Eisenman and Wise, DSSU, p. 69.
this figure, who either claims or demands from others that they acclaim him with the title רוח יד אל ברעל ("son of God, and 'son of the Most High"), as the king or leader of an oppressing kingdom. 53 Flusser's translation of the critical section is: (7) "[ ] he shall be great on earth … (8) [all] will worship54 and all will serve [him] … great … (9) he shall be called55 and by His name he shall be designated.56 (1) He shall be named57 son of God and they shall call him son of the Most High." This translation, however, does not differ significantly from those who disagree with his interpretation. What controls Flusser's view of the text, and draws the interpretive line between scholars, is the understanding of the vacat in the middle of column 2 before the phrase תור יתפב גל"ד ("until the people of God arises"). If this break is taken as an indication of the beginning of a new topic, which is viewed positively, then by contrast, what precedes it would be viewed negatively. Accepting this as an intentional hermeneutical key, Flusser, and Milik before him, interpreted what preceded the vacat as a description of the wicked ruler of the oppressive kingdom which brought distress and war, and also demanded divine worship from his subjects.

Milik saw in this figure the Syrian king, Alexander Balas 150-145 B.C.E. (son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes who had persecuted the Jews in 167-164 B.C.E.)

53There is, however, ambiguity in the Aramaic wording as to whether he is self-designated or designated by others. In II Thessalonians 2:4 the Antichrist figure designates himself, but in Revelation 13:4 his worshippers so designate him. As Flusser (p. 33) points out, the difference is minimal: "if others 'shall call him son of the Most High' they will do it at his behest." Perhaps both could be understood in this manner: he designates himself by his actions (in II Thessalonians 2:4 by seating himself in the Temple), his worshippers designate him by their acclaim (by "crowning" his actions with the self-sought title).

54Read ענ_hashes as a Hebraism meaning "worship" and not according to the usual Aramaic definition "they will make."

55Or: "he shall call himself."

56Or: "he shall designate himself."

57Or: "he shall name himself."
whose image on coins is accompanied by the inscriptions: Θεοπάτωρ ("god-begotten") and Deo patre natus ("born of a divine father"). However, as F. García Martínez has pointed out, since it was Alexander Balas who appointed Jonathan as high priest (cf. Josephus, Antiquitates 13. 2. 2 § 45), he would not have been regarded as an oppressor of Israel.

Flusser observes that the text does not say that this usurping figure will be the son of the Most High, only that he, and/or others shall call him such. Flusser conjectures that the claim of this Antichrist may be even greater than the available text reveals. Since the beginning of line 9 of the first column is missing, we can only read: [יְרוּם מְמוּשֶׁה יֵעָהה] ("... [g]reat ... he shall be called, and by his name shall he be designated"). The words בְּשָׁמָה ("by his name") are enigmatic, if we assume that the person shall be designated by his own name. However, if we determine that the person shall be designated by the name of God, then it has been effectively defined. It is therefore possible to venture that the text once read:

לַלֵּךְ הָעָד בָּרָא זָא יְרוּם מְמוּשֶׁה יֵעָהה
בָּה יִדְּא אַל הָאָמָר מִרְבָּא עַלְמוֹנִי יָפֶתְה יִקְרָא

("Great [God] he shall be called and by His Name he shall be designated. He shall be named son of God and they shall call him son of the Most High").

Flusser argues that this parallelism fits the practical nature of the general text and suggests an affinity with other apocalyptic texts. Three striking parallels are adduced by Flusser:

---


(1) the *Ascension of Isaiah* 4:2-16, which speaks of the incarnation of Beliar in whom all the peoples will believe and to whom they will sacrifice.

(2) the *Oracles of Hystaspes*, which describes a king who will arise from Syria (as in 4Q246 column 1, line 6) as a destroyer of mankind, who "will constitute and call himself God and order himself to be worshipped as the Son of God."  

(3) the *Assumption or Testament of Moses* 8:1-5, in which an end-time king of supreme authority persecutes the Jewish People, blasphemes God, violates the Law, and desecrates the Temple by forcing entrance to the Holy of Holies and offering pagan sacrifices on the altar. He likewise compares the New Testament apocalyptic text of II Thessalonians 2:4-5, where a similar case of an end-time ruler identified as the "man of sin," demands investiture with divinity by seating himself in the Temple and proclaiming himself God.

The chief argument in opposition to Flusser is that while the *vacat* does mark the transition to the final stage of the drama, it does not require that everything preceding it be understood as negative because repetition is a general characteristic of apocalyptic and thereby vitiates the assumption of sequential order necessary for this interpretation. However, if repetition is the literary device employed here, one must ask why the figure identified (or identifying himself) as...

---

60 Preserved in Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 7. 17. 2-4 in *CSEL* 19: 638-639.

61 The term ὁ λόγος = רֹאשׁ, which in Mishnaic Hebrew (e.g., *TJ* Shabbat 7:10a) and Aramaic signifies "the Person of God," thus, the blasphemy was directed toward God, cf. R. H. Charles, *APOT* 2:420, n. 5. Charles also suggests that "the innermost sanctuary" referred to may be that "of the heathen temples which the Jews were compelled to build (cf. I Macc. i. 47; Joseph. Ant. xv. 5.4)." while J. H. Charlesworth, *OTP* 1:931 translates it neutrally as "secret place." It seems preferable in light of the references to the Person of God, the Law, and the altar to see here the Holy of Holies, which Charles list as an alternative.

62 See chapter 7 for a discussion of this text in relation to apocalyptic literature and Daniel 9:27.
the Son of God only appears in column 1. John Collins addressing this problem answers that: "The figure who is called the Son of God is the representative, or agent, of the people of God. That is why he is not mentioned again after the rise of the people of God in column 2. His career and the rise of the people of God are simply two aspects of the same event." However, just as repetition often is employed in apocalyptic, so also may sequential order appear, and the literary structure of the narrative must best decide whether or not this is the case in each context. However, in fragmentary texts, such as this, the decision is difficult. Collins' argument depends upon the prior acceptance that the Son of God has reference to the Messiah, or at least is used in a positive sense, so that he can be viewed as the representative of the people of God.

Fitzmeyer and Collins both object that this text could not be the "Antichrist" because this is a Christian idea and unattested in pre-Christian Judaism. However, while the concept of the figure as a "mirror-image of Christ" (Collin's words) does not appear in Judaism, nearly every trait associated with the Antichrist depicted in the New Testament has a corollary in pre-Christian apocalyptic, especially in the "son of Belial" text above. Furthermore, there appears no reason why, as Flusser contends, that this text might not be the exceptional example of such a pre-Christian anti-Messiah. This is in fact what Collins claims for this text as an example of a pre-Christian reference to the Messiah as the Son of God, a concept also lacking clear parallels in Jewish apocalyptic. It is for this reason that Fitzmeyer hesitates to make this identification. While some of Flusser's exegesis and reconstruction of the text

64Cf. Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 169; Collins, op. cit., p. 57, n. 5.
65Ibid., p. 35. Collins notes (p. 57, n. 4) that the messianic interpretation was first proposed by Frank Moore Cross.
66Ibid., pp. 170-173.
may be questionable, his argument for an Antichrist figure in this text does appear valid.

Based on the foregoing survey, including that of Flusser, we conclude with some observations from Jewish apocalyptic literature about the specific nature of the Antichrist figure, which is an essential element in the desecration motif:

(1) The idea of “Antichrist” is strictly Jewish and pre-Christian. It should be recognized that while this figure may well be anti-Messiah (Christ), the Greek preposition ἀντί can also mean “in place of,” and indicate one who substitutes himself for or counterfeits the claims of another, as in this Qumran fragment, God.

(2) As a Jewish apocalyptic motif, it grew and developed within the apocalyptic Weltanschauung - the dualism between the cosmic and earthly forces of good and evil. The Antichrist became the human exponent of the evil forces that oppressed the people of God and desecrated the cult by which God was represented. II Thessalonians 2:4 pictures the Antichrist seating himself in the Temple in order to proclaim his divinity, a blasphemous act that may certainly be described as an “abomination of desolation.”

(3) The eschatological desecration/restoration setting of this fragment makes it clear that the interpretation of “mystery,” both in the context of Daniel 9 and, in this instance, at Qumran, was in view of a future revelation of a “mystery of lawlessness” which involved the unveiling of a human antagonist who usurps divine authority (his reign) and title (His Name). The defeat of this epitome of human arrogance and defiance of the divine will end all lesser displays of human rebellion, and usher in the restored kingdom of Israel with its glorified Temple, act necessitated by its desecration.

Thus, at Qumran, we have a continuation and development of the idea resident in the “Abomination of Desolation.” Here, an eschatological figure (whether “Wicked Priest,” “Belial,” “son of Belial,” “Malkiresha,” or “Antichrist”) is responsible for the desecration of the Temple, Land, and the
oppression of the people of God. This figure, as well as all his companion
descendants ("the sons of darkness") are slated for conflict with the righteous at
the last great battle, yet only to be destroyed without remedy or return, so that the
kingdom of YHWH may be established in righteousness without reversal. It is to
this concept of restoration that we now turn in the concept of the eschatological
Temple at Qumran.

The Concept of the Restoration of the Temple at Qumran

Only at Qumran do we find reliable references to a Jewish theology of the
Temple. One must be careful, however, not to draw incomplete inferences by
deduction from this theology. Townsend has noted that because Jewish literature
from the Second Temple period used sacrificial language in reference to various
non-sacrificial aspects of life, interpreters have often been tempted to argue that
those speaking thus regarded the Jerusalem cult as unnecessary. However, they
include authors such as Aristeas and Ben Sira who clearly held the Temple and its
cult in high esteem. We have some evidence, that while the community
regarded itself as a temple, it nevertheless may have continued to support the

67 John T. Townsend, "The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century," God and His
Temple: Reflections on Samuel Terrien's The Elusive Presence: Toward a New
Biblical Theology. Edited by Lawrence E. Frizzell (New Jersey: Department of
Judeo-Christian Studies, Seton Hall University, 1979), p. 49. Some of these
references in Second Temple literature included living a virtuous life (Philo,
Special Laws 1:50 (272); Sacrifices 12 (5); Life of Moses 2:22 (108); IQS 9:5; cf.
Micah 6:7-9), martyrdom (IV Maccabees 6:27-29); prayer (CD 11:21); praise (IQS
9:4).

68 Ben Sira uses such references with regard to observing Torah (Sira 35:1-3; cf.
32:1-5), and Aristeas of the ransoming of slaves (Epistle of Aristeas 19, 37).

69 A hoard of Tyrian silver tetradrachmas, precisely the type used for the half-
shekel temple contribution, was found in locus 120. While 4Q159 records
collection of this payment, but does not explicitly state that they were delivered to
the Jerusalem Temple. I can see no objection for believing, as does Stephen
285, that they were so delivered. If not, however, perhaps they were being held in
store for the purified Third Temple they imminently expected to replace the
Second Temple.
divine institution of the Temple, though its present priesthood was considered corrupt. Our approach here will be to survey the Essene "Temple theology," by focusing on three expressions of the Temple At Qumran as reflected in the Scrolls. These will be: (1) The Community as a Symbolic Temple, (2) The Eschatological Earthly Temple, and (3) The Heavenly or Cosmic Temple.

**The Community as a Symbolic Temple**

A distinctive theological idea expressed in the Scrolls is the concept of the Essene community as a symbolic temple. For example, in 4QPls\(^8\) viii, 5-6; ix. 6, the Qumran Community [Council] is paralleled to the Temple using spiritual imagery, for there it is referred to as a "Holy of Holies for Aaron and a Temple for Israel." Based on the Manual of Discipline (1Q5 5:5-6; 8:4-10; 9:3-6) and the Damascus Covenant (CD 3:18-4:10),\(^70\) the following points will summarize for us the concept of the community as a symbolic Temple:

(1) The community is analogically conceived of as a temple, the repository of divine truth, i.e. the revealed mysteries concerning God's will (evidence of God's Presence among the community) for holiness and the means of eschatological preparation for the last days. In 1QH 7:8f the community is conceived of as being a temple-city built upon a rock and immovable. The "rock" probably symbolized the eternal truth and knowledge of the community which would serve as an "everlasting foundation" for Israel. As the Covenanters fulfilled their representative function for all Israel, through them the Nation might itself become purified and realize a restored sanctity in the Sanctuary.

---

\(^70\)Some students of the Scrolls also include the passage in 4QFlorilegium 6:1 which has the expression מְקוֹם מַלְאָךְים ("the sanctuary of man"). This has been interpreted to refer to a temple-community, cf. Gärtner, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-42), however, the text most likely refers to the future Sanctuary to be built "among men," rather than having any symbolic sense. For the arguments in support of this, especially for the comparative evidence from the Temple Scroll, cf. Yigael Yadin, *מלעלת המתקדש* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 1:143f; "A Midrash on 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 1-11 (4QFlorilegium)," *IEJ* 9 (1959): 95-98.
(2) The community as a symbolic temple consists of both priests ("the house of Aaron," i.e., Zadokites), and non-priests ("am-Yisrael"), corresponding to the graded holiness of the Temple precincts, and in contradistinction to the non-Zadokite, i.e. unqualified, priests and worshippers at the desecrated Second Temple.

(3) The sacrificial cult offered in this temple-community (cf. 1QS 9:4-5) exhibits the proper interpretation and observance of the cultus, as opposed to the ritually defiled offering performed in the Second Temple. Since obedience to the Law was symbolized by participation in the temple cultus, if the cultus was defiled, obedience to Law itself would symbolize a pure cultus apart from the inaccessible ritual. The fact that burnt offerings were not performed at Qumran, but rather, "the offering of the lips," i.e. "prayer" (1QS 9:5; cf. CD 11:18-21), is evidence both of the regard for the Jerusalem Temple as the only acceptable place of sacrifice, and of the original intention of the First Temple to be a "house of prayer" (cf. I Kings 8:28-53; II Chronicles 6:19-40; Isaiah 56:7; cf. Psalm 40:6; 51:16-17). This emphasis on prayer as sacrifice also has eschatological connotations in view of the Essene desire to remove the unlawful sacrifices and restore the Temple to holiness (cf. Isaiah 56:7).

As the above summary implies, the primary motive for the development of a symbolic community-temple was: (1) because of the defilement of the Jerusalem Temple, a belief stated in CD 20:22: "Israel sinned and made the Temple unclean." Their own departure from Jerusalem to live at Khirbet Qumran was as a result of their inability to participate in a religiously and morally corrupt cultus, (2) their belief that God had established a unique covenant with them as the vanguard of the messianic era. In this regard they considered themselves a "divine planting" (1QS 11:8; 1QH 6:15; 8:5), (3) that the divine Presence was dwelling in their community and constituting it, for the present, as the representative eschatological Temple.
The Eschatological Third Temple at Qumran

The Essene Community saw itself as a symbolic temple, but it also envisioned a Third, Restoration, Temple as a replacement of the Second Temple in Jerusalem which it perceived as desecration by the non-Zadokite Temple priesthood. It must not be forgotten that even though the community withdrew from the Jerusalem Temple, they never ceased to regard it as the legitimate, albeit desecrated, Temple of YHWH. Evidence of this continued veneration by the sect may be seen in the fact that, according to Josephus, Antiquities XVIII, 1:5.19, they regularly sent offerings to the Temple. As we have already pointed out, they did not offer sacrifices at Qumran because they considered the Temple as the only proper place for such offerings.

One of the most explicit Qumran texts to parallel the biblical material in its description of the eschatological Temple is the Aramaic work from Caves 1, 2, [primarily 4, 5], and 11 known as "The New Jerusalem" (4Q554). This text, obviously written under the influence of the eschatological Temple of Ezekiel 40-48, but which extends the description into an ideal Restoration Jerusalem, is largely instructions for measuring the new Temple based on Ezekiel’s scheme. However, Michael Wise in his Chicago University dissertation on the Temple Scroll, has also shown how favorably this text compares with the measurements given in this text for the Qumranic Third Temple.\textsuperscript{71} While many details of the text remain elusive because of hapax legomenon and multiple breaks in the manuscripts, we can discern that the author envisioned an immense rectangular city (13 x 18 miles) with a surrounding wall containing twelve gates (one for each of the twelve tribes of Israel with Gate of Levi center most, aligned with the sacrificial altar and the Temple entrance), and with nearly 1,500 towers (100 feet tall) guarding the city. Specific reference is also made to the נאמנים,\textsuperscript{72} as in Daniel

\textsuperscript{71}Cf. Michael O. Wise, A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11. SAOC 49 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990), pp. 64-86.

\textsuperscript{72}The נאמנים (Hebrew נאמנים) are usually considered to be the Romans, whose ships in Daniel 11:30 came from the west past Cyprus (= Kittim) to defeat the army of
11:30, and frequently in Qumran apocalyptic literature, but here joined in column 11 with a probable reference to the Messianic Kingdom.\textsuperscript{73} If this is the proper reconstruction of the text, then the Kingdom may be that first introduced in Daniel 2:45, and paralleled in the collection of Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243-245). The Temple then would be the eschatological Temple of the Messianic Age.

This understanding helps prepare us for the sect’s quest for the ideal Temple as expressed in the Temple Scroll (Q11QTemple\textsuperscript{4} or 11QT). It must also be remembered that the Dead Sea community selected their site for a reason, and one such reason could be its prominence in the biblical accounts of the restoration of the final days. When the eschatological Temple is constructed, waters will flow from beneath the Holy of Holies and freshen the Dead Sea (Ezekiel 47:8-9; Zechariah 14:8). Perhaps their community existed to witness the fulfillment of this eschatological event. Since the description of this eschatological Temple will be drawn in detail from the Temple Scroll, it will be necessary to introduce this text with a brief description of its provenance and purpose.

\textit{A Description of the Temple Scroll}

11QT is twenty-seven feet in length, longer than all the previously discovered Dead Sea Scrolls combined, and contains architectural plans for building the Temple including detailed descriptions of the Temple services and festivals, many not mentioned in the Bible or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{74} 11QT has been Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Egypt. However, I Maccabees 1:1 equates them with the forces of Alexander the Great.

\textsuperscript{73}The text (according to the reconstruction by Eisenman and Wise, \textit{DSSU}, p. 43) reads: [ עם אבראים כל ענף כל ענף ... {[כָּל} נַפְשָׁו]} [ בֵּן [ אלֶה נַפְשָׁו]} "the Kittim after him, all of them after another ... among all nations, the] Kingdom ... and the nations shall serve them," column 11 [or later], 16, 21, 22).

\textsuperscript{74}The designation for this document is \textit{11QT} The numeral 11 indicates that the scroll is from Cave 11, the letters QT stand for either \textit{11Q Temple} or \textit{11Q Torah}. This later designation is based on the premise that the scroll was considered by the Qumran community as a supplementary sixth book of the Torah, or as the second half of a scroll considered an eschatological Torah. On this latter issue,
thought by some to have incorporated one of the lost books of the Bible, specifically, the book of Temple plans given by God to David and by David to Solomon (the קורות התemple). The biblical Chronicler recorded the existence of such plans when he wrote: "'All this', said David, 'the Lord made me understand in writing by His hand upon me, all the details of this pattern'... Then David gave to his son Solomon the plan [of the Temple]..." (I Chron. 28:19, 11-12). The rabbis recorded in a midrash that a document like this once existed, even referring to it as the Temple Scroll. They argued that it was received at Sinai by Moses, then passed on by Moses to Joshua, from Joshua to the elders of Israel, from the elders to the prophets, by prophets to David, and finally from David to Solomon. Whether or not we can accept this, it seems clear that the form of 11QT is not a sectarian book, but a Torah-like document. It appears that the Qumran community believed that their Temple Scroll was just such a holy book, equally a part of the God-given Torah.

*The Temple of the Temple Scroll*

Many scholars have concluded after a study of the 11QT that it does not refer to the Second Temple, nor to a visionary eschatological temple, such as that there is debate, however, as to whether the temple conceived in the scroll is an eschatological temple, or a model of an earthly temple that was intended to be replaced by a later eschatological eternal temple.

Rabbinic literature, and especially midrash, was anxious to resolve questions that arose from the text. In this case the question was, "How did David know how to build the Temple; when and from whence did he receive the written plans for the Temple mentioned in I Chron. 28:19?" The rabbis concluded that this must have been a part of the received Torah, like the instructions given for the building of the Tabernacle in Exodus 25-27. Therefore, they produced this midrash explaining that a "Temple Scroll" was transmitted through the leadership of Israel to Solomon. There may, however, be some support for this argument, since 11QT appears to be a copy from an earlier original, since fragments of other copies of 11QT manuscripts have been found in other caves.

One evidence for this is the way the text presents itself as direct revelation from God. In passages paralleled in the OT using the introductory formula "Moses said," where the Bible means that God gave Moses revelation, 11QT reads "I said," meaning that God Himself is speaking.
of Ezekiel 40-48, but to a man-made edifice to be constructed on the Temple Mount after the polluted Jerusalem Temple was removed. They had expected a messianic deliverance that would enable the building of their temple, but because of the Roman occupation, and later destruction of Jerusalem and the Qumran community, their plans could not be realized. The Temple and Jerusalem in the scroll are transformed from a city with a Temple, to “the city of the Sanctuary.” The city functions as a hedge around the Temple, there is a sacred interrelationship between the concepts of Temple and city, with each being an entirely new construction and combination, superseding any previous, and the result will be a radical elevation and change in status for Judaism.  

While the dimensions of 11QT Temple are much larger than those of the Second Temple (the outer court measuring about a half mile on a side), and differ in many other respects, the design itself reflected the idealic expectations of the Jerusalem school of architecture, and may very well evidence a plan underlying Herodian construction. Such a limited correspondence was demonstrated from its architectonic structure by Johann Maier in a study of the architectural history of the Temple based on 11QT. It has often been supposed that the reason that 11QT presented a differently structured Temple from that of Herod's Second Temple was because the authors of 11QT were opposed to the Jerusalem Temple. However, nothing in 11QT gives any impression that they had anything but reverence for the Jerusalem Temple. Rather, they had planned for a future Third Temple, to be built after the Roman occupation, on the Temple Mount, but on a greater scale and with features that incorporated the divinely-designed Temple of Ezekiel.


The Temple Scroll also includes halakhah that differs or is considered "new" with respect to the Mosaic legislation. If this is text deals with a Temple to be constructed in the Messianic Age, such would not be inappropriate, as both pseudepigraphical and rabbinic works held that in the new era there would exist new law.\textsuperscript{80} The idea that even their own laws were temporary may be seen in other documents of the Qumran Community. For example, the Manual of Discipline states that the members "shall be ruled by the first mishpatim with which the men of the Community began to be instructed until the coming of a Prophet and the anointed ones (i.e., the two Messiahs) of Aaron and Israel" (CD 9.10-11).\textsuperscript{81} However, at Qumran, while their own laws were considered temporary, they did not believe that the Mosaic Torah would be replaced (as e.g. the Sibylline Oracles 3.373-374, 757-758). Therefore, while new law was expected in the Messianic Age, the old law was not to be abrogated. The Temple Scroll, then, may represent some of the new laws that would govern the new Temple in a new age.

The Eschatological Temple in the Temple Scroll

Any study of the future Essene Temple and the Temple Scroll faces a plethora of different opinions in interpretation:

(1) Was 11QT a proto-Qumran document on par with the Book of Jubilees or an eschatological Torah, or more specifically, an eschatological Deuteronomy, or an inspired holy book, considered by the sect as theUBEVF?

(2) Does it present one or two eschatological Temples, and


\textsuperscript{81}Similar assertions are made in the Damascus Document (4.8-9; 6.14).
(3) Did the community actually envision the construction of this Temple by their own hands, or view it as merely a collection of interesting biblical notions for sectarian study? A brief response to these questions is in order.

First, 11QT has the same solar calendrical system as the Qumran community, its contents parallel the cultic concerns of the community, its various laws are based on Deuteronomy, a book used by the sect to critique the Jerusalem priesthood, many of its regulations for the Temple are unique, having no parallels in either biblical or rabbinic legislation, and its text is composed in a divinely-directed (non-mediated) style, unlike any other Jewish document. For all of these reasons, Yadin contends that 11QT has a Qumran provenance. 82 One, of course could contend that the sect developed their theology from 11QT, however, Michael O. Wise has shown that while the work is not as apocalyptic a work as the other Qumran scrolls, it does derive from an apocalyptic milieu, and is comparable to the Book of Jubilees. 83 According to Asher Finkel, 11QT picks up where Jubilees ends, and since both share many common elements (such as solar calendar calculation systems). He has shown that the major redactional concern of 11QT was governed by what he called Kanonbewusstsein ("canon consciousness"). 84 This "canon consciousness" is rooted in a profound awareness of God's presence that affects the midrash torah of the scroll, reshaping the

82 Cf. also Jacob Milgrom, "'Sabbath' and 'Temple City' in the Temple Scroll," BASOR 232 (1978): 25-27, and J. Kampen, "The Temple Scroll, the Torah of Qumran?" Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society 1 (1981), pp. 37-54. It may be that 11QT was composed in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period (c. 200 B.C.), knowing about this gap of knowledge, and influenced by the need to supply what was missing, simply composed this new document based on their contemporary understanding of the Second Temple and colored by their fascination with the eschatological temple of Ezekiel 40-48.


Pentateuchal text to conform to the theme of God’s presence. In this manner, it projected itself as an original Torah and נאם נאם for the eschatological restoration Temple.

Second, Judith Wentling has successfully demonstrated that there was only one eschatological Temple apparent in both 11QT (29:3-10), and the expectations of the Qumran community. This eschatological Temple made use of the literary models in the Pentateuch and the writings of prophets such as Ezekiel, as well as Jubilees-11QT, and depended also on the Tanach and the cycles of biblical history (possibly prophetic motifs), that reaffirmed the fact that YHWH would continue to act on behalf of His Covenant People. To suggest that 11QT contained two Temples, would deviate from the biblical precedent of one central Sanctuary, something the community was careful to preserve and follow. Wentling therefore, concludes: "Only one eschatological temple would be built. Perhaps corresponding to the Rabbinic notion of man’s partnership with God in the act of creation, the future miqdash would built by those in whom the spirit of God already dwelled."86

Third, H. Stegemann has argued that the Qumran community never intended to build their Temple in Jerusalem, rather, it served as a means to secure proper halakhah so that eschatological Israel could function according to God’s covenant. Stegemann sees nothing in it specifically designed for the Qumran community or its time, instead, it is an up-dated version of the law-code of Deuteronomy 12-26 and a pattern-book for the Temple which was designed to help prevent Israel from a second exile by re-conforming it to the ideal standard of

---


86Ibid., p. 74.

the divine will.88 Michael O. Wise appears to agree with this assessment, arguing that the how of building the Temple was not important to 11QT 29:3-10 (the covenant section), but the restoration of the Patriarchal covenant which guaranteed God's abiding presence.89 While there is much that is agreeable about Stegemann and Wise's statements about the practical use of 11QT, it must be contended that their eschatological aspirations were not simply idealistic, but from their commitment to their strict discipline as a community at Qumran they demonstrated their conviction that they were to be actual implementers of the imminent events to accompany the eschaton.

Johann Maier of the University of Cologne has presented one of the most detailed studies to date on the architectonic structure exhibited in the Temple of 11QT.90 His conclusion after examination of the data compared with that of the Second Temple was that not only was the plan an actual reflection of realistic concepts and traditions of the Jerusalem school of architecture, but that it possibly served as one source of design-style for the Herodian restoration of the Second Temple. Furthermore, the scrolls themselves give the impression, as Chilton has pointed out, "that the Essenes saw themselves as a new camp in the wilderness, awaiting their rise to power and control of the Temple."91 If this is so, then they had a detailed architectural plan in hand complement their victory. There is still a difference of opinion as to whether the Covenanters believed that they would

themselves erect the Third Temple, or whether it would strictly be an act of God.

The argument for the rebuilding of a Temple restored according to Qumranic halakhah in place of the Second Temple, after the great apocalyptic war, is in part supported by the expectation of recovering the treasures of the Temple recorded in the Copper Scroll. Because of the renewed recognition of the significance of this document for Temple studies, we will briefly consider its contribution to the concept of the eschatological Temple.

*The Copper Scroll and the Concept of the Eschatological Temple*

The Copper Scroll (3Q15) has been considered as a part of the apocalyptic tradition of the Qumran community by Al Wolters. In order to grasp the significance of this unique document as part of the Temple restoration motif, we need to review something of its character and provenance. Although the war of 1948-1949 interrupted professional searches for other scrolls in caves in the Dead Sea region, in 1952 a major expedition was mounted, eventually locating the rest of the 11 caves containing scroll fragments. In the back of Cave III were found two rolls of copper, two pieces of one scroll now known as the Copper Scroll (3Q15). The Copper Scroll is undoubtedly the most controversial and problematic of all the Dead Sea Scrolls.

*A Description of the Copper Scroll*

P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. of John Hopkins University, who has done the most recent research on the Copper Scroll and has published a newly-revised

---


translation, says of this document that it does not fit into any of the categories of the Dead Sea literature, except that it came out of a cave. He notes: It is written in a language that is different from the language of any of the other scrolls.

It is written in a script that is not like the script of any of the other scrolls. It is written on a material that is different... and its content has no parallel... It is an unusual phenomenon, an anomaly.95

The Copper Scroll, which is of pure copper, not bronze, and has suffered very little deterioration since it was unearthed, is also unique in that, unlike the other Dead Sea Scrolls which are housed in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem, it is displayed in the Jordan Archaeological (Citadel) Museum in Amman.

*The Significance of the Copper Scroll to the Temple*

The contribution of the Copper Scroll is that it describes sixty-four different hiding places of the treasures of the Jerusalem Temple, removed to protect them from the Romans during the Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66-70. This was not an unusual procedure, even for the Temple priests, since Josephus tells us that Jews at this time fled into the Judean desert to hide their property. In Ezra 2:59-63 and Nehemiah 7:61-65 it is recorded that the members of the House of Hakkoz (a priestly family of the Davidic line, cf. 1 Chronicles 24:10), unable to substantiate their genealogy after the return from Babylon, and so were reassigned priestly duties that did not require the exception degree of genealogical purity. Connecting the reference in Nehemiah 3:4 of Meremoth son of Uriah son of Hakkoz to Ezra 8:33 which says the Temple treasure was entrusted to "the priest Meremoth son of Uriah," we learn that this family became the treasurers of the Temple. In the Copper Scroll, a specific reference, in location 32, links the treasure mentioned in the scroll to the both the Temple treasury through the Hakkoz family. There it reads: "In the cave that is next to the fountain belonging to the House of

Hakkoz, dig six cubits. (There are) six bars of gold."\(^{96}\) The Copper Scroll is the only example known of a metal text containing a treasure list, and the fact that it records rather ordinary information about locations and amounts, and not imaginative exaggerations of treasures, appears to confirm its authenticity. Among the treasures hidden in the desert are thought to be an urn containing the ashes of the Red Heifer, the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, as well as vast amounts of gold and silver.

The majority of scholars have doubted the character of 3Q15, however opinion has been either faith or fable. Milik has contended that it is nothing more than Jewish religious folklore: "la réalité de ces histoires" ("fictional inventions").\(^{97}\) On the other hand, Chaim Rabin disputed the suggestion that 3Q15 was legendary and defended its authenticity.\(^{98}\) Wolters detailed study of the scroll concludes that "this inventory was inscribed on copper to ensure the future recovery, by ordinary human means, of treasures which had been so carefully recorded."\(^{99}\) Whatever the verdict for 3Q15, the Essenes most certainly envisioned refurnishing a restored Temple with the original sacred artifacts and utensils that had been part of the glorious First Temple. They believed that with the coming eschatological battle, and their subsequent triumph, they would be able to return and recover their treasures to equip the restoration Temple. Therefore, while this document is not itself apocalyptic, it may preserve one of the


strongest apocalyptic images of the restoration motif, that of fervent hope in a Jerusalem and a Temple made according to the divine ideal.\textsuperscript{100}

\textit{The Heavenly Temple at Qumran}

We have previously stated that we agree with the argument that at Qumran only one eschatological Temple was expected. While this is so, there is apparently observed in some of the documents from Qumran glimpses of another ideal Temple. While these descriptions could be merged with those concrete designs laid out in 11QT, I believe that along the lines of the Qumran dualism, and its celestial projection, that the Temple described by these texts is the heavenly Temple, i.e. the archetypal Sanctuary of the divine abode.

In this regard, J. Strugnell has presented a report concerning the angelology of \textit{Serek Sirot \textquoteleft Olat Hassabbat} (a document from the early stage of the development of Qumran theology) which pictures a celestial setting. In this text (4QS 1 37-40) the Essenes imagined a heavenly sacrificial cult with angelic beings performing priestly functions.\textsuperscript{101} In 4QPs\textsuperscript{d}, fragment 1, we find a restored city bejeweled with every kind of precious stones, especially those emblemizing the twelve tribes on Aaron's breastplate (cf. Exodus 28:17-20). The imagery is like that of Revelation 21:18-21 (with allusions to Ezekiel 48:31-34), which describes the heavenly Jerusalem, which has no Temple. Since the fragmentary commentary is based on Isaiah 54:11-12, a text dealing with the age of restoration and messianic blessing, the context is eschatological. The highly symbolic nature of the text leads me to believe that it describes a heavenly, rather than earthly scene, and that its Temple is celestial rather than terrestrial.

\textsuperscript{100}For a complete discussion of apocalypticism at Qumran, cf. George Wesley Buchanan, "The Eschatological Expectations of the Qumran Community" (Ph.D. dissertation: Drew University, 1959).

\textsuperscript{101}Cf. John Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran - 4Q Serek Sirot \textquoteleft Olat Hassabat," \textit{VTSup} 7 (1959): 318-345.
CONCLUSION TO THE TEMPLE MOTIF IN APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

Our survey of the apocalyptic literature has revealed the continuity in thought between the writing prophets of the prophetic period and these Jewish stylists who wanted so very much to interpret their present distresses in the context of biblical eschatology. In doing so, they selectively used prophetic material that spoke about Jerusalem, the Land, the Temple, and like Daniel 9, offered a cryptic chronometer by which they could ascertain the time of the end. Their interpretation and amplification of the prophet's eschatology to produce an apocalyptic eschatology, developed a complex dualistic scheme for the predetermined plan of Israel's restoration. This scheme included an eschatological Desecrator who would seek to usurp the place of YHWH in the affections of Israel, then would attack the city and the Temple. He would be opposed by Messiah, who would destroy him and his evil powers and restore the Temple and usher in the glorious age of redemption and universal peace predicted by the prophets. Upon this apocalyptic bridge linking the prophets with the first-century, we will consider whether the New Testament authors will continue the link, or forge a new link one, and whether the motif of desecration and restoration of the Temple will be applied in the process.
CHAPTER VII

THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Having seen something of the importance of the Temple for first-century
Judaism, we now turn to consider the perspective of first-century Christianity,
whose relationship with the Temple as recorded in the New Testament must be
understood in the context of this Jewish milieu. In this chapter I will examine the
eschatological motif of Temple desecration/restoration as it is developed in the
literature of the New Testament.¹ I will begin by examining the passages in the
Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John presenting Jesus' attitude toward the
Temple. In this regard the study will concern itself especially with Jesus' Temple
pronouncement passages, the cleansing of the Temple accounts, and the use of
Daniel's "Abomination of Desolation" in the Olivet Discourse.

This examination will continue with a study of the attitude toward the
Temple in the Book of Acts², concentrating on Stephen's supposed anti-Temple

¹ Doron Mendels of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has pointed out the use
of the New Testament as an essential historical document in Jewish studies: "... the
New Testament is an invaluable source for the study of many aspects of
Judaism during this [Second Temple] period and should be viewed as a Near
Eastern document by historians" The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism. The

² It has become a common practice in scholarship to distinguish between the
attitudes of the different Gospel writers concerning the Temple. Thus, it is argued
that Mark, negatively conceiving of the Temple's destruction because of the
rejection of Jesus, radically re-interprets Jewish expectation so that the end-time
significance of the Temple is transferred to Jesus and the Church, whereas
sermon, and with Paul's involvement with the Temple cultus. This latter treatment will then focus on the use of the motif of Temple desecration/restoration within the Pauline epistles, especially the use of consecration imagery employing the Temple as a spiritual metaphor for the Church, and the Pauline usage of the Danielic figure of the "Abomination of Desolation." The chapter will conclude with a brief presentation of the various views of the eschatological Temple in the books of Hebrews and the Revelation.

**Jesus Attitude Toward the Temple**

While theological norms for the Temple are difficult to find for this period, the record of dissenters, such as those at Qumran, testify to the importance

Matthew and John were aware of Jewish eschatological expectations concerning the Temple, yet also attempted a similar reformulation of the Temple. It is then posited that Luke-Acts, in contrast to these Gospel-writers, and seeing the Temple in positive terms, was true to the widespread Jewish expectation that the literal Temple in Jerusalem would play an important role in the eschatological age, cf. recently: Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple*, and the New Age in Luke-Acts (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988), and James M. Dawsey, "The Origin of Luke's Positive Perception of the Temple," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 18:1 (Spring, 1991): 5-21. However, these distinctions have been made generally in view of the monolithic interpretation of the conflict in the first-century as that of "normative Judaism" versus "apostolic Christianity." David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), p. 328, argues that "it is no longer credible to disregard the complexity of late-first-century Jewish history by reading Luke-Acts simply as a story of "Christianity" versus "Judaism." Researchers must now take into account the record of tensions that existed within Judaism as to who represented the "true Israel," between the messianist, the Qumran Coventees, the Pharisees, as well as the diverse social, economic, and political factors that defined the various Jewish groups beyond their competing orthodoxies. In this direction, Marilyn Salmon in her dissertation "Hypotheses about First-Century Judaism and the Study of Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, 1985), has argued that the intra-Jewish controversy accounts for Luke's treatment of the law and the Pharisees. Cf. also along these lines: David Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), pp. 617-644, and Jacob Neusner, "Parallel Histories of Early Christianity and Judaism," *Bible Review* (Spring, 1987), pp. 42-55. For the purposes of our study, we will acknowledge this on-going debate, but will treat the attitudes toward the Temple within the literary genres, i.e., Gospels (Jesus), Acts (Stephen and Paul), Epistles (primarily Pauline), Prophecy (Revelation).
the Temple played in their very existence and eschatological formulation. There seems to be little doubt that, whether positively or negatively, the Jerusalem Temple was considered to be an essential and central part of Judaism in the first-century.3

When we come to the person of Jesus we recognize that he is the raison d'être for Christianity, the Church, and the New Testament itself. In the words of Charlesworth:

I am convinced that we cannot re-present the New Testament documents, their theologies, and their tendencies without ultimately focusing on the challenge of one single life. Jesus is the power paradigm for all the New Testament writers. We must acknowledge that New Testament - perhaps all Christian - theology develops out of the tension between tradition and addition, between remembered history and articulated faith.4

Not only were the authority and messianic claims of Jesus the paradigm for the New Testament writers, but his handling of the biblical text also served as the paradigm for the apostolic exegesis of the Tanach.5 Earl Ellis has noted that in apostolic exegesis, the methodology employed is distinctively Jewish:

3Those who argue that the Temple was of secondary importance do so with the thinking that the synagogue had replaced the Temple as the center of worship, cf. George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), 2: 13ff and R. T. Herford, Pharisaism (New York: Putman, 1912), pp. 27ff. However, the two institutions were never in conflict, the synagogue arising from the Temple and during Second Temple times serving as a means for those outside Jerusalem to participate in the Temple cult. Synagogue services corresponded top the Temple liturgy, and were a constant reminder of the prominent place of the Jerusalem Temple, both before and after its destruction. In later Jewish thinking the synagogue, and the home as well, served as a microcosm of the Temple, re-enforcing, rather than replacing, its importance in Jewish theology and worship.


5"The teaching and exegesis of Jesus became the direct source for much of the early Church’s understanding of the Old Testament ... so the early believers seem to have taken Jesus’ own interpretation of selected Old Testament passages as a paradigm for their continued exegetical endeavors," Richard Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans
Biblical interpretation in the New Testament church shows in a remarkable way the Jewishness of earliest Christianity. It followed exegetical methods common to Judaism and drew its perspective and presuppositions from Jewish backgrounds.  

Jesus' use of both quotations and allusions from Tanach reveal that he was skilled in these various forms of rabbinic exegesis that were normative in his day (literalist and midrashic). While the majority of citations from the Tanach are Septuagintal in nature, and perhaps reflect the multi-lingual character of the day, and of Jesus' use textual criticism in pesher treatment of passages, they may have been the result of translation from Aramaic compilations or assimilation of Hebraic quotes into Septuagintal form.


Examples of this use are given by Longenecker, op. cit., pp. 70-75.

Or possibly a combination of these. It is also possible that many of the Septuagintal features in the text-form of the quotations from Tanach were unique
Because the Judaism of Jesus’ day was Torah-centric, to gain a hearing among his people Jesus’ teaching had to also be Torah-centric. The distinctive difference in Jesus’ methodology was his employment of a creative element in his hermeneutics that arose from his concept of the Tanach as a pre-messianic Torah. It is for this reason, as R. T. France has demonstrated in his work, that the church did not create Jesus, but Jesus created the church. Jesus use of Tanach as a text source for his own messianic claims established the hermeneutic for early Jewish-Christianity in terms of fulfillment-oriented exegesis. In this regard, Jesus’ eschatology, which followed the literalist approach of the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Qumran in looking for a future fulfillment of the restoration of Israel in a millennial Age, following the judgment of the Gentile nations, served as the basis for the Johannine, Pauline, and Peterine epistles.

---


Examples of this messianic interpretive paradigm in application to Jesus’ parabolic style have been ably demonstrated by Robert H. Stein, The Method and Message of Jesus’ Teachings (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978), pp. 112-147.


Cf. E. Earl Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 147-172, and Pasquale De Santo, A Study of Jewish Eschatology with Special Reference to the Final Conflict (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1957), pp. 397-402. We should add here the statement of Lamar Cope, “‘To the Close of the Age’: The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew,” Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn. JSNT Supplement Series 24 (Sheffield, 1989), p. 123: “so it seems to me that we need to acknowledge that Christian faith did arise out of the seedbed of late Jewish apocalyptic movements, but we should also recognize that its finest insights about God, human life, and discipleship are anchored in a radical understanding of the grace of God which negates the dark side of apocalyptic.” In response to Cope, I would say that the Christian faith, especially as reflected in the early Jewish-Christianity of the New Testament, is better recognized as a continuation of the eschatological thought of
Therefore, it is essential in understanding Jesus' eschatological treatment of the Temple, to underscore his continuity with a Torah-centered Judaism whose eschatological hope was primarily drawn from the biblical Prophets, and whose influence governed the hermeneutical development of the early church.

The Place of Jesus Within Judaism

With a view to this "remembered history" from which "articulated faith" flowed, it is also necessary to remember that Jesus was a Jew within Judaism, that is, a Jew who was part of Judaism and whose concerns about the Temple are to be viewed in this context. Jewish and Christian scholarship have both witnessed a profound resurgence in Jesus Research\textsuperscript{13}, and this has come primarily with the renewed perception of Jesus as an integral part of, rather than apart from, the Judaism of his time.\textsuperscript{14} E. P. Sanders, who is representative of such thinking, has

\textsuperscript{13}The first to use this term was D. Winter, \textit{The Search for the Real Jesus} (London, 1982): "But the last decade has seen an amazing transformation ... historians and theologians have turned with gusto to the original documents, parallel historical records and the geographical sites, and at every turn have found a clearer and clearer picture emerging of Jesus of Nazareth. Hence, I call the new development 'Jesus Research'" (pp. 8-9). For a summary and assessment of this trend cf. J. H. Charlesworth, "From Barren Mazes to Gentle Rappings: The Emergence of Jesus Research," \textit{The Princeton Seminary Bulletin N.S.} 7 (1986): 221-230. This shift in thinking has been the subject of at least one study, cf. Donald A. Hagner, \textit{The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus: An Analysis & Critique of the Modern Jewish Study of Jesus} (Grand Rapids: Academic Books/Zondervan Publishing House, 1984).

stated: "The dominant view today seems to be that we can know pretty well what Jesus was out to accomplish, that we can know a lot about what he said, and that those two things make sense within the world of first-century Judaism." 15

Recent research has attested to the fact that prior to 70 C.E., predictions of the destruction of the Temple abounded, so much so that there is evidence that many religious Jews expected such a destruction, partly because of the experience of the past history of Gentile domination, and partly because of the belief that a new Temple was needed. 16 Too, recent archaeological excavations at the southern wall of the Temple Mount have confirmed the New Testament account (John 2:14) of the presence of large animals in the halls of the money changers. 17

15E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 2. His application of this perspective is evident in his Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishna: Five Studies (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990). While Jesus and the writers of the New Testament were a part of Judaism, this is not to say that they were necessarily a product of it, as e.g., O. Lamar Cope: "So it seems to me that we need to acknowledge that Christian faith arose out of the seedbed of late Jewish apocalyptic movements ..., "To the Close of the Age: The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew," Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn. JSNTS Suppliment Series 24 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), p. 122. Their is still a question as to whether we may speak of "diversity within Judaism" or of "Judaisms," however, Jesus appears to be more in line with the writing prophets of the biblical period, which developed their apocalyptic message in response to the crisis over the Temple cult, than to any particular apocalyptic movement, motivated largely by political crises.

16These predictions are recorded by Josephus and in early rabbinic literature. For a listing of many of these with discussion cf. Markus N. A., Brockmuehl, "Why Did Jesus Predict the Destruction of the Temple?", Crux 25 (September 1989): 3, pp. 12-14. Doron Mendels notes that because the Temple had gradually lost its significance as a religio-political and spiritual symbol through the abuse of the priesthood, that by the end of the Second Temple period there emerged the idea that the priesthood and Temple should be destroyed (although he cites Paul as an example of this school of thought!), op. cit., p. 305.

17The area uncovered is known as the Hanuyot according to Talmudic sources (Sanhedrin 41:2; Aboda Zara 8:2) and is identified today with the three-level Southern Royal Portico (considered a sacred, or by some semi-sacred area. In this place, east of the Double and Triple Huldah Gates (in what is now called "Solomon’s Stables") where ramps led directly to the Temple Mount, there have
In light of these revelations from first-century Jerusalem, the statements and actions of Jesus within the Temple precincts become more understandable and fit well into the controversial events of Second Temple Judaism.

If Jesus was a Jew within Judaism, then it may be assumed that he shared the same reverence and concerns for the Temple that governed observant Jewish practice of the time. Indeed, Mendels observes that until the 50's of the first-century, the Temple was considered an a-political institution; most Jews and Christians accepting the Temple and the priesthood as solely religious and spiritual institutions. Because the most noted events describing Jesus’ attitude toward the Temple have centered around three pericopes which appear to cast the Temple in a negative light, it will be helpful to first balance this perspective by a survey of those texts in the Gospels that indicate a positive (i.e., reverential) attitude toward the Temple by Jesus (and, most probably, the Gospel writers).

The Passover Visit of Jesus to the Temple

The infancy narrative of Luke 2:21-38 records the account of Jesus' presentation at the Temple. The text is careful to note the strictly observant conduct of Jesus' family: his circumcision (ברית מילה) on the eighth day (Leviticus 12:3; cf. Philippians 3:5), in verse 21, and his mother's ritual mique immersion according to the purification laws (Leviticus 12:4-6), in verse 22a.


18Doron Mendels, op. cit... pp. 304-305.

These acts of ritual devotion were followed by Jesus' dedication in the Temple (verse 22b) according to Exodus 13:2 (which passage is cited in verse 23). This dedication is accompanied by the prescribed sacrifice (and noted by another citation, Leviticus 5:11 in verse 24). Luke's detail in these few verses describing the Temple obligation, especially at the outset of the presentation of Jesus' life, paints not only a picture of a religious family, but of a typically Orthodox family who held the Temple in high esteem and ordered their lives in relation to its cult. This is emphasized by Luke's addition in verse 39: \( καί \ ως \ ἐτέλεσαν \ πάντα \ τὰ \ κατὰ \ τῶν νήμων \ κυρίον. \)

It should not be surprising, that the next event recorded by Luke in the life of Jesus is the family's fulfillment of the requirement of Passover pilgrimage to the Temple (Exodus 23:14) in Luke 2:41-49. Luke again underscores the family's obedience to the Law of annual pilgrimage by stating that this was indeed performed "every year" \( (κατ' \ ἔτος) \), verse 41.\(^{20}\) The record selects this occasion of Jesus' twelfth year because he was performing the Jewish mitzvot connected with arriving at the age of puberty (verse 42).\(^{21}\)

While Luke's purpose in the remainder of this account (verses 46-49) is to reveal the early messianic consciousness of Jesus (in the contrast is drawn

\(^{20}\)Luke in making reference to this pilgrimage here and again in verse 43 with the reference to "fulfilling the days," i.e., "spent the full time" \( (τελειωσάντων \ τὰς \ ημέρας) \), the Passover week, may have also implied another instance of the family's status as observant Jews, as the requirement was only for a stay of two days. It is possible that there is likewise a hint of further devotion to the pilgrimage in the route they would have taken, probably along the Jordan from Galilee to Jerusalem. S. Safrai, *Pilgrimage in Second Temple Times* [Hebrew], pp. 15, 48 indicates that such an alternate route might have been taken to escape the Samaritans (who acted hostile to families on such pilgrimages). The necessity of taking this longer and more arduous route might have discouraged those less devoted.

\(^{21}\)It was apparently a tradition that children accompany their fathers to the Passover at least a year prior to their reaching puberty (*M. Niddah* 5:7-9; cf. *M. Hagiga* 1:1; * Pirke Avot* 5:24). S. Safrai, "Home and Family," *JPFC* 2:771f, notes that *T. Hagiga* 1:2 indicates that a child was to keep whatever mitzvot he was capable of performing. The later concept of the *Bar Mitzvah* probably developed from this early tradition.
between his earthly parents and his heavenly Father, verse 49), also prominently
in view is Jesus' spending several days after Passover in the synagogue (located
within the Temple precinct), sitting at the feet of the rabbis, exchanging questions
in the rabbinical tradition. When questioned by Miriam and Yosef about his
continued presence in the Temple, Jesus replies - in his first recorded words in the
Gospels - "I must be in my Father's [house]" (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ
εἶναι με). This statement attests to Jesus' affirmation of the Temple as the
 בית אל־יהו (= πατρὸς μου οἰκόν, cf. John 2:16), and his declaration that the
Temple is the acceptable place for him, i.e., the place where he "must be" (δεῖ
εἶναι με). Thus, at the beginning of the Gospel narratives Jesus' exceptional
reverence to the Temple is disclosed.

The Testing of Jesus at the Temple

The Gospel account of Jesus' testing in the Judean desert at the onset of his
earthly ministry at age thirty in the pericopes of Matthew 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-
11 (cf. Mark 1:12-13)\(^\text{22}\) presents another occasion to view Jesus' attitude toward
the Temple. The parallels in this account with historic Israel indicate that the
writer's purpose was apparently to contrast the testing of Israel in the wilderness
with that of Jesus; he as Messiah succeeding where the Nation failed.\(^\text{23}\) In the
second test of Jesus (Matthew 4:5-7; Luke 4:9-13) the scene is set in the "holy

\(^{22}\)The accounts are almost parallel except for Luke's reversal of the order of the last
two temptations. The reason for Luke's change in order is probably for
topographical reasons, and in the case of the second testing, possibly because he
wanted to end this pericope with a reference to the kingdom, cf. Walter Liesfield,
order is most likely the original. Mark makes only a brief reference to the event,
but J. Dupont has shown that he was most certainly familiar with the larger
account, "L'Arrière-fond Biblique du Récit des Tentations de Jésus", \textit{NTS} 3

\(^{23}\)For a thorough treatment of the use of the wilderness motif in this passage and
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city” (ἀγγεῖον πολλῶν)\(^{24}\), on “the highest point” (τὸ πτερύγιον, "the pinnacle, wing") of the Temple (τοῦ λεπτοῦ).

The reference is probably to the southeastern corner of the Temple complex, which presented the greatest height/depth ratio in relation to the ravine of the Kidron valley below.\(^{25}\) The suggestion that it referred to the Sanctuary itself is ruled out by the fact that Jesus, not being a Levite, would not have approached this area.\(^{26}\) Had the Temple not held some sanctity for Jesus (and the Synoptic Gospel writers) there would have been little reason to choose this area as a specific place of messianic testing in relation to Psalm 91:11-12, which is cited (from the LXX) in both accounts (Matthew 4:6; Luke 4:10-11). Psalm 91:11-12 refers to divine assistance through angelic intervention, and since the Temple was

\(^{24}\) This expression for Jerusalem is familiar from its use toward the end of the biblical period (Isaiah 48:2; Daniel 9:24; Nehemiah 11:1; cf. Matthew 21:10; 27:53). Luke prefers to use "Jerusalem," because he is writing of the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to the Gentile nations. It is not that the Jewish appellative “holy city” might be confusing to some Gentile readers, rather it is the geographical, not only the spiritual, concept of the city that Luke wants to emphasize.

\(^{25}\) Some have thought that the reference must be to the ἐστία or entrance porch, of the Temple, since πτερύγιον means “wings,” and at this place the building bears such a resemblance, extending outward beyond the breadth of the Temple. However, Josephus (Antiquitates XV. 412. xi. v.) describes the στῶα βασιλικήν (“royal stoa”) located in the southern part of the Temple complex (Josephus says southern part of the court of the Gentiles) as of such a great height that if anyone looked down from the top: σκοτόδυναν οὐκ ἐξικατόμητος τῆς ὕψους ἐλαῖος ἐμέτρησιν τῶν βραδύν (“he would grow dizzy, his eyes not being able to reach so vast a depth”).

\(^{26}\) For instance, J. Andrew Kirk, “The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative,” Evangelical Quarterly 44 (1972): 91-95, would see in this a challenge for Jesus to prove his messiahship by leaping from the Temple pinnacle, as in a late Jewish midrash, to prove himself to the people as a new “David” who would rid Jerusalem of the “Jebusites” (i.e., Romans). However, the midrash makes no mention of spectators, and its lateness, as well as the Levitical consideration above, makes the hypothesis untenable. Equally wrong, to my mind, is the suggestion of N. Hyldahl, “Die Versuchung auf der Zinne Temples”. Studia Theologica 15 (1961):113-127, that Jesus was being tempted to voluntarily submit to the punishment for blasphemy by being thrown off the pinnacle of the Temple.
particularly the place where God’s Presence was manifested, the assumption is that the test must be here for Jesus to demonstrate his claim to a unique relationship with God.

Several instances of Jesus’ positive attitude toward the Temple are recorded in contexts not related to the Temple, but which in their incidental reference, reveal respect for the Temple in the manner of an ordinary Orthodox Jew. The first of these references is cited as another example of Jesus’ favorable attitude toward the Temple (Mark 2:26/ Matthew 12:4 and Luke 6:4) in which Jesus describes the twelve sacred loaves of shewbread bread (Leviticus 24:5-9), as literally, "the bread of the setting forth or proposition" (τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προβοσκείας ἐν τῷ χείλει, "the bread of the face, i.e., ‘presence’”27 after the account cited in these verses from I Samuel 21:3-7. Wise suggests that this implies that “the Gospel writers thought of the Temple as the special place of God’s presence.”28 The use of this citation might only connote, Jesus’ and the Gospel writers’ perspective of the Tabernacle, since this is the context of I Samuel 21, however, his connection with the Second Temple in Matthew 12:529 indicates that he had the same regard for this structure.

In the fashion of rabbinic-style debate, Jesus employs the hermeneutical device לא תומר to argue for the validity of his actions in the profaning of the

---


29 This connection is only preserved in Matthew 12:5, most likely because of Matthew’s orientation of his Gospel to Jewish-Christian readers. However, it is possible that the connection is implied in Luke 6:4 since the term used for the Tabernacle is τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, certainly the equivalent of לא תומר, which can apply also, and perhaps more properly, to the Temple, cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Arts* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 223-224.
Sabbath in accord with established halakhah. He cites from the Torah (Numbers 28:9-10) concerning the offering made by the Temple priest \(\text{o} \text{l} \text{ lepeîs} \ \text{év} \ \text{t} \ \text{lepo} \) on the Sabbath as justification for the Messiah, as "something greater than the Temple" \(\text{t} \ \text{lepo} \ \text{mei} \ \text{en} \ \text{ést} \ \text{en} \ \text{ód} \text{e} \), verse 6. Because the cultic responsibilities of the priest superseded the Sabbath restrictions, they could technically "profane" (\(\text{bé} \ \text{bý} \ \text{lý} \ \text{o} \ \text{on} \)) the Sabbath, yet remain "guiltless" (\(\text{án} \ \text{al} \ \text{t} \ \text{ol} \)). Because the Messiah takes precedence as "one greater" (than the cultic institution), he likewise remains guiltless for plucking grain on the Sabbath. The importance of this comparison for our purpose is that it portrays Jesus' acceptance of the Temple and its cultus as legitimate, otherwise his a fortiori argument would fail.

A second incidental remark of Jesus that demonstrates his esteem for the Temple is found in the pericope of Matthew 23:16-21. In this passage, Jesus is again engaged in debate and in his arguments makes reference to the Temple, its

---

\[30\]The meaning of the Hebrew expression is literally "the light (\(\text{d} \ \text{é} \)) to the heavy" (\(\text{d} \ \text{k} \ \text{m} \ \text{a} \ \text{m} \) "substance, matter"). The words, however, are used in the sense of "less important" and "more important," therefore the minor (\(\text{k} \ \text{m} \ \text{a} \ \text{m} \)) and the major (\(\text{d} \ \text{k} \ \text{m} \ \text{a} \ \text{m} \)) points of a case. The expression, then, may be understood as an inference a minori ad majus, i.e., an argument from the minor premise to the major premise. The uses of קס in the Talmud and Mishnah reveal at least four distinct ways in which this reasoning device has been employed. The primary distinction appears in the manner in which the major and minor premises are assembled, though the act of inference remains the same after the relevant premises have been gathered. These four uses of קס may be classified as argument by identity, argument by degree, argument by difference, and argument by opposition. Both Jesus and Paul frequently employed the קס form of argument in their discussions of biblical and rabbinic halakhah.

---

\[31\]This is the best translation of the phrase, since μειζὸν is neuter, and the masculine variant is poorly attested in the manuscript evidence. However, the reference is still to Jesus in his claim to be the Messiah, since the neuter can be used to refer to persons when some quality is being stressed rather than the individual per se. For the use of the neuter cf. Nigal Turner, Syntax. Vol. 3 of J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), p. 21. cf. From Sabbath to Lord's Day. Edited by D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1982), p. 67 which argues that this quality is the authority of Jesus in contrast with that of the priests.
gold\textsuperscript{32}, and its offerings, and the altar. It may be significant that here the word used is ναός ("Temple") rather than ἱερος ("sacred"), because the former is thought to distinguish the Temple proper (especially the Holy Place and/or the Holy of Holies), whereas the latter more generally to the whole cultic complex (cf. Luke 1:22).\textsuperscript{33} John appears to make this distinction in his Cleansing pericope, referring to the area of the money-changers as within the Temple (ἱερος), John 2:14. Comparative Johannine use appears to support this distinction.\textsuperscript{34} Jesus, then, by the use of this term, and by the precious items within the Holy Place, may be advancing an elevated perspective of the Temple as having a unique sanctity in itself, for it bestows sanctity (ἅγιασακάγιαζου, verses 17, 19) on whatever common things are associated with it, rather than being sanctified by anything.

\textsuperscript{32}It is probably not the golden adornment of the בָּרוּם that is being spoken of but the gold of an individual that was reserved for the service of the Temple by ascribing it as בָּרוּם. This interpretation better understands the context of taking oaths by the Temple or its altar (Matthew 23:18).

\textsuperscript{33}The 45 occurrences of ναός in the NT are divided among the historical books (9 times in Matthew; 3 in Mark; 4 in Luke; 3 in John; 2 in Acts), the Pauline corpus (4 times in I Corinthians; 2 in II Corinthians; once each in Ephesians and II Thessalonians), and the Apocalypse (16 times in Revelation). While ναός can sometimes refer to both the Temple complex and the inner Sanctuary, it generally bears a technical distinction from ἱερος. It is significant that only ναός is used metaphorically with reference to the Church, since in these cases the emphasis is on the indwelling Presence of God, not on the Temple itself as an institution. For further discussion on this distinction, cf. BAGD. (1979), pp. 373.2, 535.1a, EDNT s.v. "ναός," by U. Borse, p. 457, and A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament. 6 vols. (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1932) 4:377; 5:38.

\textsuperscript{34}Note that in the division of usage above, the predominance is in the Apocalypse where the Holy of Holies is often indicated either by God's presence, incense, or the Ark of the Covenant (cf. 11:19; 15:8), and especially where the concept is figurative of the Divine Presence (cf. 21:22). Note especially in Revelation 11:1-2 that the Temple is referred to as τὸν ναόν τοῦ θεοῦ, and then in the next part of the verse reference is made to τὴν αυλὴν τὴν ἐξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ ("the court which is outside the Temple") as something separate. This outer precinct was thus outside the ναὸς, but still within the ἱερος, indicating the specificity given to the terms.
A third positive inference to the Temple may be seen in Matthew’s pericope concerning Jesus’ validation of the payment of the Temple tax (17:24-27). The two drachmas (διδραχμα) tax was levied on all Jewish males between the ages of twenty and fifty in support of the Temple and its services, a practice which had developed from the half-shekel levy at the annual census (Exodus 30:11-16). Therefore, this is strictly a Jewish religious obligation rather than a civil tax imposed by Rome. While Jesus’ answer has in view the greater question of his messianic authority (as in Matthew 12:4 and Luke 6:4), and consequently the right of exemption from the Temple tax for himself and his disciples (who belong to the messianic category of ulol, verse 26), he nevertheless affirms that the Temple tax is legitimate by paying it not only for himself, but also for Simon Peter (verse 27). That the money for the payment

---

35 After the Exile one-third of a shekel was collected annually, and by the time of Jesus the amount had been restored to the original half-shekel (= two drachmas). This is well attested in both Josephus, Antiquities III, 193-196 [viii. 2]; XVIII, 312 [ix. 1] and Mishnah Shekalim, (which deals with the obligation to support the Temple service).

36 The view of some commentators is that this deals with civil taxation in support of Rome. Their argument, in part, is in view of the references in verse 25 to ol βασιλείς τῆς γῆς (“kings of the earth”) and τέλη Ἡ κηνυσιοῦ (“toll or poll tax”) which they interpret as references to Roman imperial practice belonging to the period after 70 C.E. when they suppose Matthew to have been written. In this case, they see Jesus’ answer as anachronistic - the question being recast to address the concern of Christians under Roman law obligation to pay taxes to Rome cf. Richard Cassidy, “Matthew 17:24-27 - A Word on Civil Taxes,” CBQ 41 (1979): 571-580. Though the term βασιλείς commonly refers in Hellenistic literature and the Greek papyri to the Emperor, it has been suggested by D. A. Carson, "Matthew," EBC 8 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), p. 394, that here it should not specifically refer to Rome because: (1) the generalized terminology ol βασιλείς τῆς γῆς is inadequate to denote Caesar, and (2) in the context the “king” who collects the tax is Jesus’ “Father,” and comparison of Jesus’ sonship in relation to an imperial king is unprecedented. A mediating position sees here both the Temple tax (verse 24) and the civil tax (verse 25), understanding, however, that verse 24 establishes the topic of the entire pericope, while verse 25 is parabolic. The point of Jesus interrogation of his disciples, however, is to stress that as “sons of the [heavenly] Kingdom” they are exempt from the taxes of this world’s kingdom.
comes through miraculous means (verse 27), may imply that Heaven also approved of this payment.

A final instance of positive attitude expressed by Jesus toward the Temple is seen within one of the three negative pericopes in Matthew 21:13; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46. In the context of confrontation with the vendors at the Herodian ἡ λαζαρία, Jesus quotes from Jeremiah’s “Temple Sermon,” (Jeremiah 7:11) with an addition from Isaiah 56:7. The Jeremiah text is negative, and the source for the justification of Jesus’ denunciation, while the Isaiah text is both positive and eschatological. More will be said about Jesus’ use of the Jeremiah text below, but here we simply draw attention to Jesus’ affirmation with the Prophets that one central purpose for the Temple was that it was to be αὐτὸς προσευχῆς πατὰν τοῖς ἔβουσκαίν, Mark 11:17 (= יְהוָה בַּפֶּלֶל לְכָל הָעָם, Isaiah 56:7). This concept of the Temple as the place toward which even the prayers of the Gentile proselytes

37 were to be directed was originally prescribed in Solomon’s dedicatory address in I Kings 8:41-43.

Jesus apparently agreed with this design of the Temple mission, and with Isaiah envisioned that future day when all nations would worship at the Temple Mount. In this light, Jesus’ statements in these parallel pericopes against the desecration of the Temple might also be a charge against the usurpation of this original spiritual and eschatological function of the Temple for the world.

Jesus’ “Cleansing” of the Temple

Perhaps no text in the New Testament outside of Jesus’ famous Temple-destruction-prediction texts (Matthew 23:37-24:2 = Luke 19:42-44; Mark 13:2) has been used more often to demonstrate an anti-Temple attitude on behalf of

37 The terminology makes explicit that these are not another category of עֲבֹדֵי הָאֱלֹהִים הָאָרֶץ by a repetition of qualifiers הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ אֶל עֲבֹדֵי הָאֱלֹהִים הָאָרֶץ, אֶל עֲבֹדֵי הָאֱלֹהִים הָאָרֶץ. The force of this expresses something like: “non-Jewish foreigners, non-Israelites, from lands outside Israel”. That they are directing their prayers toward the Temple, and therefore to YHWH, indicates that as “foreigners” (בָּאֲרֵי) they have turned from “foreign gods” (אֲלָדוֹת נְכֵר-אֲרָמִי) and are considered as proselytes.
Jesus than the pericope of Jesus’ “cleansing” of the Temple, recorded in each of
the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John (Matthew 21:12-13; Mark 11:15-17;
Luke 19:45-46; John 2:14-22).\textsuperscript{39} To be sure, this episode ties in chronologically
with Jesus’ statements about the Temple and its destruction, since such a public
act coupled with Jesus’ citations from the prophets naturally provoked questions
about his view of the Temple. Others have sought connections between this event
and Jesus’ “cursing” of the fig tree (Mark 11:12-14, 20-21), since in Mark the
“cleansing” pericope is sandwiched between the report and the explanation of this
miracle, although it follows in Matthew 21:18-22.\textsuperscript{40}

It is also significant that this event is cited by the witnesses against Jesus
at his trial as evidence of a hostile attitude toward the Temple, leading some
commentators to believe that these witnesses were correct. Therefore, opinions
concerning Jesus’ motive in the “cleansing” have ranged from a formal
declaration of opposition to the Temple (i.e. of its existence), to a symbolic

\textsuperscript{39}The term “cleansing” that has traditionally described this account is not an
appropriate choice since it suggests purification rites or some such ritual of
sanctifying a de-sanctified site. Since neither Jesus’ actions nor words imply any
such thing, the term “clearing” would be a better substitute for actual events. We
have retained the customary terminology because of its universal recognition, but
have indicated our reservations by bracketing (“…”).

\textsuperscript{40}In the Synoptic Gospels the event is placed as the last public act of Jesus in
order to use it to the explain the Sanhedrin’s plot to arrest Jesus, while in John it is
used to introduce Jesus’ public ministry in the Temple. The positioning of the
account in each is apparently a result of authorial purpose which governs the
selection and placement of historical material for theological or dramatic
emphasis. There are, however, significant differences between the Synoptic and
Johannine accounts that have led many to adopt the position that there were
actually two “cleansings,” cf. D. A.. Carson, \textit{Matthew. EBC} (Grand Rapids:
According to John, NICNT} (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,

\textsuperscript{40}Cf. William R. Telford, \textit{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 1
(Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).
enactment of Temple destruction, to an act of taking possession of the Temple, to an attack on Sadducean enterprise, and to an attempt to signal the permanent cessation of the sacrificial system by the temporary interruption of daily sacrifices.41

Another group of commentators believe that the problem in this text is not the Temple, but the behavior of the people who had assumed control and maintenance of the Temple.42 This was apparently the position adopted by Stephen in his comments concerning the Temple (Acts 7), as his abrupt shift in verse 51 only makes sense in view of his transition from an historical review of the past rebellious attitude of those in Israel who possessed the Tabernacle and First Temple (verses 44-50) to the present rebellious attitude in Israel of those who possess the Second Temple (verses 51-53).

We will not be able to interact with these views, rather our purpose will be to analyze the event in its context and especially in the light of Jesus’ citations from the prophets (Jeremiah 7:11 and Isaiah 56:7), and these passages use of the desecration and restoration motif respectively. Based on this analysis we hope to offer some conclusions as to the purpose of the episode in comparison with the evidence already deduced concerning Jesus’ positive attitude toward the Temple and the cultus. We want to preface this study by answering two viewpoints commonly included in discussions of this event:

(1) The question of merchandising in the Temple precincts, and


(2) The question by those (usually modern Jewish commentators) who seek to equate Jesus' attitude toward the Temple with contemporary first-century Jewish dissident viewpoints (e.g. Essenes or a Pharisaic anti-Sadducean group).

The Question of the Location of the Temple "Cleansing"

Some scholars have questioned the historicity of the "Cleansing" incident on the grounds that the Mishnah (Berakot 9:5) states that the selling of animals for sacrificial purposes was not permitted within the Temple walls, yet the Gospel accounts clearly state that this took place "within the Temple" (e.g. John 2:15). Further, if such a violent confrontation took place on the Temple Mount, it would have been considered a religious and political threat, and would have brought an immediate arrest by either Temple guards or the Roman authorities. Since this did not occur the incident must be a later redactional insertion. These objection can now be put to rest in light of the archaeological evidence produced by Benjamin Mazar and Meir Ben-Dov through their extensive excavations at the south and south-west corners of the Temple Mount (1968-1977).

Two archaeological factors have now shown that a smaller Temple market was isolated inside the מִסְדִּיר or Royal Stoa, and not spread out over the Court of the Gentiles:

43However, Berakot 9:5 does not talk about the selling of animals within the Temple walls, but the prohibition against transporters using Temple grounds as a thoroughfare across the city. Most who argue from the prohibition in Berakot, however, fail to notice that Mark supports this view, adding in his narrative that Jesus also would not permit anyone to carry a vessel through Temple grounds, a detail that agrees much more closely with the Mishnaic legislation.

(1) Similarities with the Caesarean structures of the Hellenistic city centers of Alexandria and Antioch, which formed the newly-built additions of the Herodian complex.

(2) The direct access from the Royal Stoa to the market quarter below (in the main street and around the corner) via the steps leading down from Robinson’s Arch.

While it has been thought that this market was later removed due to Pharisaic opposition based on a possible reference in Mishnah tractate Shekalim, Ádna contends that “there is no conclusive evidence that the temple market was ever removed from the Royal Stoa.”

In view of the placement of the market inside the Temple walls, yet removed from the actual Temple precincts, it can now be understood that Jesus’ clash with the Temple vendors was a fairly modest incident, and for this reason permitted his daily return to the Temple precincts to conduct to address the Temple crowds (Luke 19:47; cf. Matthew 21:14).

**The Qumran Community and the Temple “Cleansing”**

It has been a popular approach to the interpretation of Jesus’ perspective toward the Temple in this account to use for support of a presumed negative attitude the example of the Qumran community’s apparent rejection of the Temple. From our survey of the Temple at Qumran we have seen that during the reign of the “Teacher of Righteousness” and his opposition by the “Wicked Priest,” the Essenes withdrew from the Temple. However, even though the community was critical of the legitimacy of the non-Zadokite priesthood, the Temple lunar calendar, and the “improper” ritual being performed, they continued to participate in the ritual by sending sacrifices to the Temple when appropriate.

We also saw that they Essene’s concept of their community as a “symbolic” temple with “spiritual” sacrifices being offered through obedience to torah, they did not mean this to be a substitute for legitimate Temple worship.

---

45Jostein Ádna, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
and considered it only a temporary measure until the eschaton, at which time they would be permitted to build the Third Temple in accordance with the "sanctified system" of design recorded in the Temple Scroll. Therefore, one cannot use the Covenanteers as a contemporary parallel to support opposition to the concept of the Temple, but only to the perceived "defilement" of the Second Temple.

The Pharisaic Attitude and the "Cleansing" of the Temple

There have also been attempts to see Jesus as an רַקְעֶנ בַּנָּהי and to find him allied with the Pharisee's in their criticism of the Temple under the jurisdiction of the Sadducees. Support for this has been drawn from apocryphal and pseudepigraphal compositions from the second to the first-centuries B.C.E. that appear to reflect anti-Hasmonean era pollutions that continued to concern the more orthodox Pharisaic party. A first-century B.C.E. text, the Assumption of Moses, whose author R. H. Charles has called the "Pharisaic Quietist," presents a diatribe denouncing the defilement of sacrifices, which it describes in terms of idolatry, language reminiscent of Jeremiah's Temple sermon referenced in Jesus' own statements at the "cleansing." The Psalms of Solomon (mid-first-century B.C.E.), believed to reflect Pharisaic sympathies, has been cited because of its opening words in condemnation of the "wicked" who have violated the Temple's sanctity by polluting "the holy things of the Lord" (1:8-13). The imagery used to describe these violations is that of "robbery," a term that seems to have a parallel in Jesus' words from Jeremiah 7:11 כִּי חָפֵלָהּ אֲנָשָׁה: כִּי נַהֲרָה וְאָרֶץ לְפֶתַּהֲלִים ("robber's den"). In like manner, the Testament of Levi (second-century B.C.E.) employs the same imagery(cf. 16:1).

While these compositions may reflect the views of some later Pharisaic critics of the Temple, there is no evidence from New Testament sources that such

46Affinities of this work with Qumran compositions have brought a reassessment of the alleged Pharisaic, anti-Sadducean, association in authorship, especially if Lawrence Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," BA (June, 1990): 64-73, hypothesis (based on 4Q Miqrat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah) proves correct and the Qumran sect's founders are in some way shown to have held Sadducean views.
criticisms were continued into the first-century C.E. sect. Such affinity in thinking, if Jesus' intention was to condemn the Temple, might have been used by Jesus' sympathizers in the sect as a defense at his trial, where this very point is used by the prosecution. In addition, the clear opposition to Jesus by some of the Pharisees, who rejected his message (cf. John 7:48),\textsuperscript{47} and formed a council against him to condemn him (John 11:47-53), and Jesus' own censure of them (cf. Luke 12:1-12; John 9:41), allow little support for Jesus acting in accord with Pharisaic ideology, even though his orthodoxy was apparently more representative of theirs than the Sadducees (cf. Acts 23:6-8). Our point in the above preface to our discussion of the Temple “Cleansing” is to show that while Jesus was not unique in his criticism of the Temple, his actions at the Temple were not the result of some ideological affiliation with dissidents or extremists, but a unique response to Temple misconduct, as we will demonstrate below.

\textit{The Citations from the Prophets at the Temple “Cleansing”}

It is our contention that in order to understand the purpose of Jesus' action in the Temple market we must understand how he interpreted the event based on his citations from the Prophets. We have previously stated that the Prophets were a guiding source for Jesus' selective public demonstrations, and here we will see that it is no less the case. Once we have seen how Jesus has chosen and applied these texts, we will consider how the Gospel writers have emphasized the various aspects of Jesus' theological purpose by their individual structuring of the account.

In the Synoptic accounts, Matthew and Luke both include the composite citation: \( \text{Ὁ οἶκος} \, \muον \, \text{oἶκος} \, \text{προσευχῆς} \, \text{kληθῆσαι} \), \( \text{ὑμεῖς} \, \delta\, \text{αὐτῶν} \, \text{ποιεῖτε} \, \text{σπήλαιον} \, \text{ληστῶν} \) (“My house shall be called a house of prayer; but

\textsuperscript{47}Although later, a group of the Pharisees are said to have been disciples and comprised a majority opinion in the Jerusalem church (cf. Acts 15:5), but it isachronistic to suppose such a group existed prior to Jesus' resurrection.
you make it a den of robbers”), Matthew 21:13; Luke 19:46. The first half of the conflation: ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθῆσαι (“My house shall be called a house of prayer ...”) is only cited in part; Mark, however, give the complete citation with the addition of the words: πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθεσιν (“...for all the nations”). This is taken from LXX Isaiah 56:7: δό γὰρ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθῆσαι πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθεσιν (“...for My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations”), cf. MT: בְּנֵיה בִּיתּ הַמִּקְדָּשָׁה לְכָל הָעַמִּים (“...For My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples”). The second half of the conflation: ἰμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπῆλαον λῃστῶν (“but you make it a den of robbers”) is taken from LXX Jeremiah 7:11: μη σπῆλαον λῃστῶν δό οἶκος μου (“...do not make My house a robber’s den”), cf. MT: לֹא תֹאכֵל בַּבֶּיתִי הָיוֹם לֹא תֹאכֵל בַּבֶּיתִי הָיוֹם אֶלָּרֵאשׁוֹ איֵשׁ מִלְמָדִים (“Has this house, which is called by My Name, become a den of robbers in your sight? ...”). This reference to Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon is unmistakable inasmuch as the expression occurs only in this text.⁴⁹

In John’s citations, he alludes to LXX Isaiah 56:7 with simply the phrase: τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου (“My Father’s house”), but adds the phrase: οἶκον ἐμπορίου (“a house of trade”) in place of σπῆλαον λῃστῶν (“a robber’s den”). With the word οἶκον (“house”), a deliberate redundancy, since ἐμπορίου means “house of trade,” he fulfills the composite citation with a word play that has the similar effect as the Synoptics in drawing attention to “house” by contrasting it to “den.” John, however, furthers the idea of σπῆλαον λῃστῶν with ἐμπορίου - an allusion to LXX Zechariah 14:21 where we read: καὶ οὐκ ἔσται Χαναάναιος

⁴⁸The only difference between the form of the citations is that while Matthew has ποιεῖτε (“you make”), Luke has ἐποιήσατε (“you have made”).

οἰκεῖον ἐν τῷ ὀλίγῳ κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ("...and there will no longer be a Canaanite in the house of the Lord Almighty in that day")

John also adds an addendum, noting that after the disciples reflected on the event they remembered the words of Psalm 69:9: ("Zeal for Your house will consume me").

**Jeremiah and the “Cleansing” of the Temple**

The citation from Jeremiah’s Temple sermon has provoked numerous suggestions as to the significance of Jeremiah in the thought of Jesus and the disciples. Knowles has suggested that a Matthaean redaction borrowed the Rejected Prophet motif from Mark, and employed it in light of prevailing Jeremiah traditions in first-century Judaism, for the typological, theodical, and apologetic concerns of the Christian community. Ross Winkle has noted the instances in which Jeremiah is mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew, the only Gospel in which he is mentioned by name. He points out that in Matthew 16:14 (which has a parallel in Mark 8:28 and Luke 9:19) Jeremiah is mentioned as one

---

50 Note that John’s ἐμπόρου has understood Zechariah’s use of קנה(יב) (“Canaanite”) metaphorically to mean “trader,” which is an alternate Hebrew meaning. Since in the context of Zechariah the focus is the eschatological future, when it was unlikely that any ethnic Canaanites would still exist, the reference is probably metaphorical. The question then is to what does קנה(יב) refer? Since the preceding verse (verse 20) speaks of a sanctified Temple and city, it might refer generally to any defiling Gentile presence, however, since the previous verses (verses 16-19) refer to Gentile nations coming to worship annually at the Temple, this is unlikely. It is better to see this, as does John, as “trader,” and understand Zechariah to say that in the eschatological Temple there will be no need for commercial exchange (nor to have certified animals, since all will be pure), therefore no merchants, or traders.


of the titles ascribed to Jesus in response to the question of his identity among the people. Aside from first-century Jewish legends that Jeremiah was still alive, Schweizer has observed that importance was attached to Jeremiah as a figure because he had prophesied the destruction of the Temple. What is even more significant is that in Jeremiah 7 and 26, Jeremiah spoke against those defiling the Temple while standing within its courts. Did Jesus’ proximity to the Temple while at the Temple market cause him to identify himself with Jeremiah and to adopt his posture as a prophet, rebuking the abuses of the Second Temple, even as Jeremiah had rebuked the abuses of the First Temple? Several parallels between Jeremiah 7 and 26 and Matthew 23:29-24:2 make this suggestion plausible.

(1) The parallel motif of “sending the prophets” (אַלְמָנִים יִשָּׁבֶר, והבְּשָׁמָם) is commonly used in Jeremiah (cf. 7:25; 25:4-7; 26:406; 29:18-19; 35:15; 44:4-5), was employed in Matthew 23:34: ἐξαποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας ..., (“Therefore, behold, I am sending you prophets ...”). In Jeremiah 7:25 and 33:4-6 LXX [English, 26:4-6] YHWH sent prophets to urge the people to repent, but failing that, He sent Jeremiah as a final warning before the destruction of the Temple and city.


54 Cf. II Maccabees 15:12-16 in which Jeremiah is said to be an intercessor before God during the priesthood of Onias III, and II Esdras 2:18 which predicts that God will send Isaiah and Jeremiah at a future time. There was also a rabbinic tradition (c. A.D. 320) to the effect that Jeremiah was the prophet mentioned by Moses as his unique successor yet to come (Deuteronomy 18:15). Several Christian writers, e.g., Victorinus of Petav (died A.D. 304), counted Jeremiah as “Never tasting death,” Some late Jewish “Paradise lists,” however, did not include Jeremiah, cf. Louis Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1913), 6:399-400.


In the same way, Jesus considers his disciples as "prophets" whom he is sending (cf. Matthew 5:12; 10:16), just as Jeremiah was sent, to a people who have previously rejected the succession of prophets before them (Jeremiah 7:25-26; Matthew 23:29-34).

(2) The parallel of the "murder of the prophets" (as opposed to the more general persecution of the prophets),57 is a motif also tying together the Jeremiah and Matthew accounts. In the Temple sermon, Jeremiah was to tell the people (7:6): רְמֵם נִכְנֶּס אֶל תְּמֹאָה מְעֵקָּב ("not to shed innocent blood in this place [i.e. the Temple]"). In Jeremiah 33:16 LXX [English, 26:15], Jeremiah applies the term to himself, by warning those who reacted to his sermon that if they kill him the priests, prophets, and people will bring קָנֵס ("innocent blood") upon themselves.

Therefore, with Jeremiah we have the people demanding the prophet's death in the Temple, even after he has denounced such practice.58 Some have seen this to refer to Jeremiah himself, who was traditionally thought to have been put to death by stoning.59


58 The only explicit mention of the murder of prophets is that of Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada the High Priest, who was stoned to death in the Temple court because he announced that God had forsaken the people because they had forsaken the Temple (II Chronicles 24:18-21). The other example is that of Uriah from Kirith-Jearim, who was extradited from Egypt where he had fled and killed in Jerusalem, because, like Jeremiah, he had prophesied against the city, and probably also the Temple (Jeremiah 26:19-23). Also, from the apocryphal book of the Prayers of Manasseh, as well as Jewish tradition, we learn that Manasseh had Isaiah the prophet executed in Jerusalem. There were other prophets killed in other places outside Jerusalem for other reasons (cf. i Kings 18:4, 13; 19:10, 14; Nehemiah 9:26; Jeremiah 2:30), but these are irrelevant to this specific motif since it is qualified by the Temple as both cause and site of the murders.

In Matthew 23:29-37 the emphasis on the “murder of the prophets” is applied to the Pharisees who are said to continue the heinous tradition (verses 29, 30, 31), and Jesus declares himself to be the next object of their intentions (verse 34). Jesus even refers to Jerusalem in an epithet as: “Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you!” (verse 37).

In addition, in Matthew 23:35 the coupling of the term αἷμα δίκαιων (“righteous blood”) with ἐφ' ἴματι (“upon you”) occurs only elsewhere in Jeremiah 33:15 LXX [English, 26:15] αἷμα δήθεν (“innocent blood”) + ἐφ' ἴματι (cf. also Jonah 1:14 LXX). With this parallel, Matthew is preparing his audience for the following events that will culminate with the execution of Jesus.

(3) The parallel of prophetic judgment against the Temple. Jeremiah 7:4-10 reveals that the people of Judah were trusting in the inviolability of the Temple: יִהְיֶה הַגַּדִּיד הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם הַיָּם H—The Temple of YHWH, the Temple of YHWH, the Temple of YHWH”). (verses 4, cf. 10), even though they had committed all kinds of evil (verse 9). Jeremiah’s reminder of the destruction of the site of the Tabernacle in Shiloh (verses 12-14) was the evidence that YHWH would carry out His judicial threat on Jerusalem by abandoning it and its Temple. Matthew 23:38 contains similar wording: λόγος ἀδίκετα ἴμαν ὁ ἀλατὶ ἴμων ἐφημος (“Behold, your house is being left to you desolate”). The term ἐφημος (“desolate”) is familiar to us from its combination with βελώνημα in the Greek phrase taken from Daniel’s ἄματος ἄλατον (“Abomination of Desolation”).

There may be here an allusion to Jeremiah 12:7 or 22:5, or a conflation of both. In this instance we believe that ὁ ἀλατὶ refers to the Temple, and thus, places Jesus in the line of prophetic denouncers of the Temple that brought indictment and/or execution as a result.

---

The result of these parallels is to demonstrate that Jesus was identified with Jeremiah as the figure of a prophet who had pronounced judgment on the Temple while within the Temple complex. In the Temple market, it was fitting for Jesus to apply the words of Jeremiah’s First Temple rebuke to the Second Temple, and to expect violent repercussions as had other prophets before him.

**The Eschatological Overtones of the Temple “Cleansing”**

We believe that Jesus intent in clearing the Temple market was primarily aimed at presenting a comparison of the present (defiled) Second Temple to YHWH’s restoration ideal - the eschatological Temple. We have already surfaced the prophetic texts either directly cited or alluded to by Jesus in the “Cleansing” pericope, and here wish to examine them in light of our research in the restoration motif.

Mark’s fuller citation of LXX Isaiah 56:7 (Mark 11:17): ‘Ο οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς έθνεσιν (“My house shall be a house of prayer for all the nations”), makes it clear that he not only had a concern for the universalistic nature of worship, but a focus on the Temple in its eschatological role. The phrase is appropriately applied by Jesus, because the incident occurred within the Court of the Gentiles. While Matthew and Luke’s omission was most likely to more forcefully contrast οἶκος προσευχῆς (“house of prayer”) with σπῆλαιον ληστῶν (“den of robbers”), their purpose was the same as Mark’s - to describe what the Temple should be as opposed to what it had become.61 The eschatological Temple was described in Isaiah 56:7:

(חַיָּבִים בְּכָל הַגּוֹיִם לְעָלְיָה, אלֶלֶרֶת קָרָא יְהוָה בְּכָל הַגּוֹיִם לְעָלְיָה, וּשְׁאוּלָהָם לְעָלְיָה, וּשְׁאוּלָהָם לְעָלְיָה, וּשְׁאוּלָהָם לְעָלְיָה."

(“Even those [“foreigners who join themselves to YHWH,” verse 6] I will bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be

---

acceptable on My altar: for My house will be called a house of prayer for all the peoples”).

At this point, it will be sufficient to draw our attention to the divine ideal to incorporate Gentile converts in the cultus. The very presence in the Second Temple of the Soreg (or balustrade with warning inscriptions) forbidding Gentile passage past the Court of the Gentiles stood as a fatal reminder that this ideal was far from realized.62

In John 2:16 we have the additional allusion to Zechariah 14:21 which again sets Jesus’ actions and statements within an eschatological context. Here, when the Messianic Age is fully realized at the end of the last day’s battle and the elevation of Jerusalem and the rebuilding (or reconstitution) of the Temple according to Ezekiel 40-48, every common vessel in Jerusalem will be consecrated as קָרָא מִזְדָּרָה, and all of the Gentile nations will come to worship on Mount Zion. Again, the focus is on the eschatological day, a day imminent in prophetic thinking, but dependent upon the coming of Messiah to properly sanctify and build the Temple (Zechariah 6:12-13; Haggai 2:7-9; Malachi 3:1-3).

If Jesus saw himself as the Messiah, then a proper function of the messianic role was to align the Temple and its cultus to the divine ideal. It is possible that we also have an influence here from Malachi 1:10 which was concerned with ritual abuse. Indeed, John chapter 1 introduces John the Baptist with a citation from Malachi 3:1a: תַּנֵּן מֵאֲלֵיהַ מִשְׁלָלָה וְהַמַּהְרָה וְלֵצִיס (“Behold, I will send My messenger, and he will prepare the way before Me”). Perhaps, John 2 completes the thrust of this citation: וְהָאֲלֵיהָ נִמְשָׁכָה, נֹאֵם וְלֵצִיס (“...and the Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to His Temple”) with Jesus’ abrupt entrance to the Temple. Since the focus of Malachi 3:1-3 is upon the purification of the Temple, we suggest that Jesus was attempting to point out the

62The Soreg was described by Josephus as being a low stone wall (1.5 meters/5 feet), located in the middle of the courtyard and surrounding the inner court, upon which were inscriptions in Greek and Latin warning Gentiles against entry upon pain of death. The first of these notices, engraved in limestone, was discovered in Jerusalem in 1871 and another in 1936.
pollution of the Second Temple, and himself as the purifier that would come in
the eschatological age to make the predicted restoration.63

In John 2:18 the Jews present at the “Cleansing” request a “sign” from
Jesus concerning his authority to present himself as the Temple restorer. This
request apparently goes unanswered, largely because it is interpreted by Jesus as a
sign of rejection. Instead, he returns to his original motive in connecting the scene
and himself with Jeremiah and the expected treatment of prophets who question
the Temple (i.e. the Temple’s cult officials) sanctity. He replies that if they
“destroy this temple [i.e. his body]”, he will “raise it up in three days,” (John
2:19).64 Both Matthew (26:60-61; 27:30, 40) and Mark (14:57-59; 15:29) include
this claim by way repetition via false witnesses and the mockery at the
crucifixion. Since the previously mentioned passages reflect the misunderstanding
of Jesus’ claim65 - that as the Messiah, and therefore, Temple Restorer, he could
miraculously tear down and re-erect the Temple in three days - John 2:21 adds the
explanation: “But he was speaking about the temple of his body.”

On the one hand, the author may here be defending Jesus against the
accusation that he was in opposition to the Temple. If the intent had been to

63Cf. Morna D. Hooker, “Traditions about the Temple in the Sayings of Jesus,”
BJRL 70:1 (Spring, 1988): 18-19 suggests that perhaps the reason the Malachi
3:1-3 passage was not cited with reference to Jesus’ activities was because in
Malachi the cleansing of the Temple was seen as successful, and the refined sons
of Levi once more offer acceptable offerings to the Lord, but the “cleansing” by
Jesus was unsuccessful, since instead of the reform he, in the mantle of Jeremiah,
requested, he met opposition, arrest, and death.

64The imperative should be rendered as a conditional after BDF, p. 387, n. 2. On
the irony intended by the citation at this juncture in John’s account, cf. P. D.
observes that “the succession of ‘temples’ is made possible because of the Jews
themselves, who by destroying the body of Jesus doomed the Temple they sought
to defend.”

TynBul 83 (1982): 80, 90, who notes that it was not that the Jews misunderstood
so much as they did not understand; a fact also true for Jesus’ own disciples until
after the resurrection.
authenticate Jesus' messiahship, he could have let the statement be interpreted literally, since the Messiah was expected to rebuild the final Temple (cf. II Samuel 7:13/I Chronicles 17:12; Zechariah 6:12), and perhaps would be expected have to destroy the former, lesser Temple in order to do so.66 On the other hand, the author may be supporting the accusation - not that Jesus would literally destroy and rebuild the Jerusalem Temple - but that he would destroy the literal Temple and replace it with a new spiritual building, the temple of his body.

Before we can begin to understand the greater contextual concern of this passage, we must understand the reference to the Temple as Jesus' "body," which is the focal point of this account. What hermeneutical device is the author employing at this point to identify this "temple?" If he is using the Jerusalem Temple as a type, then Jesus appears to be the antitype, fulfilling, and therefore, replacing the Temple with himself, i.e., with his new spiritual body after the resurrection. But, as we have attempted to show from our re-examination of the attitude toward the Temple in the Synoptic writers, there is no insinuation of a rejection of the physical Temple, and there is no textual reason to suggest that the Fourth Gospel is not in agreement with this perspective. Rather, the hermeneutic device employed here is metaphor. Just as the Jerusalem Temple was to be the dwelling place of the Name of God, so he was to become in an a fortiori manner, the dwelling place of God.67 As death "destroyed" Jesus physical body, so the resurrection (by the power of God) would "rebuild" his body physically, adding a new spiritual dimension. The metaphor, then, would be drawn from the literal reality of a coming destruction of the physical Second Temple, which would one

66There is only one apocalyptic text to support this supposition, I Enoch 90:28-29, but the messianic connection there is weak, and it is probably God Who destroys the old Temple and builds the new through His agents (verse 28). However, it is instructive that the old house, viewed in the text as corrupt, must be torn down before the new house is built. Nevertheless, the later Jewish traditions concerning the rebuilding of the Temple by the Messiah do not have in view his destruction of an existing Temple, since for them the Temple was already in ruins.

67It is perhaps for this reason that Jesus could also refer to himself as being "greater" than the Temple (cf. Matthew 12:6), since the Presence of God was absent from the Second Temple, but would be resident with him.
day, by the power of God, be "resurrected" (i.e., restored) as a physical building with a new spiritual dimension (i.e., inviolability). If this is the author's intent, then rather than having Jesus' announcing the Temple's replacement, he was affirming its [eschatological] restoration.

The "Cleansing" of the Temple and the Desecration/Restoration Motif

Despite the apparent shift from physical Temple to metaphorical or symbolic temple, the context remains within the prophetic corpus, and the statements may be taken as a conditional schema: If Jesus were accepted as Messiah, he would be the Temple Restorer according to Malachi 3:1-3 and transform the Second Temple from a place of privileged access to a house of prayer for all the nations, but if rejected, then he would be as the prophet Jeremiah (and other prophets) and suffer for his denouncing of the Temple as less than the eschatological ideal. In this regard, we can return to Mark's juxtaposition of the "Cleansing" account with that of the "Withered Tree," since the fig tree, as a symbol for Israel, cast its shadow of barrenness across the Temple scene as one of rejection. The reader, then, in approaching the confusing event of the "Cleansing" is prepared for the statement to be one of present failure in view of eschatological ideals. Just as the "fig tree" (Israel) had not met the restoration ideal, and therefore would again face the reversal of desecration, so the Temple, which stood for YHWH's Presence with Israel and the symbol of eschatological

---


69 Cf. J. W. Doeve, "Purification du Temple et desséchement du figuier: Sur la structure du 21 chapitre de Matthieu et parallèles (Marc xi. 1-xii. 12, Luc. xix. 28-xx. 19)," NTS 1 (1954-1955): 297-308 (esp. 300-306), attempted to argue that Jeremiah 7 provided a mnemonic and pedagogical link for the preservation and ordering of traditions about Jesus, and thus saw a pattern joining Jeremiah 7:11 with Matthew 21:10-17 (the Cleansing of the Temple), and Jeremiah 7:20 with Matthew 21:28-22 (the cursing of the fig tree). However, Telford, The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree, ISNTSUp 1, p. 22 contends that the thematic links Doeve suggests are not as strong as he supposes in every case, since the parallels in the New Testament echo so many other passages from the Tanach.
blessings, would be destroyed in keeping with the covenantal arrangement of “cursings and blessings.”

It is also possible that Jeremiah was selected by Jesus not only because of the Rejected Prophet motif, which connects with the desecration motif, but because Jeremiah was one of the foremost prophets of the Restoration (cf. Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10; 30:1-33:26). Jeremiah's reputation as a prophet of the Restoration was chronicled by Ezra in the opening of his book (1:1), which itself repeated the words of II Chronicles 36:22-23. This was not only so for his biblical book, but in the many apocryphal and pseudepigraphical traditions circulating about him in the first-century which centered upon the restoration of the Temple.

One of the earliest of these was that of Eupolemus (preserved in Eusebius, Preparatio Evangelica 9.39.5) who reports that Jeremiah had preserved some of the Temple treasures from the First Temple (the Ark of the Covenant and the tablets of the Law within). A more elaborate version of the same tradition is found in II Maccabees 2:1-8, where it is said that the Tabernacle and altar of incense was included in this list of recovered items, and hidden by Jeremiah until the eschatological day of restoration:

The place shall be unknown until God gathers His People together again and shows His mercy. And then the Lord will disclose those things, and the glory of the Lord and the cloud [Shekinah] will [re]appear (verses 7-8).

Jeremiah's biblical role as a prophet of the eschatological Restoration and traditional role as a caretaker of the Temple furnishings and vessels, made him a model figure of a Temple Restorer. If we remember that Jeremiah's seventy years' prophecy was interpreted by Daniel as "seventy weeks of years" and made an

70Cf. for discussion of this theme, Claus Wolff, Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, Texte und Untersuchungen 118 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976), pp. 61-79.

71Later versions of this legend (e.g.s. Lives of the Prophets 2.11, 14-18, Paraleipomena Jeremiou 3.9-11, 18-19; Syriac Jeremiah Apocryphon 169, 173, 188-189) which include Jeremiah's saving the priestly vestments and the keys to the Temple.
important text for the Temple's future desecration and restoration (Daniel 9:24-27), and later by the apocryphal writers, and that Jesus employed this text in his own eschatological discourses, we should not be surprised to find Jesus cast in Jeremiah's mold (or even identified as a Jeremiah redivivus. Matthew 16:14; cf. Mark 6:15; Luke 9:8; John 1:21) as a Temple Restorer.

If Jeremiah could denounce the First Temple and announce its destruction, and yet be acclaimed as a prophet of the Temple's restoration, why could not Jesus, who followed in his train, be accorded like honor? As we have seen, Jesus making claim to be the Messiah, must have known that these claims, set in the context of his frequent and varied contacts with the Temple, would have been connected by the restoration-anxious people with the predicted role of Messiah as Temple-builder (Zechariah 6:12-13). It seems, then, that Jesus' identification with Jeremiah could support a positive interpretation of Jesus' "Cleansing of the Temple," especially in light of the inseparable nature of the desecration/restorement motif.

The Rending of the Temple Veil and the Cleansing

Some interpreters have suggested that the account of the "rendering of the Temple veil" (Matthew 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45) is a fulfillment of the Temple "Cleansing." The Synoptics record that immediately after the death of Jesus, the veil of the Temple (καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ) was rent from top to


bottom (ἐσχίσθη ἐλάττ ὁ πόνος τῶν ἁμαρτειῶν). Taking note of the direction of this tear (from heaven to earth) has indicated to some scholars the divine displeasure of the existing Temple institution (in substitution for Jesus). Others, who do not see a replacement of the Temple institution by Christianity taught by the New Testament, have argued that this rending of the [inner] veil merely signified a new unrestricted access to the Divine Presence, made possible by the death of Jesus as the supreme sacrifice (cf. Ephesians 2:11-22; Hebrews 10:20).

While the rent veil may have symbolized an unhindered approach to the Divine Presence through the death of Jesus, this does not imply that the Temple thereby was no longer a viable and sacred institution. The early Jewish-Christians apparently understood this as figurative usage, for they continued to regard the restrictions of holiness in the Temple precincts, and even though Paul was accused of attempting to violate the Soreg by taking an uncircumcised Gentile into the court of the Jews (Acts 21:28-29), the charge was unfounded, as Paul himself repeatedly attested (cf. Acts 24:12, 16-20; 25:8). As we argued earlier, if

---

74E.g., Donald Juel, "Excursus: Temple Veil," in Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. SBLDS 31. Edited by Howard C. Kee and Douglas A. Knight (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 140-142, arguing that an outer veil interpretation best symbolized the Temple as an institution, believes that this similarity with the Jewish portents, and the occasion of the rending at the moment of Jesus' death, indicated a precise fulfillment of Jesus' prediction that he would destroy the Temple (Mark 14:58). The problem here is, as the NT interpreted the prediction, and as we shall seek to show in chapter 4, the reference was not directly to the Second Temple, but to Jesus' own body (as a temple), which nevertheless drew its comparison from the Temple, but had positive, rather than negative, associations.

75While Paul in Ephesians 2:14 probably has as his example the soreg when he says that Jesus "broke down the middle wall of partition," the concept of "barriers" in the Temple that prevented unhindered access to God is his point, and does not rule out the same idea for the veil. Paul Ellingworth, The Epistle to the Hebrews. NICET (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, Co., 1993), p. 519, sees a common tradition underlying both the accounts in the Synoptic Gospels and Hebrews, rather than a direct dependence.
the Temple had been regarded as abandoned by God and no longer a fit place for “Christian” worship, then why was it not disregarded by the Jerusalem Christians and made the object of polemical attacks in their writings? On the contrary, as we shall see with Paul, the Temple was used as one of the highest metaphors for Christian sanctification. The " rending of the veil," then, was a physical phenomena that was meant to be understood as a theological construct of the mediatorial office of Jesus. In this sense, since the Nation had rejected this priestly work of Messiah, the Temple that symbolized the cultic relationship between God and the People, would itself demonstrate the divine displeasure (its destruction). However, as the New Testament builds upon the prospect of Israel's national acceptance of this work in the future (cf. Romans 11:25-27), the rent veil could not prohibit a rebuilding of the Temple once this restoration occurs.

Therefore, Jesus as a prophetic reformer, did not object to the Temple as an institution, nor did he reject it outright. Rather, he showed a concern for its ritual purity in not permitting merchants to pass through its sacred precincts (Mark 11:16), and exhibited a cultic “zeal” (John 2:17; Psalm 69:9) for the sacrificial system. His “reaction” was a calculated demonstration in the prophetic style to charge the Jerusalem leadership and priesthood with altering the divine ideal for the Temple. Instead of having become a house of prayer, in which Israel, as a light to the nations, had brought about Gentile conversion to the One true God and directed them in cultic obedience, it had become a ritual haven for cultic abuse and political and sectarian rivalry.

We are not of the opinion that the Temple market itself was the object of Jesus’ denunciation, for it seems unlikely that it did met with sanctity standards,76

76Money-changers as well as the selling of animals was a necessity for the performance of Temple worship, and in fact their absence would have compromised the Temple’s sanctity and brought about desecration through ritual neglect. The money-changers served a vital purpose in exchanging the defiled Roman coinage for the ritually prescribed shekel (cf. Exodus 30:13-16), have been compromised if in fact Matthews, op. cit., p. 123, cites the study by N. Q. Hamilton, “Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank.” JBL 83 (1964): 368, who has shown that the Temple treasury under the high-priestly aristocracy was utilized for beneficent purposes, and therefore, the charge of commercialization and widespread graft by money-changers cannot be substantiated. Further, Josephus,
rather, it was simply the setting within the Temple, and possibly at the same place where Jeremiah gave his Temple sermon, from which Jesus could employ the imagery of theft, i.e. robbing YHWH of His glory by desanctifying the purpose for the Temple. The failure of the Restoration community in rebuilding the Second Temple to sanctify themselves, as the post-exilic prophets revealed, led to renewed hopes of realizing the promised restoration under the Hasmoncean reforms, however, as the sectarians at Qumran testify, the hope that the Second Temple under Roman rule would match the divine ideal had been abandoned. Instead, hopes now turned to apocalyptic intervention and the establishment of the eschatological Sanctuary by the Messiah at the eschaton. The present Temple was destined for destruction, but this is not negative, since in its place would be built the glorified Temple of Ezekiel's (and the Temple Scroll's) vision. Jesus, as a rejected Messiah, could only forecast the desecration motif to the present generation of Jews, but at the same time, held out the restoration motif of the ideal Temple, which would one day realize a universal worship from among all the nations.

Jesus' "Cleansing" of the Temple was an announcement of the eschatological day in which Messiah would restore the Temple. Richard Hiers suggests that Jesus very purpose in going to Jerusalem was to prepare both the people, the city, and the Temple for the Kingdom of God, which he believed was

---

Antiquities 20. 205, reveals that although the priestly house of Ananias prospered, there is every reason to believe that Caiaphas exercised such strict control over the Temple market that it could not have left open to charges of robbery. In addition, the Roman procurators oversaw the Temple treasury, and as they themselves were involved in profiteering, they would have been exceptionally careful to watch out for Temple deception, and therefore, the Temple market would have been further restrained from unchecked avarice.

77Paula Fredriksen, "Jesus and the Temple, Mark and War," SBL Seminar 1990 Papers 29. Edited by David J. Lull (New Orleans: Scholars Press, 1990): 299, has pointed out that in the light of restoration theology, such destruction is not "negative," nor does it imply any condemnation of the Temple, cult, Torah Judaism, etc., since in the idiom of Jewish apocalyptic, destruction implies rebuilding.
about to dawn. Since the eschatological Temple, though new, was still to be a continuation of the old, Jesus' disciples and apostles continued their relationship with the Second Temple up until the time of its destruction, indicative of the continuity that existed between Israel and the Church. Since the Church now symbolized the ideal to be one day realized by the eschatological Temple, it served as the true avenue of sanctified worship for the Jewish-Christian cultic community. The Jewish-Christian movement to bring Gentiles to conversion through the abandonment of idols and obedience to the God of Israel (cf. I Thessalonians 1:9) was perhaps likewise motivated by the restoration ideal expressed in Isaiah 56:7 and Zechariah 14:21. Indeed, I Thessalonians 1:10 focuses the Gentile converts hope on the coming Messiah (Jesus) who will fulfill the promised restoration (cf. Acts 3:19-21), after delivering his own from the judgments to attend the eschaton.

The Olivet Discourse and The Desecration/Restoration Motif

Jesus prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem has produced a tremendous volume of scholarly interpretations, most of which fall into the category of a threat or curse by Jesus on the sacrificial institution represented by the Temple. The "Cleansing" of the Temple, which was a demonstrable prediction of the Temple's destruction, but perhaps not clearly understood by Jesus' disciples, was followed by a clearer presentation on the Mount of Olives (hence, the "Olivet Discourse"), according to Jesus revised pattern of instruction (post-eventu, John 13:19; 14:29, and non-parabolic, John 16:29). The non-
parabolic prophetic portions of the Olivet Discourse are contained only in the Synoptics: Matthew 24:3-31; Mark 13:3-27; and Luke 21:7-28.

The discourse in Matthew and Mark are generally parallel accounts, however, Luke’s account has significant differences. These differences are explained by some scholars as Jesus’ answer to three separate questions posed by the disciples: (e.g., Matthew 24:3):

1. Ἐπε ἡμῖν πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; (“Tell us when these things [destruction of the Temple] will be?”).
2. τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας; (“What will be the sign of your [Messiah’s] coming?”).
3. τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; (“What will be the sign of the end of the [Gentile] age?”).

It should be observed that questions one through three are asked in Matthew 24:3 and Mark 13:4, however, Jesus’ addresses only questions two and three in these contexts. Luke apparently asked only question one (cf. 21:6-7a), thus, Jesus’ answer to this first question is recorded here (verses 20-24), in addition to his answer concerning the eschatological signs at the end of the age (verses 8-19, 25-28) as recorded by the other Synoptic writers. Further, there are exegetical reasons for supposing that Luke alone deals with the nearer destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Titus in 70 C.E. What is common to these questions in each account is that they come in response to Jesus’ unsolicited statement concerning the Temple that “not one stone shall be left upon another,

---

80A comparison of the Greek texts of the three accounts reveals, e.g., that while Matthew and Mark use the term θλίψις [μεγάλη] ("great tribulation”), Luke uses the term ἀνάγκη [μεγάλη] ("great distress"). This is because θλίψις may serve as a technical expression of ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Ἰάκωβου ("the time of Jacob’s trouble"), an eschatological event, while ἀνάγκη may refer to a less specific time of persecution, such as that attending a military conquest. Cf. further on this Lukan distinction, J. Dwight Pentecost, Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology (Grand Rapids: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 276-277. As we will see below, this permits Luke's chiastic structure to have both an historical series and an eschatological series, whereas Matthew and Mark’s chiastic is strictly eschatological.
which shall not be torn down” (Matthew 24:2; Mark 13:2; Luke 21:6). Whether or not we accept the preceding interpretation of the differences between these accounts, each contain Jesus’ predictions concerning the desecration of the Temple (either in 70 C.E. and/or the end-of-the-age).\footnote{Cf. Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1978), pp. 75-76, has purposed an alternative solution to the question. He argues that Jesus linked the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the age and promised both to his generation. Was Jesus, therefore, wrong, for the end of that age (70 C.E.) did not bring the predicted coming of Messiah? Ford responds negatively, because he believes that Mark 13:30 can be understood as belonging to the same genre as Jonah’s “Yet forty days and Ninevah will be overthrown,” (p. 75). He says: “We submit that the exegesis of Mk. 13:30 is only complete if we allow for the possibility that Christ, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, may have used an absolute statement with less than an absolute meaning, in harmony with those Scriptures He so implicitly trusted. It is possible that he believed that if the early church proved faithful to its missionary commission, and if the chastened Jewish nation repented, the end would transpire in that same Age. It is the linking of the gospel proclamation to the world with the end of the Age that provides the hint of the contingent element,” (p. 76).}

**The Influence of Daniel 9 on the Structure of the Olivet Discourse**

The citation of Daniel 9:27 in Matthew and Mark’s eschatological discourses, and the allusion to the events of the "seventieth week" in the desolation of Jerusalem recorded in Luke’s parallel account, have suggested that the Danicic text might have served as a structural framework. In his doctoral dissertation\footnote{John A. McClean, “The Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:27 as a Literary Key for Understanding the Structure of the Apocalypse of John” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1990), pp. 121-186.} at the University of Michigan, John McClean made a case for the structural impact of Daniel’s "seventieth week," and especially of the concept of the "Abomination of Desolation" on each of the Synoptic gospels and the Johannine Apocalypse. In the case of the Synoptic eschatological discourses, he found eight literary motifs from Daniel 9 correlated with the discourses, and that each gospel could be divided into three prophetic sections corresponding to Daniel 9:27. The consideration of the order of these events in light of the Danicic
prophetic structure suggested by the use of Daniel 9:27 reveal a direct influence, if not dependence, upon the "Seventy Weeks Prophecy." Thus, the structure of the Olivet Discourse could be modelled on the paradigm of Daniel 9:27 with the first half of the seventieth week parallel to the preliminary signs of the period of tribulation predicted by Jesus, and the final half of the seventieth week paralleled by the signs of the greater tribulation. At the midpoint of these two periods stands the signal event of the "Abomination of Desolation." Presented graphically, this parallel structure would appear as follows:

Figure 11: Structure of the Olivet Discourse according to the Seventieth Week
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<td>(3) Second half of the Seventieth Week (Daniel 9:27c): The Eschatological Fulfillment with the Coming of the Son of Man (Matthew 24:29-31; Mark 13:24-27; Luke 21:25-28).[^{83}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In like manner, Joseph Kidder earlier recognized this dependence, but attempted to prove that the key phrase "the Abomination of Desolation" (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14) actually serves as the apex or pivotal point in the chiastic

\[^{83}\] Technically the events indicated in McLean's diagram as midpoint of the Seventy Weeks belong with those of the second half of the week, which we have indicated by brackets. This seems to follow the division of the period of tribulation into two parts: first half (Matthew 24:4-14; Mark 13:6-13) and second half (Matthew 24:15-28; Mark 13:15-23). The midpoint would then be characterized by the single event of the desecration of the Temple (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14).
arrangement of the Olivet Discourse narratives in Matthew and Mark. Kidder's interpretation of the chiastic structure argues for two distinguishable series of events: an "historical" series of (pre-fall-of-Jerusalem) on the left side of the chiasm that culminates in the destruction of Jerusalem (marked by the "Abomination of Desolation"), and an "eschatological" series (post-fall-of-Jerusalem), on the right side, treating events from that point onward and culminating in the Second Coming of Christ.

While in agreement with Kidder's demonstration of chiastic structure, we find McClean's evidence of the structure of the discourse informed by Daniel's seventieth week to alter Kidder's interpretation of the event series. Thus, the entire discourse in Matthew and Mark should be viewed as eschatological, with the two series being the first-half of the seventieth week, the "Abomination of Desolation" at the midpoint as the pivot, signaling the judgment which begins at Jerusalem, and the second-half of the seventieth week which extends this judgment to the Gentile nations with its climax at the eschaton. This understanding of the Olivet Discourse would then be diagrammed according to the typical ABA pattern as:

---

84 Cf. S. Joseph Kidder, "This Generation' in Matthew 23-24," AUSS 21:3 (1983): 203-209. This chiastic arrangement is also shown by him in Luke 21 (cf. diagram 3, p. 209), but here, due to the historical emphasis (over the eschatological) and the intentional absence of the key phrase "abomination of desolation," (note also the omission of the warning against false messiahs in the eschatological side of the chiasm which should parallel the historical in verse 8), both of which are tied to the eschatological drama. Therefore, the pivotal phrase becomes "when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies" (verse 20). This verse is the historical parallel to the eschatological "abomination of desolation," since each deals with Jerusalem, the Temple, and desecration. The historical phrase even uses the catch word "desolations," but not to equate the phrase with the "desolations" of Daniel 9:27, but [perhaps] rather Daniel 9:26, which, we have argued, is historical subsequent to the eschatological setting of verse 27, and helps structure the eschatological emphasis in Matthew and Mark. In this way Luke's presentation of the historical account complements Matthew and Mark by forecasting the details in their eschatological account.
Figure 12: The Chiastic Structure of the Olivet Discourse in Matthew & Mark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midpoint - Seventieth Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. &quot;Abomination of Desolation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:15; Mk. 13:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Half - Seventieth Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Preliminary Tribulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:9-13; Mk. 13:9-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Signs on Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:6-8; Mk. 13:7-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. False Messiahs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:5; Mk. 13:5-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Prediction of Destruction of Temple &amp; Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 23:37-24:3; Mk. 13:2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desecration Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Half - Seventieth Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D'. Great Tribulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:16-22; Mk. 13:15-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'. False Messiahs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:23-28; Mk. 13:21-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'. Signs in Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:29; Mk. 13:24-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'. Final Destruction at the Eschaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matt. 24:30-33; Mk. 13:26-27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Restoration Series |

In the above diagram observe that there is further inversion in the B:C:B':C' pattern which forms its own lesser chiasm within the broader chiastic structure. This phenomena is not unusual\(^{85}\) and occurs also in the Sermon on the

---

\(^{85}\) Cf. egs., Robert L. Alden, "Chiastic Psalms (III): A Study in the Mechanics of Semitic Poetry in Psalms 101-105," *JETS* 21 (1978): 199, who while indicating the presence of such inversion within his chiastic outline, but does not comment on their special structure.
Mount (Matthew 5-7) and in the Apocalypse. As a distinguishable sub-structure, it serves to highlight the counterparts of messianic deception and attendant signs relevant to the seventieth-week division at the crucial points leading to and following from the pivotal "Abomination of Desolation." This inter-chiastic device may also pinpoint the use of the desecration/restoration motif within the general theme of ascending apostasy (first half) and corresponding retributive judgment (second half). Therefore, the first series represents the earth-oriented desecration that climaxes in the "Abomination of Desolation" in the Temple. This ultimate desecration demands a heaven-oriented demonstration, which is seen in the second series representing restoration, since it climaxes in the coming of Messiah and the regathering of Israel.

This use of the desecration/restoration motif may receive a wider application in the broader chiastic structure of the texts. Kidder has observed in the broader structure of Matthew 23-25 that the use of the phrase ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς ("this generation") occurs twice, once in each series, and earmarks respectively the witnesses to the "signs on earth" and the "signs in heaven." Further, he noted that the first γενεὰ received judgment as a result of their complicity in the

86Cf. for the treatment of this inverted pattern within the chiastic structure of the Apocalypse, K. A. Strand, Interpreting the Book of Revelation. 2nd ed. (Naples, Florida, 1979).

87Cf. Strand's similar identification of a "Exodus-from-Egypt"/"Fall-of-Babylon" motif within the broader chiastic structure of the Apocalypse, Ibid., p. 52.

88Cf. Kidder, "'This Generation' in Matthew 24:34," pp. 205-207. Kidder also observes that the phrase κηρυχθήσεται τὸ τώ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν δή τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πάσιν τοῖς ἔθεσι ("this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a witness to all nations") in Matthew 24:14 constitutes a secondary pivot which functioned as a warning leading up to the climatic events of both series. Kidder's conclusion concerning this usage is important to the interpretation of the discourse as a whole: "Indeed, it may well be that Matt. 24:14 in holding this pivotal position actually serves [as] an alarm against the idea of merging the two judgment-events into only one single event, by pointing to the fact that proclamation of the gospel relates to both of them" (p. 207). This conclusion, however, allows for our interpretation of the two series as being within the same temporal context, i.e., Daniel's seventieth week.
deception, while the second yeved received the reward of deliverance as a result of persevering until Messiah's coming. This fits the specific covenantal background of the motif in cursing (with desecration) and blessing (with restoration) as well as corresponding with the term yeved to the Jewish Nation destined to fulfill the prophetic program in the end-time.

Since the pivotal use of the "Abomination of Desolation" in the Olivet Discourse developed the subject of a Temple Desecrator of Daniel 9:27 within the desecration/restoration motif, it may argue for the importance of the desecration/restoration motif as a principal literary device in establishing an eschatological hermeneutic for Christianity consonant with the Jewish restoration hope.

An inquiry into Jesus' situation in the Synoptics, and his use of Daniel in his eschatological discourse will enable us to further examine this importance. We may approach this study by answering two questions: first, why did Jesus predict the destruction of the Temple?, and second, how does his prediction make use of the desecration/restoration motif that we have traced thus far through the Tanach and apocalyptic literature?

**Jesus' Prediction of the Temple's Destruction**

We have said that there exists a relationship between the "Cleansing" of the Temple incident and Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple. This relationship came from the common understanding that the Second Temple had not been the recipient of the restoration promises, due to the spiritual failure of Israel, and therefore, was destined for destruction. It has been our opinion that Jesus did make an implicit pronouncement of judgment against the Temple in his clearing of the Temple market, but it was not a negative condemnation of the Temple, nor of the sacrificial system, but of the same cultic abuses that threatened the existence of the First Temple, and in view of the expectation of an eschatological Temple to replace the present Temple that had not been able to realize the divine ideal. Since the Second Temple was not the Restoration Temple, the prophetic judgment oracles still applied to it, and it was these that Jesus used
as his source for his explanation of both the coming Roman destruction of the Temple, and of an anticipated rebuilt Temple that would exist at the time of the eschaton and be delivered and restored in fulfillment of the eschatological predictions.

That this was not only the perspective of Jesus, but of a fairly large percentage of Jews in Jesus’ day, has been argued with substantial evidence from historical sources by Markus Bockmuehl. In his article he cites examples from Josephus, Tacitus, and early rabbinic literature that indicate that there was a flourishing hermeneutical tradition before 70 C.E. that predicted the Temple’s destruction. He gives the reason for this school of interpretation as two-fold:

(1) Theological. The first and most important reason was that the restoration promises of the biblical prophets had not been fulfilled. Prophecies about the exile and subsequent return to the Land under ideal conditions were obviously unfulfilled. This awareness is found already in the pre-Maccabean book of Tobit (13:16-18; 14:5), as well as in Daniel 9:17, 26-27. The corruption and decline of the Hasmonean dynasty and subsequent occupation by Roman forces exacerbated doubts that a full restoration, much less a liberation, of the Jewish Nation would take place. In addition, there were doubts, by groups such as the Essenes, and those who frequented the Jewish Temple at Leontopolis, that the Maccabees had effected a complete cleansing of the Temple. If despite its Heodian-restored splendor, it was not the eschatological Temple, and if the purity of the Zadokite priestly line was at all a matter of concern, then the only logical conclusion was the present corrupt system would need to give way to a new one.

---

89 Cf. Markus Bockmuehl, “Why Did Jesus Predict the Destruction of the Temple?,” Crux XXV: 3 (September, 1989), pp. 11-17. Holding to the same interpretation for Jesus’ predictions, yet without the element of judgment, is E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (London: SCM Press, 1985), pp. 85-88, who notes “the naturalness of the connection between expecting a new temple and supposing that the old one will be destroyed,” (p. 85).
(2) Social and Political. In addition, the degeneration of the priestly aristocracy invited comparison with the earlier prophetic oracles of judgment and destruction (the desecration motif). Of the twenty-eight High Priests between 37 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., all but two came from illegitimate non-Zadokite families.\textsuperscript{90} It became increasingly clear to most Jews that the cultic center, which regulated all of Jewish life, was in the hands of a vast network of economic and religious oppression. The legitimate and necessary operation of the Temple was supported by a maze of intrigue, nepotism, and graft (Mishnah Keritot 1.7), such as that of the well-known priestly family of the house of Kathros (cf. Baraita, B.Pesahim 57a). Such social and political factors prompted many Jews to consider the theological perspective previously discussed.

\textit{The Olivet Discourse and the Abomination of Desolation}

In apocalyptic fashion, Jesus in the Olivet Discourse describes the end of the age as a time of the rise of false messiahs, false prophets, and general Jewish apostasy (Matthew 24:4, 11; Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8). There will also occur a time of escalating wars between nations of the world and a worldwide persecution of the Jewish People (Matthew 24:7-9; Mark 13:7-11, 13a; Luke 21:10-15, 17), during which Jews will betray one another (Matthew 24:10, 12; Mark 13:12; Luke 21:16). All of these things are said to occur prior to the end of the age, but are not in themselves, or all together, the sign of the coming of the Messiah and the promised restoration.

The signal for the final hour is reserved for the “Abomination of Desolation.” Jesus carefully instructs his audience to watch for this sign - that was previously predicted by Daniel - i.e. the “Abomination of Desolation” positioned within the Holy Place (the Temple), (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14). Luke’s omission of this signal event is one of the reasons it is believed that at this point in his narrative he is presenting the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. rather than the

eschatological end of the age. What is clear from these passages is that Jesus interpreted the “Abomination of Desolation” according to the Danelie model, and that he believed that Daniel 9:27 was eschatological and reserved for the end of the age, a perspective also held by many of the apocalyptic writers (e.g. I Enoch, Jubilees). What is also clear is that Jesus made this event the pivotal incident that signaled the certain succession of the remaining events to conclude the age. What follows is the persecution that attends the rise of the Antichrist, apparently associated with the “Abomination of Desolation,” which we believe will receive clarification in II Thessalonians 2:4-5, the celestial upheaval that accompanies the Day of the Lord, and the triumphal coming of Messiah to gather the Elect Remnant of Israel from throughout the world (Matthew 24:16-31; Mark 13:15-27; Luke 21:25-28).

From the above description of the Olivet Discourse, we can see Jesus’ use of our motifs. The first section of his presentation employs the desecration motif, in which growing apostasy is climaxed by the appearance of the Antichrist (Belial/Beliar), who is recognized through the “Abomination of Desolation,” i.e. Temple desecration. The desecration motif sets the stage with the scene of further persecution and apostasy, until with the second section, the Deliverer comes with all the apocalyptic signs attending, and brings the promised restoration which is commenced by the regathering of the scattered Jewish Remnant. From our previous survey, we can see that Jesus stands in the tradition of the writing prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets, and that his themes largely complement the vast assortment of apocalyptic writing that preceded him. We now turn to the continuation of Jesus’ message through his disciples, and consider whether his prediction of the Temple’s destruction affected their attitude toward the Temple during their ministry.
THE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE TEMPLE IN ACTS

However one dates the Book of Acts, it is universally recognized that the events recorded represent a pre-70 C.E. viewpoint. In Acts the Temple is still standing and the narratives containing references to the cult are presented in the context of a normative and acceptable cultic function. For example, we find in the opening chapters of Acts the disciples of Jesus stationed in the Temple precincts (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:21). Not only were the disciples as observant Jews keeping the Shavuot feast (Acts 2:1), but they daily congregated in the Temple in the Stoa of Solomon (Acts 2:46), which was apparently their favored place of meeting (Acts 3:11; 5:12). Acts 2:46 notes that they assembled together "with one accord" (δυναμαδεν), which may simply mean that they were without discord in their ranks (in comparison with other Jewish sects) or mark their exceptional spiritual unity in worship. It has been speculated as to why they assembled at the Temple:

1. It was the place designated for public teaching, which is why Jesus frequented the site.
2. It was a place where there were crowds [of worshippers], thus, a ready audience for their witness and message.
3. It was the place designated for proper Jewish prayer at prescribed times of the day, hence, as good Jews they were following the custom of the Law.

91Scholarly consensus is that Luke-Acts, if even written by the same author, was composed by a Gentile writing outside of Palestine after A.D. 70. However, it will not do, as Dawsey, op. cit., points out, to posit that a Gentile, writing after A.D. 70, presumably to a Gentile audience (note address to "Theophilus", Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1) borrowed a positive view of the Temple from Judaism and incorporated it into both the Gospel and the history of Christianity.

92The word δυναμαδεν is the equivalent of ἄρρητα, occurring 36 times in the LXX, and was used as a technical term to denote the exceptional unity of thought and character of Christian conduct (cf. Acts 1:14; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12; 8:6). Acts 7:57; 8:12; 19:29 employ the term to depict unity in the face of hostile opposition.
In support of the third option, Acts 3:1 specifically states that Peter and John were going at the hour of prayer. The text does not indicate that they were going for any reason other than to pray (and Acts 2:46 expects the reader to understand the reason), and this is supported by Peter's later recorded ritual in prayer (Acts 10:9). If Peter and John were among those at the Temple in Acts 2:46, and as leaders it would seem probable, and if they were all in "one accord," then this text may be indirectly implying their unity of devotion to the Temple.  

That the Temple was regarded by Peter, the de facto leader of the disciples as primum inter pares, and by John, the traditional author of the Apocalypse, as the legitimate cultic institution is seen in Acts 3:1 (cf. verse 3) where it is stated that they went to pray at the Temple specifically at the "ninth hour", the time of prayer associated with the evening sacrifice. Acts 5:12-13

---

93 We must remember that at this time the early disciples of Jesus were all observant Jews. Peter is particularly revealed as such (cf. Acts 10:14; Galatians 2:7, 11-14). Even at the Jerusalem Council, still years away, the kashrut laws are still applied through the Noahic covenant to the Gentile converts to the Jewish Messiah (Acts 15:19-21/28-29), a proviso that was agreed to by even the most observant among the group (Acts 15:5 with verse 22). It is very difficult to defend any position of these Jewish believers other than that they continued to reverence the Temple as the place designated by God for daily prayers. Just as Jesus' condemnation of the Jewish Nation had not led them to abandon their country, so Jesus' announcement of the Temple's destruction had not caused them to reject it as valid.

94 Later, in Acts 10:14, Peter's adherence to kashrut laws is presented in his denial: "I have never eaten anything unholy (κοινὸν = τὸ ἄφθορον, "profane, ceremonially unclean") and unclean (dekathaptov. = ἁπάντως, "ceremonially impure").

95 This observation, at least, ought to balance the thinking of those like Sandmel, who regarded John as the most anti-Semitic of the Gospels.

96 Such specificity of purpose here must indicate the high esteem held by these for the Temple and not simply be incidental to the events which transpire as the drama of the story contra Calvin who supposed the reason for going to the Temple was because it offered the best opportunity for missionary work (incorrectly assumed by the command of Acts 5:20 to preach at the Temple). That prayer, and not missionary endeavor, was the purpose of the assembly is made clear by Acts 5:13, which indicates that "the rest" (λεγοῦν = δὲ λαὸς) "[did not]
indicates that the regularity of this group’s worship, and especially their remarkable demonstrations of spiritual ability, set them apart from other observant Jews, and brought them acclaim for their piety.97

When the members of this group are later arrested by order of the Sanhedrin, it is not because their views of the Temple and cult are in question, but their messianic claims concerning Jesus, and apparently the political consequences resulting from the Sanhedrin’s complicity in his death (Acts 5:26-40). While the accusation against Stephen was that he spoke “against this holy place [Temple]” (Acts 6:13), the text, as will be shown, parallels the same accusation used against Jesus at his trial, and is considered to be a false testimony.

The loyalty of this early Christian leadership to Jerusalem and the Temple area is remarkable, in as much as they were Galileans, and most of their ministry with Jesus had centered in regions outside Jerusalem. That Jerusalem should become the center and hub of early Jewish-Christianity (cf. Galatians 1:18-2:2) attests to the particular sanctity this group held for the city and the Temple. To be sure, Jesus’ modus operandi upon his arrival in Jerusalem was to teach in the Temple (Luke 19:47; 21:37), and Acts 1:8 recorded Jesus’ own command to begin their proclamation of the gospel from Jerusalem, a command when reiterated by an angel (Acts 3:11; 5:19-20), directs them to the Temple.

Furthermore, in view of Jesus’ condemnation by the Sanhedrin, his death in that city, and his own predictions of the Temple’s imminent destruction, it would seem that the disciples might corporately reject Temple worship in favor of their own community as a "new" temple. That the opposite is observed, implies that they did not view the literal Temple as conflicting with their concept of Jesus’ atonement nor with the Church. In fact, Hegesippus, who was a member of the

associate, join, with” (κολλᾶσθαι in the sense of spatial proximity) them out of esteem for their piety and the miracles they performed.

97Luke in Acts 5:13-14 clarifies the non-Christian Jews’ reserve of approach by stating that (1) these Jews (ὁ λαὸς) “esteemed them” (ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοῖς), and (2) some joined their ranks (προσετίθεντο ... πλῆθος), indicating that amalgamation, rather than ostracization was the result.
Christian leadership a generation after the apostles, recorded that James, the head of the Jerusalem church was renowned for his Temple worship:

He alone was allowed to enter the Sanctuary, for he did not wear wool but linen, and he used to enter alone into the Temple and be found kneeling and praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew hard like a camel’s because of his constant worship of God, kneeling and asking forgiveness for the people.\footnote{Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History.* Translated by Kirshope Lake. *Loeb Classical Library* (New York: G. Putnam’s Sons, 1926-1932), 2. xxiii.}

Another reason may be suggested as to the establishment and continued presence of the early Jewish-Christian community in Jerusalem. This reason is eschatological, and centers on the Temple and the city as having a significant role in the coming Age of Redemption. This hope was drawn from Jesus’ apocalyptic discourse on Mount Olivet (Matthew 24:3-31; Mark 13:3-37; Luke 21:5-38) in which he places the desecration of the Temple as the signal event (cf. Daniel 9:27) preceding the Messiah’s coming. This hope was voiced in Acts 1:6 where the disciples are told to wait for the promise of the עזרה והדר, which was, according to the Prophets, essential to the establishment of this time of restoration (Joel 2:28-29 cited in Acts 2:16-21; Ezekiel 36:27; 37:14; 39:29 cf. Jeremiah 31:33; Isaiah 32:15; 44:3). Jesus’ interpretation of the time of restoration was consistent with the Prophets and non-canonical Jewish apocalyptic writers.\footnote{This concept was of an earthly messianic reign preceding the eternal state, sometimes of a thousand years duration, as at Revelation 20:4, but also of varying length, cf. J. W. Bailey, "The Temporary Messianic Reign in the Literature of Early Judaism," *JBL* 53 (July, 1934): 170-187. This literal hope of restoration was even shared by Philo, though accustomed to allegorization of Jewish religious beliefs, nevertheless could write: "the cities that now lay in ruins will be cities once more," *De Praemiis et Poenis*, p. 168. For the documentation of this view of an eschatological earthly kingdom at Qumran cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989), p. 300ff.} Thus, Sanders, after surveying the Jewish literature relevant to this period concluded: "the hope that seems to have been most often repeated was that the restoration of the people
of Israel ... the kingdom expected by Jesus ... is like the present world - it has a king, leaders, a temple, and twelve tribes."100

That this hope was a controlling factor in the disciples' presence in Jerusalem may be implied by the central place this hope occupies in their proclamation of repentance to the Jerusalemites (Acts 3:19-21). In this passage, the very terms used to express the promise are drawn from the prophetic message concerning Israel's future restored Kingdom, which almost certainly derived its source directly from Jesus own teaching in Matthew 19:28 (cf. Luke 22:30), and Acts 1:6.101 In Matthew 19:28, in particular, we have use of the term which Gundry correctly ascribes to: "Israel's renewal when God fully establishes his kingdom on earth."102 This term complements the prophetic concept of eschatological renewal in the restoration which we saw in Ezekiel 36:24-38, and which also occupied the prophetic message of Isaiah (e.g., 49:5-13; 56:1-8; 60:1-


101The terms in Acts 3:20-21 are drawn from the language of the prophetic discourses. The phrase in verse 20, καρποὶ ἀναψύξεως is parallel with the phrase χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως in verse 21. The former use of ἀναψύξεως is attested in the LXX only in Exodus 8:15 where it must have the sense of "respite," following παρέξως. The idea, then, is of a "respite" from Gentile oppression through the deliverance from Gentile domination accompanying the advent of the Messiah (cf. Zechariah 12-14). This domination was considered a judgment from God for past apostasy (cf. Deuteronomy 28:36, 47-50) that would find a reversal with Israel's restoration (cf. Isaiah 11:11-12, cf. Luke 21:24; Romans 11:25). The latter use of ἀποκαταστάσεως is identical to Acts 1:6 of the "restoration" or "establishment" of Israel's Kingdom, and parallel in sense to παλλιγγενέσια ("renewal, regeneration") in Matthew 19:28. The prophetic hope here is that the restoration of Israel's blessings - politically and spiritually - would be conditioned upon repentance, which in turn would bring the Messiah to fulfill the promise of the messianic age. Note also that Acts 3:19-21 qualifies this eschatological age with restoration motifs: καρποὶ ἀναψύξεως ("times of refreshing") and χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ("the times of the restoration of all things"), clearly stating that this period yet to come was predicted by the all the writing Prophets of Israel (πάντων ἄγων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν ἅτι αὐτῶν).

22; 66:18-24).\textsuperscript{103} The same idea of a renewal of both the Land and the people of Israel is found in the apocalyptic literature (e.g., Tobit 13:16-17; 14:5-6; Jubilees 1:15-17, 26-28; 1QM 2:2-7). Furthermore, in this passage, the disciples are encouraged to look forward to sharing an earthly rule with Jesus as the messianic King: ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ανθρώπου ἐπὶ βρόντας αὐτοῦ, καθήσετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα βρόντοις κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ("when the Son of Man will sit on his glorious throne, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel").\textsuperscript{104} Therefore, if the disciples and the early Jewish-Christian community were awaiting the imminent arrival of the messianic Kingdom, as was their stated goal (Acts 1:6), they would have originally remained in Jerusalem, since it was to Jerusalem that he was expected to return (cf. Zechariah 14:4) and from which his rule, and theirs, would begin (Jeremiah 3:17; Zechariah 14:9, 16-17).\textsuperscript{105}


\textsuperscript{104}The role of the disciples would be governors functioning as tribal judges (cf. II Kings 15:5; Psalm 2:10; Isaiah 1:26), similar to the traditional role of the phylarchs, the princes of the twelve tribes, who would rule over Israel in the period of the restoration as depicted at Qumran (e.g., 1QM 3:3; 5:1-2), and the apocalyptic literature (e.g. Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs - Testament of Judah 25:1-2; Testament of Benjamin 10:7), cf. William Horbury, "The Twelve and the Phylarchs," NTS 32 (1986): 503-527, esp. pp. 512, 524.

\textsuperscript{105}While the early Jewish-Christian community's expectation of Israel's restoration was valid, their remaining at Jerusalem was invalid. In Acts 1:6 when they expect the restoration from Jesus after the resurrection, they are told by him (verse 7) that it awaits the predetermined time of God, and that they, rather, are to spread the news about Messiah beginning from Jerusalem, but extending all over the empire (verse 8).
The Temple Speech of Stephen

The most extensive speech in the Book of Acts is Stephen's discourse delivered before the Sanhedrin (7:2-53). In a style uncharacteristic of Luke, the Gentile compiler of the account, the speech repeatedly appeals to the Tanach, citing some forty passages in its interpretive details of Israel's early history. Assuming, in the light of this extensive use of the Tanach, that Stephen's speech reflects Christian doctrine, it is debated as to why this sermon appears


107 A partial listing is as follows: verse 3 (Genesis 12:1); verse 5 (Genesis 48:4); verses 6-7 (Genesis 15:13-15); verse 14 (LXX, Genesis 46:27); verse 18 (Exodus 1:8); verses 27-28 (Exodus 2:14); verse 30 (Exodus 3:2); verse 32 (Exodus 3:6); verse 33 (Exodus 3:5); verse 34 (Exodus 3:7-8, 10); verse 35 (Exodus 2:14); verse 37 (Deuteronomy 18:15); verse 40 (Exodus 32:1, 23); verses 42-43 (LXX, Amos 5:25-27); verses 49-50 (Isaiah 66:1-2).

polemically inclined against the Temple and cultic offerings in view of Luke’s general pro-Temple position. Such debate presupposes that Stephen here attacks the institution of the Temple. Many have thought this a forgone conclusion simply because speaking “against this holy place” (Acts 6:13) is part of the accusation against Stephen. Marcel Simon, for instance, maintains that “its main characteristic is a strongly antiritualistic trend, and a fierce hostility towards the Temple, which he considers almost as a place of idolatry.” ¹⁰⁹ The justification for this argument is drawn from the use of the term χειροποιητὸν (“made with [human] hands”) in verse 48. The contention is that Stephen is rejecting the Solomonic Temple “made with [human] hands,” as against the Tabernacle “made according to the [heavenly] pattern” (verse 44).¹¹⁰ Further, since the term is used


¹¹⁰Simon again argues his position, in this case by reference to exploited Hellenistic Diaspora Jews who, carrying the opposition at Qumran from simply the present priesthood to the Temple itself, would see the very construction of a man-made building for worship as a violation of God’s will, cf. Saint Stephen and the Hellenists (London: Longmans, 1958), pp. 84-94.
by the LXX of the manufacture of idols, it is argued that Stephen identified the Temple and its sacrifices with idolatry in verses 42-43. Despite this evidence, it is doubtful that Stephen’s speech attacks the Temple at all. Several arguments may be offered in defense of the position:

(1) While the charge against Stephen is that he spoke against the Temple, Luke takes pains to show that this accusation comes from false witnesses. Their claim is that Stephen said that Jesus would destroy the Temple and its altar (Acts 6:14), an allegation made at Jesus’ trial and already shown by the Gospel writers to be false (Matthew 26:60-61; Mark 14:56-59). Luke also does this by paralleling Stephen’s account with that of Jesus’ Passion. Not only are the testimonies against Stephen similar to those against Jesus (Acts 6:13 = Mark 14:58), and labeled false (Acts 6:13 = Mark 14:57), but, the last three words of Stephen correspond to the three Passion sayings of Jesus (a. Acts 7:55 = Matthew 26:64; Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69; b. Acts 7:59 = Luke 23:46; c. Acts 7:60 = Luke 23:34).

---

111 However, it is not accurate to say that the LXX uses only of idols, for in LXX Isaiah 16:12 we read ἐνεκενεποίηται ἐλς τὰ χειροποιήτα αὐτῆς where the reference is to the συνέποιην.

112 Cf. J. R. Brown, Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism. The Winslow Lectures 1963 (Illinois: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1963), pp. 13-14, who says: "Stephen’s speech ... has found almost as many interpreters as it has commentators, but it is surely not a polemic against the Temple. In fact, the accusation that he was against the Holy Place is very carefully ascribed by the author to false witnesses. The data of the speech is that the Jews have rejected Jesus ... not an isolated case, but the culminating episode in a long history of disobedience ... Very naturally he refers back to the building of the Temple ..."


114 On the basis of these similarities, J. Finegan, Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu (Giessen, 1934), pp. 72-74 and H. Lietzmann, “Der Prozess Jesu,” Sitzungsber. Preuss. Ak Wissenschaft: Phil. - hist. Kl., 14 (1931), pp. 313-322 (in Townsend, dissertation, pp. 122-123), have argued that Jesus’ trial before the Sanhedrin was a construction based on Acts 6:11-7:60. The opposite, however, is more likely. First, Luke alone of the Synoptic Gospel writers omits the accusation from his account of Jesus’ trial. The explanation for
Moreover, the accusation against Stephen includes a charge that he speaks against Moses, but in Stephen’s speech, he appeals both to Moses and to the Temple for support against his counter-charge that his accusers, rather, are in opposition to the Temple and Moses.

(2) The claim that χειροποιήτων distinguishes Tabernacle from Temple, and that Stephen thereby views the Temple as an idolatrous institution is erroneous. χειροποιήτων is used in Hebrew 9:11, 24 also for the Tabernacle, and Stephen’s argument is not against the Davidic/Solomonic Temple in favor of the Mosaic Tabernacle, but simply to state that God is not to be defined or confined by reference to a human creation, namely a temple.

This is the same argument used by Paul in Acts 17:24 concerning the localization of the deity in a pagan, or any such structure “made with [human] hands” (почті χειροποιήτος). Both speeches have in view the transcendence of God, Who as solitary Creator is undetermined by His creation. As to the charge of Stephen’s viewing the Temple as a place of idolatry, the focus of Stephen in his historical review is not idolatry, in the sense of worshipping images, but rather human self-assertion which refuses to recognize divine revelation and thus leads to idolatry (cf.

this is his practice of including in Acts (actually the continuation of the Gospel, cf. Acts 1:1) material lacking in Luke (cf. Acts 1:7; 9:40; 12:4). Obviously, he has based Acts 7 on his Gospel sources. Second, the Stephen story has similarities with the whole Passion narrative and the Transfiguration account as well (Acts 6:15 = Matthew 17:2; Luke 9:29; cf. Mark 9:3) not simply with the trial alone. It could hardly be argued that all of these traditions in the Gospels were influenced by Stephen’s speech! Third, there is only one mention of a prophecy of the Temple’s destruction in Stephen’s sermon, while numerous traditions put such a prophecy on the lips of Jesus, and such a tradition is firmly fixed in two places in the Passion narrative. Therefore, it appears that Luke drew on the sources for the Passion account for allusions to Stephen’s speech when he wrote Acts 6:11-7:60.

115 χειροποιήτος has the meaning of secular Greek of “human-made as opposed to natural,” and while Philo uses it of idolatry, he also uses it in this sense to denote “calamities artificially provoked by man’s destructive energy,” cf. Spec. Leg. 1.184; 3.203; Flacc. 62.
Romans 1:18-23). Sweet, who contends that the background for χειροποιητοίς is clearly from Tanach, rather than Hellenistic spiritualizing, argues that the use of χειροποιητοίς here, in view of its parallel in Acts 17:24-25, is directed against the Jewish accusers of Stephen who have, by their rejection of Jesus and his witnesses, have put themselves in the position of pagans who fail to perceive God’s hand and work (cf. Acts 5:38-39). Further, as Brawley has observed, Stephen has prefixed his recollection of the Tabernacle with a tirade about disobedience and idolatry during the wilderness wandering (Acts 7:38-43) as an example of Israel’s rebellion during that initial period, rather than during the period of the Monarchy.

(3) The argument of Stephen is part of a developed cycle between acts of divine mercy and human rebellion. In this structure, David’s desire for a Temple is presented as a positive sign of God’s favor, just as the Tabernacle, both which were given according to the heavenly νυμφαὶ (Exodus 25:8-9; I Chronicles 28:19). In this context Stephen employs a citation from Psalm 131(132):5 to claim that the original purpose for David’s construction of the Temple was it serve as a σκήνωμα (“dwelling”) for God’s presence, and that Solomon actually completed the process.

This argument depends upon adopting the variant reading Θεός in Acts 7:46 instead of the more difficult reading οἶκω. A reading of οἶκω would imply that Stephen differentiated the Tabernacle as for the “house” of Jacob, i.e., as a place where the people were to serve God, from


117 Brawley, op. cit., p. 121.

118 Indeed the best manuscripts have οἶκω and this is the preferred reading, cf. Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971), pp. 351-353.
Solomon’s Temple, which was misunderstood as God’s abode.\textsuperscript{119} Whether or not we admit that the use of the variant is a case of \textit{lectio facilior}, in harmony with the citation from Tanach, the shift to \textit{olkō} is awkward, and would not be understood by any reader in Luke’s day.\textsuperscript{120} Furthermore, the syntax in verses 46b-47 argues for \textit{θεω}, since it is the closest antecedent for \textit{αυτῶ} in verse 47 (rather than \textit{θεοῦ} in verse 46a), and the last half of verse 46 stands parallel to the first half.\textsuperscript{121} Thus, Solomon builds a house for God, and the finding of favor before Him corresponds to finding a habitation for Him. In addition, Stephen’s argument moves to the subject of the divine habitation in verse 49, rather than to a debate as to whether the Temple is a place for the people’s worship or God’s presence.

(4) The problem for Stephen in Acts 7 is not the Temple, but the \textit{actions of the people} to whom God had given the Temple. This, as Weinert has observed, is in keeping with Jesus’ attitude in Luke, which did not oppose the Temple or its cult, but the improper and desecrating behavior of those associated with it.\textsuperscript{122} On the one hand, Stephen’s concern is to demonstrate that God’s revelation of Himself was not always confined to the Temple, thus, God revealed Himself [as a Savior] to Abraham in Mesopotamia, to Joseph in Egypt, and to Moses in the

\textsuperscript{119}This is the position of A. F. J. Klijn, “Stephen’s Speech - Acts VII. 2-53,” \textit{NTS} 4 (1957-1958): 25-27, who by analogy with an alleged parallel in IQS IX, 3-6 finds support for the \textit{olkō} reading. However, the Qumran text deals with service to God in a purely spiritual “house,” a sense not normative to Luke’s non-spiritualizing treatment of the Temple and cult.


burning bush, and likewise through Jesus as Messiah (although he is here not mentioned by name). On the other hand, the rejection of Jesus as a revelation of God, possibly because he did not fulfill the predicted messianic role of Temple restoration, compels Stephen to defend the implied thesis that the messianic purpose first involved a restoration of the hearts of the Nation to God, a purpose never realized in Israel's history because of its continued rejection of God's prophetic representatives. This rejection had manifested itself in a form of worship in which the existence of the Temple was regarded as an indication of divine favor, despite the impropriety of that worship. However, this was the very attitude of the Nation prior to the departure of the Shekinah and the destruction by the Babylonians.

Stephen’s abrupt shift to an adversarial position in verse 51 makes no sense unless we see a parallel here between the past rebellion of the people (who were given the Tabernacle) and the present rebellion of the people (who were given the Temple). Stephen’s argument to his accusers is that by their rejection of God’s revelation in Jesus, they are company with their ancestors who likewise rejected God’s revelation in the wilderness. This rebellion, however, is highlighted by Stephen’s use of χειροποιητος. He is clearly contrasting in verse 48 (ἀλλ’ οὐ) their attitude of rebellion given in verse 41: καὶ εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν (“and they were rejoicing in the work of their hands”) with the rebuke against the pagan concept of a temple as a man-made edifice for the gods: ὁ θεός ἐν χειροποιητοῖς κατοικεῖ (“the Most High does not dwell in [houses] made by [human] hands”). The point of Stephen is that just as YHWH had manifested Himself at Sinai, yet the people had sought for God in the work of their own hands, so now, God had manifested Himself in Jesus as the promised Messiah, yet again there were those who sought for God in the work of their hands - in this case the Temple and its cultus. All of these things were to serve God’s purpose in manifesting Himself, but they were not to replace that manifestation when it appeared (i.e., in Jesus). For all that the Temple signified, including the coming restoration, it was inadequate to fulfill its purpose
of manifesting the true God beside the revelation of God that had now come in Messiah.

Behind Stephen's thought may be the argument that since Messiah would ultimately build the Restoration Temple, involving the Gentile nations, and the return of the Shekinah (Zechariah 6:12; Isaiah 56:7; Ezekiel 43:4), and Jesus was the Messiah, all acts of rebellion against him were acts of rebellion against God and God's purpose to restore Israel as a witness to the nations. Jesus is thus pictured in verse 52 as standing at the end of a long line of prophets who were sent to Israel, and subsequently rejected because of their misplaced confidence in the Temple as the revelation of divine blessing. Stephen argues that to seek for God's blessing through the Temple, while at the same time refusing God's Word, and especially as mediated through the Messiah (who is greater than the Temple, cf. Matthew 12:6), is to desecrate the function of the Temple; an act of no less defiance than that displayed at the foot of Mount Horeb. For this reason he can link them in attitude with their ancestors in verses 51-53.

Our conclusion, then, is that Stephen did not target the Temple (Solomonic, or by extension, Herodian), nor argue in any way against its sanctity. His comments concerning the Temple rather concerned the idea of God's presence being restricted to an earthly building, and of the inadequacy of claiming the Temple as security while at the same time being in rebellion to the Temple's God. His use of Isaiah 66:1-2 confirms that he is thinking in cosmic proportions, like Solomon in 1 Kings 8:27, and fits well within the traditional Jewish perspective that regarded the Temple as the place where God's Name dwelt and as the place of prayer. Like the prophets who condemned trusting in the Temple while violating the Law for which the Temple stood, Stephen condemns those who have rejected Jesus, whose purpose was to fulfill the Law (Matthew 5:17-18), and who himself identified with the prophets in their message against Law-breakers (cf. Matthew 12:5-8). Stephen, then, has directed his condemnation against the people (leadership) who have rejected God's revelation of Himself, not the institution that was meant to reveal Him.
The Attitude of Paul to the Temple in the Book of Acts

According to Acts, the Temple was not only central for the apostles and early Church, but also for Paul.\textsuperscript{123} How did Paul as a Jewish-Christian conceive of himself in relation to Judaism? As the Book of Acts moves with chapter 8 to focus on the character of Saul (Paul), it includes historical reports of his veneration of the Temple. The list of these observant acts include: his observance of the feasts regulated by the Temple (Acts 20:6),\textsuperscript{124} his religious vows (Nazarite vow, Acts 18:18), *miqve* purification rites, in one case involving four other proselytes (Acts 21:23-26; 24:18), offering of sacrifices at the Temple (Acts 21:26; 24:17), prayers and worship at the Temple (Acts 22:17; 24:11), and regard for the priesthood (Acts 23:5), and his payment of the Temple tax (Acts 24:17). After a riot at the Temple due to a false rumor that Paul had brought a Gentile into the court of the Jews, and he was rescued from the rabble by Roman guards, he addressed his accusers and the crowd and declared himself a Jew (Acts 21:27-39).

When other occasions were afforded him, especially by Gentile officials, to defend himself against the Jews, he nevertheless referred to his Jewish heritage and professed his ceremonial purity (24:18). At the end of the Book of Acts he is depicted as one who can address leaders of the Jews in Rome as "brothers," and affirm to them that he had "done nothing against our people or the customs of our fathers" (28:17), and bore no malice against his "nation" (28:19). These references depict Paul as devout as any Jew toward the Temple, as one who assisted others in performing their Temple obligations, and as one who insisted on regulating his life by the Temple calendar (the feast days), even to interrupting his own missionary work. All of these actions seem to be strange coming from one who was commissioned as "the Apostle to the Gentiles" (Romans 1:5; cf. Galatians 2:7-9).


\textsuperscript{124} Paul was so intent on observing the feasts, that at the end of his third journey he avoided the province of Asia in order to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost (Acts 20:16).
Such texts must place Paul in the camp of normative Judaism with respect to his attitude toward the Temple, for as Townsend has correctly observed, "there is little reason to suppose that Paul, after becoming a Christian, radically changed his attitude toward the Jerusalem temple or that he was opposed to any Christian, Jew or gentile, taking part in its cult." Such statements caution us to read Paul's disputations with Jewish legalizers and his harsh comments concerning the Law in light of his lifelong adherence to Judaism. Furthermore, these indications of Paul's Temple reverence should be sufficient to warrant a re-appraisal of his use of Temple and cultic metaphors in his epistles as indicative of replacement by Christ and the Church.126

Paul's Attitude toward the Temple in the Pauline Epistles

The prevailing view of Paul's treatment of the Temple, and of his use of cultic or purification motifs in his epistles, is one of replacement, i.e. Paul spiritualizes or allegorizes the Temple and its ritual in order to show its fulfillment in the Christian Church as the true Sanctuary of God.127 However, what we have


126 There is no doubt that Paul's understanding of the Law and the Temple had been reformed (or perhaps informed) by his belief that Jesus was the Messiah, however, this new meaning need not have altered the old truths, but rather enhanced them in terms of an eschatological fulfillment, of which he saw the Christian community as the first and essential component (cf. Romans 9:4-6, 27; 11:1-32, esp. verses 28-32).

127 One writer believes that Paul's imagery, at least in I Corinthians 3:16-17, was not the Temple at all, but the Tabernacle, cf. J. M. Ford, "You Are God's 'Sukkah' (I Cor. iii. 10-17)," NTS 21 (1973/74), pp. 139-142, however, his alleged parallels are not convincing and against the use here of desecration motif, which envisions the desecration/destruction of the building itself, only the Jerusalem Temple could be understood as the source. William Hendriksen, Exposition of Ephesians, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967), p. 145, argues that in Ephesians 2 the allusion must also be to the pagan Greek temple of Artemis (or Diana to the Romans), which was located in that city. He notes in support of this position that Paul's words in Acts 17:24 are applicable to any man-made temple, that the temple of Artemis, as one of the seven wonders of the ancient world could hardly have been eclipsed in Ephesian thought by the Jerusalem Temple, and that this temple and its cult were at the
seen from the Lukan historical perspective of a Paul faithful to Torah and continuing to worship in the Temple, would be expected in Paul's own epistles. Therefore, it is not incongruous to hear Paul in II Thessalonians 2:4 refer to the Jerusalem Temple, even in a state of desecration, as τοῦ ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ("the Temple of God"), nor to hear him list with equal reverence the Temple among Israel's greatest spiritual blessings in Romans 9:4-5:

οὕτως εἰσὶν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὃν ἡ ὑλοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ η ἠμαθεία καὶ η νομοθεσία καὶ η λατρεία καὶ η ἐπάγγελσι ὃν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἔξ ἥν ὃ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὃ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, ἡμῖν;

("who are Israelites, to whom belongs the adoption as sons [Exodus 4:22] and the glory [Exodus 16:10] and the covenants [Genesis 12:1-3; Deuteronomy 30; II Samuel 7:5-17; Jeremiah 31:31-34] and the giving of the Law [Exodus 20-24] and the Temple service [Exodus 25-31] and the promises [Leviticus 26:3-13; Deuteronomy 28:1-14 and Prophets], whose are the Patriarchs, and from whom is the Messiah according to the flesh ...")

If Paul were here rejecting the Temple cult (ἡ λατρεία), he would also be rejecting the other listed privileges of Israel, including the Messiah himself, since they are all part of the same divine blessing. Townsend, whose 1958 Harvard dissertation on the Jerusalem Temple in the New Testament questioned the

center of conflict for Paul (Acts 19:23-41). While this suggestion has merit, we cannot read the mind of Paul beyond what he has directly or indirectly revealed in his texts, and these bear witness, it seems to me, only of the Jerusalem Temple. When we look for sources for Paul's theological treatises to Gentile audiences, he does refer to familiar Greek poets (Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12), religious objects (Acts 17:23) and notions (Acts 14:11-13), but he has not used them to communicate spiritual truths, even by analogy, but rather condemned such (I Timothy 1:3-4; 4:7). The fact that Paul in I Corinthians 3:16 and 6:19 introduced his Temple metaphor with the interrogative phrase οὐκ οἴδατε; ("do you not know?"), suggests that the image was assumed by Paul to already be a familiar one, an what temple would be more familiar to Diaspora Jews living in Corinth (and fit for use as an analogy to the believing community) than the Jerusalem Temple? It is of further relevance to this argument that Paul did not have to explain his analogy or defend the appropriateness of its use, but expected it to be received without contention. Only the Jerusalem Temple could be expected to merit this uncontentious reception.
assumption that Paul rejected the Temple and its cult on the basis of the documents, noted in a 1979 article: "Only occasionally has anyone suggested that, like Saul the Pharisee, Paul the Apostle continued to regard the Jerusalem temple as the true temple of God; yet his epistles do not contain a single word against this temple."128 While this notion runs contrary to contemporary Pauline presuppositions concerning Pauline allusions, Sweet has proposed one explanation for this difficulty:

It is possible, though difficult, to distinguish an attack on an institution from an attack on those who run it, or to distinguish rejection of an institution from the quest for something better which puts it in the shade - as, for Paul, the glory of Moses' dispensation was "de-glorified" by the surpassing glory of the Spirit's (2 Cor. 3:10). Eschatology, unless it is purely escapist, must seem subversive to those whose stake is in the status quo. Thus it is possible to have respect for the Temple, as the place where God said his name should dwell, and for the Law as holy, just and good, and to combine such respect, on the one hand, with fierce criticism of the present administration whose failure may lead God to demolish his own institution ... and on the other hand, with looking for God's "fulfillment" of the earthly institution which (it may be believed) he has already set in motion.129

We have already briefly reviewed Paul's attitude toward the Temple in the Book of Acts, but since it might be claimed that this was re-cast by Luke in terms of his own positive attitude toward the Temple, let us add examples from the Pauline epistles to this same effect. We will begin by a cursory listing of Paul's analogical use of Temple and cultic metaphors, and then proceed to deal with the interpretive assumptions drawn from these texts.

128Ibid., p. 52.
The Attitude of Paul to the Temple in the Pauline Epistles

Those who hold that Paul rejected the Temple and cult as illegitimate, and replaced the old institution with Church and its worship of Christ as the New Temple, base their interpretation on part or all of the following conclusions:

1. Paul referred to the Church as a temple, universally (Ephesians 2:19-22), locally (1 Cor. 3:16-17), and individually (1 Cor. 6:19).

2. Paul depicted the true Jerusalem (including the Temple) as the heavenly Jerusalem, replacing the earthly Jerusalem (Galatians 4:25-26).

3. Paul used sacrificial and priestly language in terms of Jesus’ crucifixion or Christian’s sanctification under the New Covenant (Romans 3:25; 12:1; Titus 3:5), referring to the Temple cult only as part of the Old Covenant, now succeeded in Christ (Romans 9:4; 1 Corinthians 10:18).

4. Paul regarded the law as a παταγωγός (Galatians 3:24) to which at least Gentile Christians were no longer subject. Since the law ordained the Temple and its cult, they should have no meaning for those not under the law.

Let us consider these in light of the attitude already evidenced for Paul in Acts, first answering the question why Paul used the Jerusalem Temple as the source for his motifs of the Church.

Paul’s Use of the Temple as a Motif

Paul employed the figure of the Temple as a motif, both as a political and social metaphor. He apparently followed the Koine distinction between ναός and ἑρών, since the former is exclusively employed in his epistles, and the latter never appears in figurative usage. Several reasons may be deduced for Paul’s use of the Temple motif:

---


131 One reason for this selection, as was mentioned earlier, is that the ναός consisted of or was equivalent to the Holy of Holies in technical distinction, and therefore indicated the place of spiritual dwelling and of divine communion. We
(1) *Paul’s education in Jerusalem as a Pharisee.* Such training would have oriented his concept of worship in terms of the Temple, and as he continued to view it as the central place of Jewish worship, and to worship there himself (Acts 21:22-29), the Temple would have been a natural source for his explanations of worship. The fact that Paul exclusively uses *vaōs* (the Temple proper and especially the Holy of Holies), rather than *lepōn* (the Temple precincts), shows that he is thinking about the *spiritual* nature of the Temple as the place where God’s Presence dwelt. If Paul was seeking to denigrate the Temple as a defunct institution in view of constituting the Church or Christians as the new spiritual temple, then it would be expected that he would abandon a term for the Temple that emphasized its spiritual significance and incomparable holiness. On the other hand, if Paul regarded the Temple with reverence, then he would have found this association ideal for communicating the truth of the sanctified constitution of the assembly and its saints.

---

may add as support for this distinction the use of the plural, which occurs only in Acts 17:24 (*χειροποιητοι* *vaōs*; "temples made with hands") and 19:24 (*ναοίς· ἄγγελοι; *"silver shrines"*), both with reference to pagan temples, where the focus seems to be on the presence of an idol. Whether or not the idol was placed within the pagan temple’s inner sanctum, that was where the Ark of the Covenant and the *Shekinah* were located in the Jerusalem Temple, and only *vaōs* would draw attention to this comparison. Since Paul’s point to his readers is that God now dwells in them and constitutes them a holy place, the best referent for his analogy would have been *vaōs*.

132 The German commentator Otto Michael argued for this distinction in his article on “*vaōs*” in *TDNT*, 4: 880-890 (especially p. 887), although he notes that this distinction cannot be strictly maintained in all of the Greek of the New Testament period. From the Gospel of Matthew (27:5) he cites what he considers an example (pp. 884-885) of *vaōs* referring to the Temple precincts when Judas is said to have thrown the thirty pieces of silver into the *vaōs*. But, the text does not say that Judas entered into the *vaōs*, which was something he, in fact, could not do, only that he threw the money there. Even if Michel is correct concerning the usage during the New Testament period, it is more likely that the usage in the LXX, where *lepōn* is rarely used for the Temple (outside of I Esdras and Maccabees) may have influenced Paul, cf. *TDNT* s.v. "*lepōn;*" 3:226, 233.
(2) Paul's journey to Jerusalem to learn from the apostles. Paul consulted with Peter and James about the Christian movement centered in the Holy City. Since Peter later used similar Temple-motifs in his epistle (1 Peter 2:4-10), Paul may have learned from these apostles about the positive respect shown the Temple by the Jewish-Christian community in Jerusalem. Paul would have undoubtedly learned from them of the respect paid the Temple by Jesus (e.g. his reference to it as "My Father's house," John 2:13-17; Matthew 21:12-13).

In addition, the distinction given the Temple by the assemblies of the early Christians there, may have influenced Paul to use the Temple as a motif for his largely Gentile audience, anxious to conform to the mother Church in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 15:22-35). It is significant that in Acts 15 at the Jerusalem Council, that Paul heard James argue the Church's position on worship based on the use of a Temple-motif (Acts 15:15-18). James' argument was apparently adapted from the LXX text of Amos 9:11-12, which contains variants from the MT that may have influenced James' conviction concerning the Gentile's eschatological worship in a restored sanctuary.

133 Unlike Paul, Peter refers to the Temple indirectly by reference to the Church as ἐλαχιστος ("a [spiritual] house"). This is almost equivalent to ναός (here, because he continues his analogy by referring to the actions of the Temple priesthood within the Holy Place, by calling the Church a "holy priesthood" that offers up spiritual sacrifices (1 Peter 2:5).

134 Acts 15 is important to this argument because it shows that Paul not only recognized the authority of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:2, 4 - Paul reported to the Council concerning his ministry and to receive their verdict on the faith/works controversy), but that he was actually commissioned by them to communicate their theological position to the Gentile churches (Acts 15:22).

135 This is admittedly a complex interpretive matter, however, James is using the Amos passage not to demonstrate present fulfillment, but to show that a Gentile inclusion was predicted in God's program for Israel, and that μετὰ παραγωγὴ ("after these things"), verse 16a, i.e., after the present witness to the Gentiles, the program for Israel would be fulfilled. This served as an assurance to the Jewish Church that the many conversions of Gentiles reported by Paul would not be a
(3) Paul viewed the Church as sharing the same theological distinctives as the Jerusalem Temple. Paul seems to have thought metaphorically of the Church as a dwelling place, corporately and individually, for the Shekinah (equated by Paul with the Holy Spirit, cf. I Corinthians 3:16; 6:19; Ephesians 2:22), possessing a cornerstone which lended unity and harmony to the building (Paul’s imagery of Christ as the Head of the Body, cf. Ephesians 2:20), and containing priests which carry out a holy function in sacrificial worship (Paul’s depiction of Christians as a royal priesthood), who present themselves as a sacrificial offering (θυσίας) in their priestly performance (λατρείας), cf. Romans 12:2. With this theological correspondence in view, the use of the Temple motif was appropriate.

(4) Paul’s metaphorical use was consistent with the hermeneutics of first-century Judaism. The use of the literal/physical Temple to advance the concept of a spiritual Temple was developed from those texts in Tanach concerned with the proper motives for the cult of the Temple. The pre-exilic prophets’ criticism of improper or improperly-motivated offerings (cf. Amos 5:21-27; Isaiah 1:11-17; Micah 6:6-8; Hosca 6:6; Jeremiah 6:20; 7:21-22) conversely called for pure spiritual motives to accompany the sacrificial rites (cf. Psalm 51:15-17; Hosea 14:2). Likewise, with the exilic and post-exilic prophets, living for a time without a functioning Temple and cult, apparently substituted mizvot as spiritual sacrifices (Daniel 1:8; 3:12; 6:5, 10) until actual sacrifices could be continued (Ezra 3:2-6). In addition, the spiritual use of the Temple in both the epistle to the Hebrews

\footnote{This observation was made by R. J. McKelvey, \textit{The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament} (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p.43. It should be noted, in exception of McKelvey, that even if such a substitution was made during the Exile, it did not alter the belief in normative Judaism that the Temple was the central sanctuary or that the cult was the only proper means of spiritual service to God.}
and the Apocalypse, as well as later rabbinic orientation of the earthly Jerusalem to the heavenly Jerusalem, may suggest that Paul's usage was normative for his time.

**Pauline Usage and Hellenistic Influence**

Some scholars have suggested an influence also from Hellenistic thought, such as the writings of Philo and the Stoics, because in these man was viewed as a temple.\(^{137}\) However, Paul does not say that man is a temple, but that the Christian's σῶμα ("body") was a temple, a tenet rejected by Philo and the Stoics.\(^{138}\) Further, Paul does not say that the σῶμα alone is a temple, but only as it exists as part of the believing community, the corporate "Body" [of Christ] (i.e., the Church). This was an idea that Hellenistic writers could not accept, since they held a dualism existed between body and mind, with the body being evil, and their concept of man as a temple was entirely individualistic.

Furthermore, in the anthropology of the Hellenistic and the Graeco-Roman humanists, the concept of "temple" had to be spiritualized because their concept of God could not countenance the idea of the divine presence in man-made dwellings or receiving material offerings. Paul's concern, on the other hand, was not with anthropology as much as with eschatology (in its soteriological expression), and therefore he did not spiritualize the Temple, but analogously applied the function of the literal Jerusalem Temple to illustrate the concept of

\(^{137}\) Philo taught that the purified soul of man becomes the temple of God as a result of human achievement. The Stoics, while not directly making reference to man as a temple, indirectly taught the idea, e.g., as in Seneca's concept of man housing a part of the divine spirit. In contrast to Philo, the Stoics believed that the indwelling of God was by natural endowment.

\(^{138}\) Philo saw the σῶμα as the prison of the soul and only allowed that it could have been the temple of God for Adam as the perfect man. Seneca, for example, contended that the σῶμα was useless and perishable, a threat to the purity of the soul or spirit, which alone could glorify God. Cf. J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), p. 76.
purification (sanctification) requisite for those ἐν χριστῷ ("in [union with] Christ").

**Pauline Usage and Influence from Qumran**

In the previous chapter we considered the concept of a "spiritual" temple and "spiritual" sacrifices (obedience to torah) resident in the teaching of the Dead Sea sect. In contrast to Philo and the Stoics, the literature of Qumran revealed the use of "temple" in a communal sense, i.e., of the Qumran community forming a "spiritual" temple. While not rejecting the concept or necessity of a literal Temple, the perceived pollution of the Second Temple, and the eschatological raison d'être of the Qumran community, would have required such figurative usage. Gärtner believes that the connection in the Pauline linkage of holiness and the temple indicates that there was a direct dependence upon Dead Sea texts.

While Paul was probably aware of these sectarian documents, and though some parallels appear to exist between the Pauline and Qumran literature, the apostle's Christological orientation would have limited, if not precluded, his direct use of Dead Sea material. For example, both Paul and the Qumran community held that God dwelt in the faithful, but for the former this was the result of a gracious bestowal by the Spirit based on the work of Christ, whereas for the latter it resulted from adherence to torah. It is perhaps better to view Paul's metaphorical temple usage as the result of a common hermeneutical approach (e.g. midrash, pesher), given the similar positions of the Christian and Qumran

139Note that the development of the ἐν χριστῷ doctrine is presented in Corinthians (e.g., 1 Corinthians 12:12-13; cf. 2 Corinthians 3:18) and Ephesians (e.g., Ephesians 2:6-7; cf. 4:4-6; 5:23), the two books in which Paul employs the Temple metaphor in connection with σῶμα.


141However, in II Corinthians 6:19 Paul's analogy of defilement introduced to the Temple via idols indicates that he is drawing his imagery from Tanach rather than Qumran, whose literature, though stating opposition to idolatry, never explicitly contrasts idols with the Temple. This is also consistent with Paul's dependence on Tanach in the remainder of I Corinthians 6. For the use of temple-imagery at
communities with respect to the Temple. However, as Sage has pointed out, Jesus used the Temple metaphorically with reference to his physical body in John 2:19-22, and this may have been sufficient precedent for Paul to do likewise, since his subject is the spiritual Body of Christ. Having considered some of the possible reasons for Paul’s metaphorical use of the Temple as a motif, let us return to the principal texts mentioned earlier (Ephesians 2:19-22; I Corinthians 3:16-17; I Corinthians 6:19; and Galatians 4:25-26) for an analysis of their argument in favor of a positive Pauline attitude toward the Temple.


142Both the Qumran community, and, originally, the Christian community, were considered sects of Judaism. Their similar allegiance to their sectarian teachers (the "Teacher of Righteousness" and Jesus), their belief that they were the Elect, faithful to the Torah and the Prophets, and their necessary separation from the established religious leadership, may well have caused a common identification between their community and the Temple as the embodiment of sanctification and especially the presence of God. Neither at Qumran, nor in Paul, was the "community" viewed as a replacement for the Jerusalem Temple, even though its cult was considered corrupt. Paul and the Jewish-Christians worshipped in the Second Temple, and while the Qumran community separated itself from direct participation, they may have indirectly respected the institution by payment of the temple tax.


144The correspondence between Christ's physical body and Christ's spiritual body, the Christian community, may have been drawn by Paul from his view of Jesus' resurrection (the subject of John 2:19-22) which made possible the indwelling of the believer individually and corporately by the Spirit. If so, then Paul's dependence for the use of the Temple metaphor is based directly on that of Jesus.
Paul’s Concept of the Church as a Temple

That Paul called the Church a temple does not prove that he intended to replace the Jerusalem Temple by the Church. In Paul’s analogus use of ναός, the grammar implies that substitution of the Church for the Temple was not in view. The noun ναός is indefinite (“a temple”), rather than definite (“the Temple”) in most all occurrences, and if Paul clearly meant to teach that the Church was presently, or eschatologically, the new Temple, then the article would have been expected. Leon Morris suggests that the anarthorous use was to put emphasis on their character as God’s temples. The one case where ναός may be understood as definite, I Corinthians 3:17, still does not have in view

145The idea of replacement, however, is axiomatic to many commentators, cf. Ralph P. Martin, 2 Corinthians. WBC 40 (Waco: Word Books, 1986), p. 201: “Since, for Paul, the Temple of God in Jerusalem had been replaced in Heilsgeschichte by the Temple of God (the believing community) …”

146While we argue that Paul used the indefinite to avoid giving the sense of replacing the Temple with the Church or Christians, we nevertheless believe that he had the literal Jerusalem Temple as a reference. For this reason Heinrich A. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistle to the Corinthians (Winona Lake: Alpha Publications, Reprint 1979), p. 78, and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Reprint 1970), pp. 67-68, believed that Paul intended to be definite here, since to use an indefinite would imply there was more than one Temple, which would not only be inconsistent with the Jewish conception of the “One Temple for the One God,” but would distort the Christian conception of the one Body of Christ. Since we will argue that Paul is using the Temple metaphorically, he could properly have used the definite article (and did in I Corinthians 3:17), since the figure is not confused with the literal object from which it is drawn. However, the indefinite sense avoids the paradox of only one ναός θεοῦ, and yet many churches and each Christian as a ναός.


148While in this verse the construction is lacking the article, definiteness might be intended if Colwell’s rule that anarthorous predicate nouns preceding the verb are usually definite is applied. The word order here is: ναός θεοῦ εστε, and even if not an illustration of the rule probably still indicates definiteness by the emphatic position of ναός, cf. BDF (1961); par. 273. Johannine usage of ναός with the definite article seems to always indicate the Temple in Jerusalem as distinct from
replacement of the Temple by the Church, but addresses the need of the individual believer at Corinth to remain undefiled in the midst of paganism, symbolized there by the temples of Apollo and Aphrodite (at the Agora and Acrocorinth respectively).

Just as the Jerusalem Temple remained the center of sanctity in the midst of Gentile domination with its many temples (considered a desecration), so those who had found the one true God now represented His one true temple in Corinth.\textsuperscript{149} Nothing in this analogy requires that their status as the temple in Corinth replace the Temple in Jerusalem, rather, it from the reality of this Temple that their temple derives its sanctity.

Paul’s selection of the Jerusalem Temple as a metaphor for the Church was justified by an understanding of the spiritual function of the Temple in Judaism. Our source texts demonstrate this significance, drawing upon six spiritual elements that defined the purpose for both structures:\textsuperscript{150} (1) \textit{The Temple as a dwelling place for the Divine Presence.} As we argued in chapter two, this was the primary significance of the central Sanctuary from its proto-type in Eden to Mount Sinai where the Shekinah filled the tent of meeting and the Tabernacle. Even though Solomon articulated the conflict between divine immanence (\textit{על-אצרא} (atzarah) and transcendence (\textit{והמצה المتوו תם אל כיילכלך} (heqem ezer yomei temer la yiylalq)) and at the dedication of the First Temple

any symbolic usage. In this respect Isbon T. Beckwith, \textit{The Apocalypse of John} (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1919), p. 586, is bold to assert: "This is the temple at Jerusalem that is in view. The temple at Jerusalem is never used to symbolize Christians or the church."

\textsuperscript{149}This is the position of Gordon D. Fee, \textit{The First Epistle to the Corinthians. NICNT} (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987), p. 147.

(I Kings 8:27), nevertheless, the Temple was popularly considered as the place where YHWH’s Name was caused to dwell. It is for this reason, and because the Shekinah was manifested within the Holy of Holies,\textsuperscript{151} that Paul employed ναός over λεπόν, because it more clearly communicated this reality which Paul now saw as defining the Church (whether universal, corporate, or individual).

This emphasis is seen in Paul’s grammatical construction in I Corinthians 3:16 where we read: ναός θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὁλκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. Here the explicative καὶ serves to further explain the previous statement, namely, that the Corinthians were God’s temple because God’s Spirit was dwelling within them. This is also seen in I Corinthians 6:19 when Paul writes: τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναός τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγγελον πνεύματος ἐστιν. It is the “indwelling” (ἐν ὑμῖν) Holy Spirit that constitutes the individual (σῶμα) as a “temple” (ναός). Also in Ephesians 2:21-22 we find Paul paralleling the phrases ναόν ἄγγελον ἐν κυρίῳ and κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι, in which construction, the second phrase explicates the first, showing that the Church is a temple because it hosts the presence of God through the Spirit.\textsuperscript{152}

(2) The Temple as a place for spiritual offering. In this instance Paul looks beyond the material sacrifices to those spiritual motives the offerer brings to the altar. While for Paul Jesus has fulfilled the typological significance

\textsuperscript{151}The arrangement of Greek temples also revealed this concept of the indwelling deity, for an image of the deity (cult statue) was usually placed at the end of the cella, cf. Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.v. "temple" (Oxford: University Press), p. While Paul rejected any such notion for the Jerusalem Temple, the word was probably ideally chosen by the LXX to refer to the Holy of Holies for this very distinction.

\textsuperscript{152}For additional evidence from Greek constructions in this text cf. Scott S. Cunningham, “The Temple Motif in Ephesians 2:19-22” (Th.M. thesis: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1980), pp. 56-64.
of the sacrificial system,\textsuperscript{153} the purpose of offerings as a spiritual expression of faith, obedience, and devotion remained. This conclusion may be supported by Paul’s application of sacrificial terminology to the spiritual life. The use of the liturgical metaphors παραστήσαι ("dedicate"), θυσίαν ζώσαν ἄγλαν ("living holy sacrifice"), and λατρείαν ("priestly service") in Romans 12:1; his description of his own service in relation to the Philippian church’s faith as being σπένδωματι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ ... ("poured out [as a libation offering] on [their] sacrifice and priestly service ..."), Philippians 2:17, and the Philippian’s gift as a θυσίαν δεκτήν ("acceptable sacrifice") in Philippians 4:18, and his own work as a λειτουργός ("priest") λειτουργοῦντα το εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ("sacrificing [as a Temple sacrifice] the good news of God") and of his Gentile converts as a προσφορά ("sacrificial offering"), Romans 15:16, all attest to Paul’s view of the believer as a priest and his spiritual conduct as priestly service.

In addition, his use of these metaphors for Christian obligations such as λατρεύουσις ("worship"), Philippians 3:3, δέος ("prayer" or “[priestly] supplication, petition”), e.g. Philippians 1:4, and ἡ εὐχαριστία ("the Lord’s Supper," cf. I Corinthians 10:14-21 where the Temple service

\textsuperscript{153} Cf. I Corinthians 5:7 - “Christ our Passover,” and Romans 3:25 - with most likely Yom Kippur in mind. It must be admitted, however, that Paul did not necessarily hold that because Christ had fulfilled the spiritual aspects of the sacrificial system (both for salvation and sanctification), that Christ thereby replaced the validity of the continuing Temple sacrifices. Because Paul, following the Prophets (cf. I Samuel 15:22; Psalm 40:6-8; 51:16-17; Micah 6:6-8) saw that the sacrifices were never considered efficacious in themselves, nor the act of offering as meritorious in itself, he saw them as simply as the ordained vehicle by which faith could be overtly demonstrated, and therefore valid as long as they could serve this purpose (i.e. while the Temple stood). This may explain the infrequent use of sacrificial terminology by Paul with respect to Jesus’ crucifixion, only three times in his epistles (I Corinthians 5:7; Romans 3:25; Ephesians 5:2), however some argue that Paul’s use of the prepositions δι’ and ὑπὲρ for substitutionary atonement (Romans 5:8; 8:3; Galatians 1:4; 4:20), and περὶ ἡμαρτίας (in Romans 8:3) which designates a sin offering in the LXX (Leviticus 7:37; 9:3; 14:13, 22, 31, etc.) should also be included.
The Temple as a witness to the Gentiles. The Temple and its cult were always inclusive of the non-Jewish foreigner, and assurance was given to him of God’s presence to hear prayers if directed toward the Temple (I Kings 8:41-43), and for this reason Isaiah had good cause to envision the eschatological Temple as "house of prayer ... for all peoples"), Isaiah 56:7. The Temple functioned as a witness to the surrounding nations of the glory and power of YHWH (I Kings 9:6-10; II Chronicles 7:19-22). In addition, one of the duties of the priest was to witness to the people through the proclamation of Torah (Leviticus 10:11; Deuteronomy 33:10; Malachi 2:7). Thus, the Temple served as a paradigm for the Church (the believing community) to witness to the world of the glory and power of God as revealed in Jesus as the Messiah (Acts 1:8; II Corinthians 5:20).

The Temple as the model for holiness. Had Paul any other temple in mind other than the Jerusalem Temple, he could not have written: ἐν τῷ πᾶσα ὁλοκληρωμένῃ συναρμολογημένῃ συνοχῇ εἰς ναὸν ἁγίον ἐν κυρίῳ ("in whom all the building being fitted together grows into a holy Temple in the Lord"), Ephesians 2:21, or again in I Corinthians 3:17: ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγιά ἐστιν, οἰκίστε ἐστε ἴματες ("for the Temple of God is holy, which you are"). To make such an analogy to holiness requires a holy Temple, and only the Jerusalem Temple was the defining locus of all sacred space, the center of sanctity to a Jew, and especially to a Pharisee like Paul.

The analogy from the holiness of the Temple is also implicitly seen in II Corinthians 6:14-7:1 (cf. contrasts of verses 14-16 with the exhortation to "separation" verse 17), and is perhaps behind other Pauline appeals to sanctification, since the appeal is often made in priestly language, and where else would holy priests serve but in the holy Temple.
Only the Temple could have provided the unique construction metaphors for Paul's sanctification exhortation to build on the proper foundation with permanent materials in 1 Corinthians 3:10-12. It has been suggested that Paul's depiction of his own role in verse 10 as a ἀρχιτέκτων, was perhaps part of the vocabulary of ancient building contracts for temples.155 Whatever the case, he certainly means more by it than common building construction, as the context reveals.156

While it is true that Paul's list of six building materials in verse 12: χρυσόν ("gold"), ἀργυρόν ("silver"), λίθος· τιμίος ("costly stones"), ξύλα ("wood"), χόρτον ("hay"), καλάμιν ("straw") is given in a descending scale of values, cost is not the issue here, but perishability (gold the most imperishable to straw the most perishable), yet even here, these represent the permanence and impermanence of Christ versus Gentile σοφία ("[human] wisdom") within the context of the Temple-imagery.157

---


156 It is also noteworthy that Paul in 1 Corinthians 3:9 juxtaposes a gardening metaphor with a [Temple] construction metaphor: θεόν γεωργίαν, θεοῦ οἴκοδομὴ ἔστε ("you are God's garden, [you ] are God's building"). This relationship of husbandry to building was apparently drawn from Tanach, where parallel examples may be seen, each in some connection to the cultus (cf. Deuteronomy 16:21; Isaiah 61:3-6; Jeremiah 35:7-9, 17; Ezekiel 28:26; 36:30-36). It is also quite possible that οἴκοδομὴ could be used to express that part of the semantic range of ὀίκος which approximates to "dwelling places," (cf. the phrase τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ λευκοῦ in Matthew 24:1, though the plural here may modify the semantic range. In like manner, Ignatius, Epistle to the Ephesians 9:1, refers to the cross as the μνημείῳ, the instrument by which it is raised.

157 This is the usual focus in interpretation of this section, cf. Gordon Fee, op. cit., p. 140, though L. L. Welborn, "On Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics," JBL 106 (1987): 85-111 argues that Paul has in mind the cosmic conflict between "the rulers of this age" and "the power of God" (cf. 1 Corinthians 2:5-8), however, the "rulers of this age" here are not cosmic, but earthly - the Roman rulers who crucified Jesus - and the "power of God" is (from the human viewpoint) the weak and humble manner in which the gospel has been presented (cf. 1 Corinthians 2:1-4). For a more prosaic and contextually satisfying alternative see the presentation of the view of D. R. de Lacey below.
Therefore, the list of materials in verse 12 anticipates the Temple metaphor of verses 16-17 and must have in mind the construction materials of the Temple. Indeed, gold and silver would not be reasonable materials for any other type of building; only a temple would contain all of these elements.\(^{158}\)

This is further confirmed by the manner in which these materials are tested, i.e., by fire. Since, the context has in view a future judgment of God at which the believer’s work will be examined, the context is eschatological, and the use of fire as a metaphor for such judgment is standard.\(^{159}\) While it is the work (the manner of construction), rather than the building (temple, cf. verse 16) is tested by fire, the association must have in mind the historic destruction of the First Temple by fire, since the desecration of the Temple and the consequence of divine retribution are the subject of verse 17. This punishment owes its severity to the fact that God’s \textit{vāqēr} is holy, a response that would be unintelligible if the sanctity and inviolability of the Jerusalem Temple were not in view. The use of the desecration/restoration motif here and at II Corinthians 6:14-7:1 will further confirm the appropriateness of the Jerusalem Temple as an analogy for the holiness to be perfected by the Church (cf. II Corinthians 7:1).

(5) \textit{The Temple as a symbol of unity}. The Jerusalem Temple served as a unifying factor politically and religiously for the geographically separated tribes of Israel. When David consolidated the north and south by the placement of the Tabernacle and his capital in Jerusalem, he created this unity, divisible only by war (political) or apostasy (religious). However, it is not to this

\(^{158}\) The Temple was constructed of wood with straw for thatch for the roofing, then built up of stones, with Solomon’s Temple in particular, said to be gilded with gold (the Holy of Holies) and its foundation laid with costly stones (cf. I Kings 6:17, 20-22).

\(^{159}\) The use of fire in apocalyptic imagery is integral to Paul’s gospel (II Thessalonians 1:7) and was probably modeled after Malachi 3:19(4:1) as a Day of the Lord motif (cf. Isaiah 66:15; Daniel 7:9). In terms of the appearance of YHWH with fire (cf. Exodus 3:2; 19:18; Ezekiel 1:13).
unity that Paul looks when he seeks to illustrate this theme, but to the uniformity of the building stones and their placement around a cornerstone, unifying the whole. Thus, in Ephesians 2:21-22 we read:

ἐν ὃ πᾶσα οἰκοδομή συναρμολογημένη; εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ; συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικηθήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι

(“in whom all [the] building being fitted together ... into a holy Temple in the Lord ... builded together for a dwelling-place of God in the Spirit”).

The unity of the Temple is symbolized here by the verbs συναρμολογημένη and συνοικοδομεῖσθε, which respectively denote a “fitting together” and a “building up together” of stones to form a cohesive unit. Based on this analogy, Jesus becomes the cornerstone (after a midrash of Isaiah 28:16; cf. I Peter 2:4-8)\(^{160}\), the believers become the individual stones, placed equally with each other to form a unified Church, like the holy Temple.

The issue of unity may have also been at the forefront of the concern treated by Paul in I Corinthians 3. While the usual interpretation sees the problem of the false σωφία as the focus of the passage, de Lacey

\(^{160}\) The word ἄκρογυναλός has been variously interpreted as to its location in the Temple complex. It is used by the LXX to translate ἐν ἐπίσημον σύνθεσιν at Isaiah 28:16 and Symmachus uses it to translate ἀναλογίαν ἐν Πλευρᾶς in Psalm 118:22. Since the prefix ἄκρος intensifies the force of γυναλός, it is taken to indicate either “height” or “priority”, and was therefore either that stone which was first set by the builder and which determined the lie of the whole construction, i.e., a “foundation stone”, or as Joachim Jeremias, TDNT, s.v. “ἄκρογυναλός,” 1 (1964): 792, originally suggested an Abschlusstein (“capstone”), or as Stig Hanson, The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell's Boktryckeri, 1946), pp. 131-132, a “final stone.” This argument finds support in the Testament of Solomon 22:7 with: λίθος ἄκρογυναλός εἰς κεφαλὴν γυναλός τῆς πληρώσεως τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (“a great cornerstone [put] at the head of the corner completing the Temple of God”), and from its other use in the New Testament with λογείαθαι in Ephesians 4:16 (συναρμολογείαθαι) to indicate an integration from above, i.e. high up on a building. Whether we take the sense as elevation or strategic position, the stone still remains part of the Jerusalem Temple and draws its importance from that fact.
has argued that the problem of factiousness was considered an even
greater threat to the church by Paul, and was another reason for his
employing the Temple imagery.\textsuperscript{161} He would see this section, if not the
whole letter, as an apologetic defense of Paul's apostolic credentials. The
Temple-image, then, becomes the ideal means of defusing the threat of the
Apollos-group by shifting the attention to the whole church's self-identity
as a worshipping community; something not possible within a context of
divisiveness. Just as in Ephesians 2, an appeal to unity based on the
functional unity of the Temple's construction and its unification in
worship will foster a return to the spiritual cohesiveness that ought to
characterize the Church, and which was symbolized by the long process of
the careful rebuilding of the Second Temple.\textsuperscript{162}

(6) \textit{The Temple as a Growing Community}. The fact just stated, that the Temple
was still under construction in Paul's day, gave rise to his use of this
prominent aspect of the Temple as an image of the growth of the believing
community of Christians at Ephesus. Ephesians 2:21 (cf. 1 Peter 2:5) in
describing the unified building of the Temple, uses the verb \textit{a\v{b}\digamma\nu}\nu to
denote this continuing construction of the Temple structure. The growth is
both internal, by the greater cohesion of the individual stones, and
external, by the addition of new stones. This is also an integral part of the
solution to the factions in Corinth, and I Corinthians 3:7 also employs
\textit{a\v{b}\digamma\nu}\nu in this sense. However, here, the imagery is of horticulture, each

\textsuperscript{161} D. R. de Lacey, "\textit{ol\nu\n
\textsuperscript{161}It seems to me that the construction of the Herodian Temple, lasting, with its
continual additions and embellishments, through the lifetime of Paul, and almost
until the A.D. 70 destruction, would have heightened the appropriateness of this
analogy to any Jerusalemite, pilgrim, or visitor to Jerusalem. It certainly was at
the center of the Jesus' disciple's interest during their trips to the City, and
prompted Jesus' famous prophetic declaration of the Temple's destruction (cf.
Matthew 24:1-2; Mark 13:1-2; Luke 21: 5-6). It is also relevant that in each of
these accounts the \textit{stones} are the referent, both for the disciples and Jesus.

\textsuperscript{162}\textit{The Function of a Metaphor in Paul},
\textit{JSNTS} 48 (Sheffield: JTOs, 1991), pp.406-408.
leader of a faction each contributing to the overall growth of the Church by the addition of new converts, yet, as previously mentioned, this metaphor is often joined to the construction metaphor in the very next verse (verse 9), and thus agrees the Temple-growth imagery.

Paul’s picture, then, is of an increased community of believers through the promotion of unity among its members.

**Paul’s Concept of the Church as the Eschatological Temple**

Thus far we have dealt with two of the four arguments offered by proponents of the position that Paul taught that the Church permanently replaced the Jerusalem Temple as the true cultic institution on earth. Another argument in favor of this view is Galatians 4:25-26, a text beset with interpretive difficulties,\(^{163}\) in which it is contended Paul equates the heavenly Jerusalem with the Church and declares that it has eclipsed the old earthly Jerusalem. Paul does here accept the concept of an eschatological Jerusalem, hence an eschatological Temple, however, an examination of the text will reveal that his concern in Galatians is not with the eschatological age, but with an apologetic concern facing the Galatian church. Paul, as we will see, keeps separate his two images of the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem, and does not confuse or equate the heavenly Jerusalem with the Church on earth.

In the Galatian epistle, possibly written prior to the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15), or sometime thereafter,\(^ {164}\) Paul is writing an apologetic defense of his

---


position on Christian liberty (cf. Galatians 2:4; 5:1, 13). A polemical tone is evident in the book, first in answering charges against his apostleship (chapters 1-2), then in arguing this theological position on justification by faith (chapters 3-4), and again in contending against the theological position of his opponents on circumcision (chapter 5:1-12). The most ironic section appears in Galatians 5:13-6:18, following the pattern of Paul’s epistles with concluding practical admonitions. It is within the section arguing Paul’s theological position that to reinforce his case in appeal to Tanach, he adds a midrash on the story of Abraham, which he concludes with what he terms an ἀληθορούμενα (“allegory”).


165 The theological theme of the book is a treatise and defense of the Pauline position on justification by faith, which he illustrates by citations and allusions from Tanach, yet, the practical theme is Paul’s defense of the accusations against his supposed compromising view on the Law, and his alleged liberal position on Christian liberty. He must defend his apostleship in light of these renegade suspicions, and it may be that his presentation of justification by faith serves as the theological ground for his defense of the freedom that results from this act.

166 We should perhaps not understand “allegory” in the classical sense. Although in the first-century the term was acquiring a technical connotation (as in Plutarch and Heracleitus), it may not have had the same meaning that it was later give by the Alexandrian school of exegesis, and in fact, none of the figures are themselves here “allegorized.” His use, then, is a typological, or analogical one, and term itself, a hapax legomena in the New Testament, conveys this thought in the literal translation of the verb ἀληθορέω (ἀλλο + ἀγορέω) “to speak [to] another,” (cf. NIV’s dynamic equivalent: “these things may be taken figuratively”). This may be demonstrated by an analysis of the analogical characteristics of the story, the principal one, which, according to Gale, The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul, pp. 67-68 is fragmentariness. Paul does not proceed from the story itself, showing how the various elements within it correspond to certain facts in the contemporary situation, but moves instead from one idea to another as these arise out of the present situation and applies some correspondence from the story. The absence of systematic development is seen in two ways: (1) in the way in which a single figure in the story is used at one moment to represent one thing or one idea and at the next moment to represent something quite different, (2) in the way in
He introduces the figure of Abraham first in Galatians 3:6 with a citation from Genesis 15:6 concerning the reception of the promise by faith. This will form the theological foundation of his discussion of the nature of the relationship between promise (the Abrahamic Covenant) and Law (the Mosaic Covenant). Underscoring the conditional nature of the Mosaic Covenant, he cites in Galatians 3:10 from Deuteronomy 27:26 as evidence that legal obligation results in a curse upon all who violate its commandments, thus removing themselves from the sphere of promise (verse 14; cf. 5:4).

With verse 16 he returns to his context in Genesis 15 with an allusion to Genesis 15:5, using its singular reference (over against a collective interpretation) to "seed" (σπέρματα = "ח調查") as defining the spiritual limitations of the inheritors of the promises to Abraham. The argument is that relationship to God, rather than physical descent determined the individual inheritance of the promises. This relationship was established by faith in Jesus, who as Messiah was intended as the sole "seed" of Abraham. While Jesus’ followers share in his inheritance, he is depicted as the only Israelite capable of fulfilling the Abrahamic Covenant for the Nation. However, the point here is that the inheritance was originally granted freely through faith, not on the basis of legal obligation, so Paul returns to answer the question of the relationship between promise and the Law in verse 17.

Although historically Law followed promise, yet. Paul maintains, that the conditions of the Mosaic Covenant did not vitiate the unconditional promise of the Abrahamic. Rather, the Law was a necessary, though temporary, custodian of the promises until the Messiah should be born (Galatians 3:19-23; 4:4). The Messiah, then, took upon himself the curse of the Law, thereby freeing men to receive the promise by faith (Galatians 3:13, 26). With this Pauline midrash as

which even single points of correspondence are not developed or carried through to their full conclusions. While this usage is unique to the Pauline corpus, it was a common exegetical device in the first-century, cf. A. T. Linclon, Paradise Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul’s Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology. SNTSMS 43 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1981), pp. 12-15, and J. Bonisirven, Exégèse Rabbínique et Exégèse Paulinienne. Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique (Paris: Beauchesne, 1939), pp. 210-212, 309-311.
background, we are prepared for Paul’s analogical use of the figures of Abraham’s wives Hagar and Sarah from Genesis 16 and 21 in the section of Galatians 4:21-31.\textsuperscript{167}

Paul’s introduction of the Abraham midrash was in view of the polemical nature of his defense. This continues to be the explanation for his typological/analogue use of the Hagar-Sarah stories, and especially the unique clash between type and antitype here, since, as Barrett has pointed out, his exegetical method here was determined not by his own choice, but by his opponents use of the Pentateuchal traditions.\textsuperscript{168} Apparently, Paul’s opponents derived their theological position of spiritual inheritance by physical descent from these same accounts in Genesis,\textsuperscript{169} and while the literal interpretation of the text conveys this thought, Paul surfaces the greater spiritual intentions of the texts, based on the Abrahamic-faith paradigm which includes these wives, to establish his refutation.\textsuperscript{170} His

\\textsuperscript{167}In this section follows standard midrashic exegetical methodology, beginning with a citation from Tanach (verses 21-22), then developing his exposition around principal themes from the texts (verses 23-29), and then concluding with a final citation and application (verses 30-31), cf. D. Patte, \textit{Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine}. \textit{SBLDS} 22 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 117-127.


\textsuperscript{169}That Paul is employing his opponent’s own proof texts against them is evident from his introduction to this section with an ironic appeal: \textit{Δειγμάτω Μοί, οί υπὸ νόμον θελούτες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;} (“Tell me, you who desire to be under the Law, do you not hear the Law?”). This also accords well with Hellenistic diatribe literature, in which the use of an opening interrogation is a traditional device, and Pauline debate style in which invokes his opponent’s argumentation against them with an initial question (cf. Romans 2:17-4:25; 6:1-7:25; 8:31-39; 9:1-11:36). Paul’s method here is not to cite specific texts, though he does employ the normal citation formula (\textit{γεραπται γάρ ὅτι}), but summarizes select material from various chapters. His use of the citation formula also calls attention to the biblical basis for his opponent’s arguments, with which he differs on the basis of the theological interpretation of the entire tradition.

\textsuperscript{170}Typology presupposes that \textit{Heilsgeschichte} displays a recurring pattern of divine action. F. F. Bruce, \textit{Commentary on Galatians}, p. 217 notes that just such
selection of only two of Abraham’s wives with only their children (verses 22-23), followed the contrast introduced by his opponent’s to defend their child of flesh = child of promise thesis. However, Paul forcibly injures his opponent’s exegesis by use of his typological/analogical method in verses 24-26:

ἀτινὰ ἐστὶν ἀληθεορόμενα: αὕται γὰρ εἶσιν δύο διαθήκαι, μὲν μὲν ἀπὸ δρος Σινᾶ εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἡτὶς ἐστὶν Ἑγά. τὸ δὲ Ἑγάρ Σινᾶ δρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ᾿Αραβίᾳ· συντοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. ἢ δὲ ἀνω ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡτὶς ἐστὶν μητὴρ ἡμῶν.

(“Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery; she is Hagar. Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia corresponding to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But, the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother.”).

In Paul’s contrast here, the focus is on the mother’s rather than the children.171 This change in focus is due to his new direction of argumentation, using the two women to typify the Abrahamic and Sinaiic covenants, a focus which nevertheless is consistent in the context, since it is continued by extension from the Abrahamic promise/Mosaic law contrast of the previous Abraham Midrash.172 While it is difficult to understand the textual basis of Paul’s equation of Hagar with Mount Sinai and the Law,173 the slavery motif provides the literary

---

171 For this reason Paul shifts from the use of the more specific term ὀλοὺς (“sons”) to more general term τέκνων (“children”).

172 To do otherwise, such as importing the idea that Sarah is the New Covenant, does violence to the literary Sitz im Leben of the allegory.

173 The phrase τὸ δὲ Ἑγάρ Σινᾶ δρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ᾿Αραβίᾳ in verse 25a is disputed. The problem arises textually because of manuscript variants: A,B,D, κ.τ.λ. read: τὸ δὲ Ἑγάρ Σινᾶ δρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ᾿Αραβίᾳ (“Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia”), but Β, C, G, κ.τ.λ. read: τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ δρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ᾿Αραβίᾳ (“For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia”). Other slightly different variants also exist. In favor of the first variant, the use of the neuter article τὸ with
justification for the analogy, since the Jews, and not only them, but their cultic center - Jerusalem - are in a state of bondage to the Mosaic Law, just as Hagar and her children were in bondage.

The other side of the contrast is unexpected, for Paul does not set in antithesis the equations Sarah/free woman = Abrahamic Covenant = New Jerusalem as anticipated. Instead, he relegates the first two elements of the equation to an ellipsis, making explicit only the last element (verse 26a) which he describes as the ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ (“Jerusalem above”) and as ἐλευθέρα (“free”). Thus, in contrasting τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ of the Hagar equation with ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ in the antithetical equation, Paul juxtaposes temporal and spatial categories, which although unusual, has a precedent, as we have seen in chapter 2, in the biblical theology of the מָיֵי הָאָדָם or the cosmic/earthly schema.¹⁷⁴

Hagar, rather than the feminine ἡ, indicates that the reference is to the name of Hagar rather than to the woman herself. This does not mean that one has to accept that some peak on Mount Sinai may have been so designated, or that Hebrew רָעָם, Aramaic רָעָם, or Arabic hadjar (“crag,” “cliff”) is being used as a paranomasia based on the similar sounds, cf. G. I. Davies, “Hagar, El-Hegra and the Location of Mount Sinai,” VT 22 (1972), pp. 152-163, but that the copula ἐστὶν means “signifies,” or “represents,” in harmony with the correspondence conveyed by συντομικά, cf. II Corinthians 3:17; and especially I Corinthians 10:4 (typologically): ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἡν ὁ Χριστός (“and the rock was, [i.e., “signified”] Christ”). In addition, in the second variant, καὶ following, an insertion that would have been not have been necessary had Hagar not been the original reading. Thus, even καὶ could be added in support of the first variant. Since so many variants exist in an attempt to clarify the text, the lectio difficilior should be preferred, even though it is the longer, and especially on the intrinsic grounds mentioned above, for how would a mere geographical statement (as in the second variant) contribute to the analogy? The more difficult problem is how this identification supports the analogical argument, though it is not crucial to its equation.

¹⁷⁴While the antithesis between Sinai and Zion developed in a number of directions from this early concept, and is contrasted in Hebrews 12:18-24 and in the later pseudo-Cyprianic anti-Jewish treatise De montibus Sina et Sion (Oxyrhynchus Papyri IV, 991-1000), it is deliberately avoided here so that the focus may be entirely on Jerusalem and the contrasts derived from its condition. Paul from his lack of description, appears to assume that his audience is familiar with this concept of τῇ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ.
Paul now adds to his parallelism between the two women and the two cities, the qualifier ἡ τις ἡ ἔστιν μητήρ ἡμῶν, which bases the contrast upon a Zion as the mother of the faithful motif.175 His use of this motif is again apparently conditioned by his opponent’s assumption that τῇ νῖν Ἰερουσαλήμ served as the mother city and therefore as the center of faith for both Judaism and the Church, which existed only as a Jewish sect or in proselyte status to it.176 Paul’s argument by this inclusion is that, while he acknowledges that Jerusalem is the cultic center, it is not now, nor has it ever been, the true mother. Since, as Paul argued, faith, not Law, is what establishes the true relationship with God, then the Jerusalem above, which was not part of the legal system, is the true center for believers, whether Jew or Gentile.177

However, we should not see here a rejection or replacement by Paul of the Jerusalem Temple by ἡ δήν Ἰερουσαλήμ,178 but, like Jesus’ “cleansing” of the Temple, an attack on contemporary Judaism which threatened the freedom of

---

175This is a motif that has a history in biblical and extra-biblical Jewish tradition (cf. Isaiah 49:20f.; 50:1; 54:1-13; Jeremiah 50:2; Hosea 4:5; 2 Barach 3:1-5; 2 Esdras 10:7, 17. Nevertheless, Paul does not employ it as an original theological argument, but only as an apologetic response to his opponent’s presuppositions based on it.

176This seems to have been the position of Paul’s opponent’s from his charges in Galatians 1-2. If they were insisting that Jerusalem, because of its unique sanctity, be the controlling factor for the Gentile-Christians, then the distinction removed by the ground of common access to God through faith (cf. Acts 15:11; Ephesians 2:11-22, Paul’s other Temple-analogy) was obliterated.

177Indeed, in Paul’s thinking, the inviolability of Jerusalem was only rightly conceived in terms of the eschatological Jerusalem, which “not made with hands,” could not be desecrated by men. It was because such a true cultic center existed, that hope could continue for a restored Temple and a resumed cultus, when the earthly house was desolated or destroyed. However, here, Paul does not talk about a future descent of the heavenly Jerusalem, so we should not assume that his analogy is necessarily operating on the traditional apocalyptic model.

178One must resist the temptation to define Paul’s use of on the familiar grounds of Jewish apocalypticism and rabbinic notions of the heavenly Jerusalem, since here his analogical method is being determined by his polemical argument, and therefore has redefined these elements of the text.
faith. From Paul’s perspective, the Mosaic system (embodied in the Temple) as interpreted by the Judaizers was not compatible with the independent nature of ἡ ἁγία Ιερουσαλήμ. 179

The literary context does not imply that the earthly Jerusalem would be destroyed and replaced by ἡ ἁγία Ιερουσαλήμ, but only sets up a positive correspondence in its position as the mother to the Christian faith. Where the Judaizers would put Christianity within the sphere of Judaism, Paul argues that two separate realms exist, both properly subsumed within the true mother, but put in antithesis by the Judaizers. One cannot have a “citizenship” in both cities as here contrasted - one must be either in born bondage to the Law in the “present Jerusalem,” or born to freedom as a child of faith in the “Jerusalem above.” If that is the case, then no regulatory authority can be exercised by the former upon the latter. This is dramatically stated in verse 27 (citing Isaiah 54:1):

γεγραπται γάρ, Εὐφράσθητι στείρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, βῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ ὡδίνουσα· ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμων μᾶλλον ἡ τῆς ἑχούσης τοῦ ἄνδρα.

(“For it is written, ‘Rejoice barren woman who does not bear; break forth and shout, you who are not in labor; for more are the children of the desolate than of the one who has a husband’”). 180

179 The idea of ἁγία (“above”) does not mean “future,” as though the Jerusalem depicted were coming in the eschaton. Rather, with its antithesis to νῦν (“present”) it has the idea of “eternal,” having both a pre-existence and a future durative existence.

180 Isaiah 54:1 is here cited not only because it is a locus classicus for this theme, and a part of Isaiah 40–66 which served as a source for testimonia for the New Testament and the early Church, but because the mother here congratulated is Jerusalem. The use of Isaiah in this fashion was preceded by the Qumran texts, where the authority for their wilderness retreat was adduced from Isaiah 40:3 (cf. 1QS 8.13; 4Q Is). Qumran also used parts of Isaiah 54 (e.g. verse 11) to refer to the elect community forming the nucleus of the restored Israel of the future. Paul apparently understood the Jerusalem above to be the community of the elect, but not necessarily with an eschatological restoration to Israel in view, even though Isaiah 54:1 was used this way in rabbinic literature. With Paul, the cities, not the women, are being again contrasted, so that the Jerusalem before the exile and the Jerusalem after the exile, but destined to be restored, are in view, and the two cities are distinct entities.
In Isaiah 54:1 the barren woman is used as a restoration motif for Jerusalem after the exile, however, here Paul applies it to Sarah, who as the matriarch of faith was given the promise of the inheritance.\textsuperscript{181} Paul's deliberate use of irony here shifted the promise from the historical Jerusalem, the city of the Law, to the city of faith, the Jerusalem above, again showing that the promise given unconditionally was prescriptive of the freedom of faith, not the bondage of the Law.\textsuperscript{182}

Paul then returns to the Pentateuch to conclude his argument from his original context. In verse 28 in typological fashion, he links Isaac with Christians (Jew or Gentile), as children of the promise, and then in verse 29 to forge the link between the present situation and the Pentateuchal tradition with the Isaac-Ishmael struggle.\textsuperscript{183} This persecution (ἐξίστασις) alluded to might be that preserved in later rabbinic tradition, which was based on Ishmael's alleged idolatry,\textsuperscript{184} or better, a challenge for inheritance based on submission to voluntary circumcision.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{181}Elizabeth Gaines, op. cit., p. 292, n. 20, maintains that this link was not original with Paul, but suggests antecedents in rabbinic literature, which probably preserved traditions of the first-century (cf. Pesiquim Rabbi 32:2; Haftorah to Bereshit 6:9-11:32). The originality in Paul's exegesis was not in his application of Isaiah 54:1 to Sarah, but in identifying Sarah with Gentile believers.

\textsuperscript{182}This does not require that Paul saw the Church as fulfilling the Abrahamic promise, but that believing Jews and Gentiles had equal rights of inheritance in the spiritual promise - of being Abraham's seed spiritually - through Christ. In harmony with Paul's statements in Romans 3: 25-29, I believe directed to only ethnic Jews (physical inheritance versus spiritual relationship) in view of countering the same theological assumption as at Galatia, it is best to not posit that Paul did not also include a hope for the fulfillment of the Abrahamic Covenant by a restored Israel (cf. Romans 11:25-27).

\textsuperscript{183} It is also an interesting suggestion that this persecution might be considered as a result of the Genesis 3:15 antagonism, since it was within the proto-Temple desecration context, and carried messianic overtones. Of course, no such linkage is implied in the text.

\textsuperscript{184}Haggadic literature frequently elaborated on this tradition. Genesis Rabbah 53:11 (on Genesis 21:9), based its conclusions that the struggle was over
Whether or not Paul had such an extra-biblical tradition in mind, he used the connection to facilitate a last ironic thrust for his argument from Genesis 21:10, for with this text Paul calls for the expulsion of the Judaizers on the basis of the very law they claimed for their support.

**Summary of the Temple in Galatians 4**

We have seen that in this context Paul does in fact distinguish between an earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, but it is this very distinction which argues against any idea of replacement. The Temple symbolized the legal system of Judaism, which in Paul’s view, was now being used to discredit the faith of Gentiles who had not undergone ritualistic proselytism (i.e., circumcision). This system was seen as subordinate to the greater promise made to Abraham, which was apart from and prior to the Mosaic Covenant. Since Christ is the ultimate seed of Abraham, fulfilling the spiritual aspects of the promise for those who believe, religious apostasy based on the more sinister connotations claimed for פָרֶשָׁה (“sexual sporting”, or “violent action”). R. Ishmael charged that Ishmael was an idolater based on the use of the term in Exodus 32:6 in connection with the worship of the golden calf. In a similar manner, Targum Neofiti I on the same text says that Sarah saw Ishmael “doing unseemly things,” which an added gloss explains as actions pertaining to a foreign cult. R. Akiba likewise saw Ishmael’s conduct as immorality on the basis of Genesis 39:17 where Potifer’s wife claimed that Joseph came לא יֵלֶךְ עָלָיו (“to lie with me”), but literally to בְּפָרֶשָׁה (“to play with me”). R. Azariah in the name of R. Levi, expounding on II Samuel 2:14, where פָרֶשָׁה is used of the sport of shooting arrows, said that Ishmael used to shoot arrows in the direction of Isaac, while pretending to be playing. Cf. further, J. Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (Cambridge: University Press, 1969), pp. 204-206.

185Rabbinic tradition makes mention of the rivalry between Ishmael and Isaac over the matter of inheritance based on circumcision, which is the context here. According to Genesis Rabbah 55:4 (on Genesis 22:1), Ishmael was claimed the inheritance because he had accepted circumcision voluntarily at the age of thirteen (Genesis 17:25), whereas Isaac had received it involuntarily when he was but eight days old. If this were in the background, it would help make the connection with Paul’s typology clearer.
then the earthly Temple was at present in bondage to this system. However, an
eternal Jerusalem (with an eternal Temple) existed to fulfill the status for these.

Paul does not deal eschatologically with the Temple in this analogy, and
does not equate the mother Jerusalem in heaven with the Church on earth. While
Paul may still hold that the heavenly Jerusalem was the counterpart of the earthly
Jerusalem, he polemically presents them as separate realms in his analogy. Yet,
nothing in this text cancels respect for the present Temple, nor mitigates against
an ultimate fulfillment for the Temple in terms of desecration (II Thessalonians

The Desecration/Restoration Motif in the Pauline Epistles

The conventional construct known as apocalyptic eschatology, enables the
isolation of eschatological motifs in genre other than apocalyptic, as we have
already seen from our consideration in the Gospels, and particularly in the
"Cleansing" of the Temple incident. Here we want to consider the use of the
desecration/restoration motif in the Pauline epistles. Our presentation here will be
limited to two examples, each employing the desecration motif: I Corinthians

The Use of the Motif in I Corinthians 3:16-17 and 6:18-20

We have already commented on I Corinthians 3:16-17 and 6:18-20 with
respect to Paul's use of the Temple as a metaphor for the Church and the
Christian's physical body. We now want to demonstrate how each of these
passages incorporates our motif of desecration/restoration. In I Corinthians 3:16-
17, the presence of the indwelling Spirit in the Church, corresponds to the
Shekinah within the Temple, establishing the sanctity of that in which it resides.
As the desecration of the Temple would result in the destruction of the Temple, so
the attempted desecration/destruction of the Church will result in the destruction
of the individual perpetrator.

The focus of the offense is the behavioral sphere which results in ritual
contamination. The problem in the context (3:1-15) is one of cliquishness that
threatens to destroy the Church by splintering it into rival factions, something that in Paul’s day was also observable within the political sphere of the Temple. Just as these Jewish sectarian rivalries eventually were, in part, responsible for the destruction of the Second Temple, so might a similar “party spirit” affect the analogous “holy place,” the Church (which is indivisible as the “Body of Christ,” cf. I Corinthians 1:13). The consequences would bring the wrath of God, as would any desecration of the Temple. The language here possesses, as Käsemann and Fee have pointed out, all the earmarks of a sentence of holy law, in which the lex talionis and chiasm (φθείρεταιφθείρεται: “If anyone the temple of God destroys, destroy this person will God”)186 Here the desecration motif presents a double entendre the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple and the Church as Christ’s own spiritual temple, which it combines to express the fearful judgment of God on the Last Day.187

The judgment Paul announces is also patterned after the expected judicial consequences of Temple desecration and defilement, since it appears in the formal character of casuistic law.188 In Exodus 28:43 and Leviticus 16:2 the penalty for such is capital punishment. While men who seek to destroy the Church may escape judicial review on earth, Paul assures such ones that the heavenly tribunal will execute swift justice in accord with the severity of this crime against holiness. In this announcement of the divine execution of “temple desacrators” we see the eschatological nature of the desecration motif, as present desecration invites future retributive response. There may also be in the background of this individual eschatological warning the universal eschatological warning, always latent in


Paul, of the coming Temple desecrator, the Antichrist, who will likewise meet with eternal doom as a result of his ultimate sacrilege.

In I Corinthians 6:18-20 the desecration motif appears in the imperative: τῆν πορνείαν (“Flee fornication!”). The reason for this urgent warning is because of the analogous relationship between the body and the Temple. As the Temple belongs to God by virtue of His dwelling within it, i.e. possessing it - it is His house - so the body of the believer, which has the Spirit of God indwelling it, belongs to God as His possession. Note that the term Paul uses here for the bodily “temple” is ναός, which was the technical expression of the inner sanctum, especially the Sanctum Sanctoris, the “Holy of Holies.”

In the Temple cult, to allow foreign objects, not legitimately part of the sancta, into the “Holy Place” constituted a desecration of the highest magnitude, since it was tantamount to an invasion of idolatry. That this is Paul’s meaning here may be seen by the exact same parallel construction in I Corinthians 10:14 where there the injunction is against idolatry. Therefore, Paul is saying that because the body is possessed by God as His own “temple,” the outside invasion of foreign bodies, i.e. in fornication, disrupts the essential unity, and constitutes an idolatrous affront to ownership. The purpose of the Temple was to “glorify” God through the performance of the cultus which forged the relationship between “My people” and “My God” in practical terms. In like manner, the purpose for the bodily “temple” is to “glorify” God by living a sanctified life, which precludes the commission of defiling acts, i.e. πορνεία.

The Use of the Motif in II Corinthians 6:14-7:1

This passage is especially significant to our study of the Pauline use of the desecration motif, since it contains the only occurrence in the New Testament of the term: Βελιάρ (“Belial” [or “Beliar”]) which we have encountered in the apocalyptic literature and at Qumran (cf. Hymns Scroll and unpublished halakhic letter 4QMMT), although the accompanying language Paul uses is more
exclusive to Qumran. As with I Corinthians 3 and 6, the problem again is an idolatrous union formed by the holy and the profane. The Pauline imperative bears this out with the words: Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπάτησα καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαὸς (“I will dwell in them and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people”). The first part of the clause Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς (“I will dwell in them”) could very well be a paraphrase of Ezekiel 37:27 (LXX) which speaks of a dwelling place, literally “taking up lodging” (κατασκήνωσις). This word, ἔνοικεῖν, according to Martin, is a stronger term for habitation than the term σκηνῶ (“tabernacle”) = יַבֵּן. Of greater importance to our study, however is Paul’s antithesis section, verses 14b-16a which is predicated on verse 16b and the assertion that believers are ναὸς θεοῦ ζωντος (“a temple of the living God”). Before considering the antithesis section, let us notice the terminology Paul uses to establish his premise that as a “temple of God,” believers are not to allow any union which would defile God’s Presence. His analogous relationships to justify his argument are drawn from the legal literature and the prophets. First, citing Exodus 29:45 and Leviticus 26:12, Paul borrows the covenantal language of YHWH’s suzerain-vassal relationship to convey the unbreakable bond between the believer and His God: Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπάτησα καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαὸς (“I will dwell in them and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people”). The first part of the clause Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς (“I will dwell in them”) could very well be a paraphrase of Ezekiel 37:27 (LXX) which speaks of a dwelling place, literally “taking up lodging” (κατασκήνωσις). This word, ἔνοικεῖν, according to Martin, is a stronger term for habitation than the term σκηνῶ (“tabernacle”) = יַבֵּן. Of greater importance to our study, however is Paul’s antithesis section, verses 14b-16a which is predicated on verse 16b and the assertion that believers are ναὸς θεοῦ ζωντος (“a temple of the living God”). Before considering the antithesis section, let us notice the terminology Paul uses to establish his premise that as a “temple of God,” believers are not to allow any union which would defile God’s Presence. His analogous relationships to justify his argument are drawn from the legal literature and the prophets. First, citing Exodus 29:45 and Leviticus 26:12, Paul borrows the covenantal language of YHWH’s suzerain-vassal relationship to convey the unbreakable bond between the believer and His God: Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπάτησα καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαὸς (“I will dwell in them and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people”). The first part of the clause Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς (“I will dwell in them”) could very well be a paraphrase of Ezekiel 37:27 (LXX) which speaks of a dwelling place, literally “taking up lodging” (κατασκήνωσις). This word, ἔνοικεῖν, according to Martin, is a stronger term for habitation than the term σκηνῶ (“tabernacle”) = יַבֵּן.

The imagery, then, is of the Shekinah within the Holy of Holies, the most exclusive, private, and non-invasive place on earth. The second part of the clause takes us back to the Garden of Eden and the Edenic Sanctuary motif with the

---


words ἐμπεριστῆσαι ("I will walk among them ... "). Here is a reproduction of the cultic expression, ἡ λατρεία used in Genesis 3:8 of God’s approach in Eden and of the activity of a priestly performance in Leviticus. This language, connecting the Pentateuch with the Prophets in a continuity of thought, portrays the divine ideal for the Christian community that was formerly restricted to the Temple and its cult. Davies finds in the use of this cultic imagery justification to conclude:

The Church is for Paul the fulfillment of the hopes of Judaism for the Temple: the presence of the Lord has moved from the Temple to the Church ... and the life of the Church replaces the temple cult through its own spiritual sacrifices (Rom. 12:1ff.) and the foundation of a new temple (Eph. 2:20). It is easy to conclude that there was a deliberate rejection by Paul of the Holy Space in favor of the Holy People - the Church.191

However, the idea is not one of replacement, but of correspondence, adopting the cultic motifs, which are pregnant with theological and eschatological meaning, in order to reinforce the concept of spiritual separation from a spatial separation model. In other words, the Christian community, the Church, is like the ideal eschatological Temple in that it is a "temple" in which God reveals Himself, covenants with His people, promises His abiding Presence, and relates to them as priests involved in sacred service. This, then, allows for the Church to be a temple - and in the Pauline understanding of the Church as the repository of the Divine Spirit in this age - the [spiritual] Temple, while not displacing the prophetic role of the Jerusalem Temple in the age to come. Davies also acknowledges this, stating that he sees no explicit rejection of the Jerusalem Temple by Paul, and supporting his affirmation by reference to II Thessalonians 2:3-4, where he observes the Temple remains "for Paul a centre of eschatological significance."192


192Davies, op. cit., pp. 193-104.
With Paul’s concept of the Church in mind, we may return to the antithesis section to consider the significant contrast between Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ (“Christ and Beliar”) in verse 15. The antithesis section of verses 14b-16a reads:

\[ \text{τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἁμοιά ἡ τίς κοινωνία φωτὸς πρὸς σκότος; τίς δὲ συμφωνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ, ἡ τίς μερὶς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου; τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῦ ὥς ἄνθος μετὰ εἴδωλων; } \]

(“...for what partnership have righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship has light with darkness? Or what harmony has Christ with Beliar, or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever? Or what agreement has the Temple of God with idols?”).

These five rhetorical questions, each commencing with the interrogative pronoun τίς, are set off in a logical progression to substantiate the conclusion already drawn in the imperatival clause which precedes, i.e. Μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτερογαγοῦντες ἀπίστους.

Since Paul is addressing a Jewish-Christian and Gentile mixed congregation within one of Asia Minor’s most notorious pagan cities, Corinth, his contrasts are not abstractions, but relate to various concerns for purification in the midst of defilement. It is in this context that we can understand his exception reference to “Belial” (or as here, “Beliar”). With the introduction of the clause τίς δὲ συμφωνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ (“What harmony has Christ with Beliar”) we have two hapax legomena with συμφωνησις and Βελιάρ. The word is a technical expression for “syncretism,” and has in view the coalescing of a true faith, represented in this case by “Messiah/Christ” with a pagan cult, represented by “Belial.” There have been numerous suggestions offered to explain Paul’s use of Βελιάρ instead of the more common (and expected) Σατανᾶς.193

I am of the opinion, based on the comparative use of the term in the non-canonical writings, that Paul envisioned an eschatological antithesis between

193Some suggest that Paul’s choice of the term was influenced by his rabbinic training since in Sifre Deuteronomy 117 (on Deuteronomy 15:7-9) and Sanhedrin 111b the expression is explained as a pun: בלי עול (“having no yoke”), i.e. “having thrown off the yoke of God.”
Χριστός, the human-divine deliverer of Israel and Restorer of the Temple, and 
Βελιδρος, the quasi-human Antichrist figure who is the oppressor of Israel and the 
Desecrator of the Temple.194 This explanation accords well with the original 
usage of the term, the pattern of Paul’s teaching concerning Antichrist in Gentile 
cities,195 and the eschatological tone that accompanies Temple metaphors in the 
desecration motif. It may be that Paul’s concept of the Antichrist in the Temple (II 
Thessalonians 2:4) is in the background of his antithesis in verse 16a: τίς ἀθὲ 
συγκατάθεας ναῶθεν θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων (“What agreement has the Temple of 
God with idols?”).196 While this could be a general reference against defiling the 
holy place, the preceeding contrast between “Messiah” (Christ) and “Belial” 
(Antichrist) may intend an allusion to this ultimate, and in Paul’s thinking, 
imminent, desecration. While the expression ναῶθεν θεοῦ (“Temple of God”) is a 
familiar one with Paul, it is noteworthy that it is exactly this phrase that is used in 
II Thessalonians 2:4, to describe the entrance of the Antichrist into the Sanctuary. 
Also, the use of the hapax συγκατάθεας in I Corinthians 4:16a may lend to this 
interpretation, for it goes beyond the idea of mere “syncretism” to that of “union, 
agreement,” the very kind of blasphemous identification that the Antichrist claims 
with God by his action of positioning himself in the Temple.

194“Belial” in the apocalyptic literature was represented as a personalized (supra-
human) force in opposition to YHWH and His People, especially in the final 
battle of the Last Day (cf. Jubilees 1:20; T. Reuben 4:11; T. Simeon 5:3; T. Levi 
19:1; T. Daniel 4:7; 5:1; T. Naftali 2:6; 3:1’ Ascension of Isaiah 3:11), and 
especially at Qumran, where we saw him as an immoral force inspiring the 
“Wicked Priest” and causing the defilement in the Jerusalem Sanctuary (cf. IQM 
13:1-4; IQS 1:18, 24; 2:19; IQM 1:1, 5, 13; 4:2; 11:8; 13:4, 11; 14:9; 15:3; 18:1, 
3; 1QH 6:21; 4QFlor 1:8, 9; 2:2). Cf. further, H. W. Huppenbauer, “Belial in den 

195Cf. II Thessalonians 2:5: “Remember that I was telling you these things when I 
was with you,” a reference to his frequent teaching on this subject.

196If the provenance of II Thessalonians is Corinth, as many conservative scholars 
affirm, then added weight is given to this argument since Paul may well have been 
communicating the same message under different metaphors to these respective 
congregations.
We return to the use of the desecration motif in the appeal to "separation" in II Corinthians 6:17; 7:1. The imperatival phrase: ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ("go out of their midst") has an almost escapist tone with the use of ἐξελῆθω ("to go out, escape," cf. I John 10:39). If the Antichrist teaching were in the background, then such tone would be an appropriate allusion to the Olivet injunction to "flee" when those in Jerusalem see the "Abomination of Desolation" in the Temple (Matthew 24:15-16; Mark 13:14). The idea of cultic or ritual-purification in this call to "separation" (ἀφορίσθητε) is made by a citation from Isaiah 52:11, which is a command to priests who are transporting the sancta back to Jerusalem from the exile in Babylon in the day of restoration. Isaiah is directing those, when that eschatological event occurs, to not defile the Temple vessels by making contact with foreign objects. This is an apt analogy for Paul, since as a "temple of God" the Church is not to permit "foreign" things (i.e. "lawlessness", "darkness", "unbelievers", "idols", etc.) into their holy relationship with God, which would render them defiled, and hence, disqualify them from His service.

This liturgical metaphor is reinforced in 7:1 with the words:

... καθαρίσωμεν (α ἡτατορφι συνανκτέ) ἐαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωτην ἐν φόβῳ θεο

("... let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God").

In the purification process here described, Paul’s joining of the "indicative" and the "imperative" is to call for a demonstration of the holiness that is already present in the constitution of the Church as a "temple of God." The ἡρατα μολυσμός ("defilement") connects the thought once again with idolatry (Jeremiah 23:15 LXX; cf. 1 Esdras 8:80; II Maccabees 5:27), and the dual expression σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ("flesh and spirit") may connect with

---

197Cf. further, Theophilus Mills Taylor, "Uncleanness and Purification in Paul" (Ph.D. dissertation: Yale University, 1956).
apocalyptic terminology and hint at the future fulfillment for the Church in terms of the restoration motif.  

**The Desecration Motif in II Thessalonians 2:4-5**

The Second Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians has been called "the tale of the two parousias," because in it is contained the "appearance" (παρουσία) of Christ and of the Antichrist. Our purpose here is to examine the use of the desecration motif as it comes through the figure of an eschatological desecrator/desolator, i.e. the "Abomination of Desolation." The occasion for the writing of II Thessalonians is most likely in response to a report received by Paul as a result of his first Thessalonian correspondence. In particular, word came of a group of διακριτοὶ ("[Christian] neglegents," cf. II Thessalonians 2:6-15) who had abandoned the normal affairs of life in view of the imminency doctrine that Paul had espoused. This was an erroneous application and a misunderstanding of the appeal to be prepared for the events of the Last Days (cf. I Thessalonians 5:1-11).

Further, Paul learned that there was confusion (Paul calls it ἐξαπάτησης, "deception," verse 3a) concerning his eschatological scheme, and that some were erroneously teaching that the apocalyptic "Day of the Lord" had already begun (II Thessalonians 2:2), hence, the alleged justification for Christian negligence. II

---

198Cf. R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (1971), who insists that I Corinthians 7:1 stands in the Jewish apocalyptic tradition, so that πνεῦμα is God's πνεῦμα ("spirit") given to man (cf. T. Naphtali 10:9: "Blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God which has been placed and breathed into him"). Such a usage would be similar to our previously studied context of I Corinthians 6:17-19.


200While authorship is not necessarily a crucial factor in the tracing of our motif, I am assuming both of the Thessalonian epistles to be genuinely Pauline. The Corinthian correspondence appears to bear some significant theological parallels with II Thessalonians 2, which in my opinion, argue for common authorship.
Thessalonians 2 offers a correction (ἀπερίδος, cf. 5:2) to this view, explaining that before the "appearance" of the Messiah, must come the "appearance" of the Antichrist (II Thessalonians 2:3-9).

Robert Jewett, arguing from a rhetorical-critical perspective, has suggested that the background for the Thessalonian's eschatological confusion may have resulted from the influence of a Cabiric cult.\textsuperscript{201} He hypothesized that this cult, whose promise of a return to a utopian golden age had not materialized, had caused radical millenarians, the δακτυλοι, to understand Christianity as a replacement for the Cabiric religion and Paul as theologically consonant with the priests of Cabirus, whose behavior had resisted the usual structures of work, sexual ethics, and congregational authority, and refused to prepare for the Parousia because they were already experiencing it in their ecstatic activities.\textsuperscript{202} When Paul failed to conform to this expected behavior, the δακτυλοι began to suspect the validity of his gospel and to publicly deride him in the Thessalonian assembly. Thus, for Jewett, the reason Paul wrote both the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians was to defend his apostleship, and to establish a proper millenarian mode of conduct consistent with Christian apocalyptic expectation.\textsuperscript{203} While accepting Jewett's conclusion, we find his hypothesis of the syncretization of a Cabiric cult by Christians suffers for want of historical documentation, and he offers only suggestive parallels which might as easily be explained by a misinterpretation by over-zealous Christians of Paul's eschatological doctrine in light of present persecution. We also agree with Jewett's millenarian model, but we disagree with using rhetoric and sociology as determinitives in critical analysis, and would agree with Stephen Krafchick's criticism\textsuperscript{204} that his use of possible scenarios to interpret the epistle, rather than an


\textsuperscript{202}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 127, 176, 191-192.

\textsuperscript{203}\textit{Ibid.} pp. 170-171.
analysis of the text to support the scenarios, throws suspicion on his claim that no audience hypothesis would skew the evidence.

The Eschatological Desecrator in II Thessalonians 2

The setting for the discussion of the figure termed variously in this text: ἡ ἀποστασία ("the apostasy"), verse 3a, ὁ διώκων τῆς ἀνομίας ("the man of lawlessness") and ὁ νικῶν τῆς ἀνομίας ("the son of destruction"), verse 3b, and ὁ ἄνωμος ("that lawless one"), verse 8, is unquestionably eschatological, as the reference to verse 1 (cf. verse 8) is the ἀποκάλυψις/παρουσία, and verse 2 ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ("the Day of the Lord").205 The events Paul describes here as preceding the "Day of the Lord" is generally described as ἡ ἀποστασία ("the apostasy").

In the Jewish apocalyptic literature we have seen the forecast of a final rebellion by "the wicked" in Israel against "the righteous" in Israel, who represent YHWH and Torah sanctity, at the Last Day (cf. e.g. Jubilees 23:14-23; IV Ezra 4:26-42; 6:18-28).206 A close parallel to our context is that in the Psalms of Solomon 17:13, 23-27, which describes "the son of David" delivering Israel by destroying "the lawless one" (cf. II Thessalonians 2:8a), by "the word of his mouth" (cf. II Thessalonians 2:8b), the purging Jerusalem and restoring the Promised Land to the Jews. Based on these parallels, Buchanan concluded that the


205Cf. B. B. Warfield, Biblical and Theological Studies (New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 472-473, who insisted that this "was fulfilled in the terrible story of the emperors of Rome." However, as with the events of Daniel 9:27, upon which this text is most likely based, no actual historical event(s) can be found to match the literal description.

hopes expressed in II Thessalonians were clearly suanteleological. In a similar fashion, Jesus in the Olivet Discourse had predicted an “apostasy” in which many would defect from the true faith (σκανδαλισθήσονται) and betray one another to deceiving false prophets (Matthew 24:10-11). In these accounts, the forces of the “wicked” are led by “Belial” in an end-time conflict with the forces of “righteousness” led by Messiah. In the Fourth Gospel the ground had been laid for the interpretation of this End-time Desecrator as an individual leader or counterfeit messiah. We read in John 5:43:

ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὑόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετέ με· εἶναι ἄλλος ἐλθεν ἐν τῷ ὑόματι τῷ ἱδώ, ἐκείνων λήμψεθε

---

207 George Wesley Buchanan, “The Eschatological Expectations of the Qumran Community” (Ph.D. dissertation: Drew University, 1959), p. 269. The expression “santeleological” is derived from the Greek term συντέλεια (“completion, close”), which in the NT marks the “end of the [present] age” (συντέλεια [τοῦ] αἰώνος), e.g., Matthew 13:39; 49; 24:3; 28:20, as in apocalyptic literature, e.g., “in the last days of the consummation [of the age]” (ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας [τοῦ] αἰώνος), Similitudes 9, 12. This term is also used of the end time (τῶν καιρῶν) in LXX Daniel 9:27, which qualifies the apocalyptic scope of the Second Thessalonican epistle.


209 Some commentators seek to distance this “apostasy” from its apocalyptic parallels, preferring, as does F. F. Bruce. 1 & 2 Thessalonians. WBC 45 (Waco: Word Books, 1983), p. 167, to see a general civil revolt against public order, which in view of Romans 13:1-2 would constitute a rebellion against “divine authority.” Bruce’s rejection of a Jewish end-time apostasy is colored by the absence of this teaching in Paul elsewhere, especially in Romans 11:25-27, the only Pauline context to deal with eschatological Israel. However, Paul’s purpose in Romans 9-11 has been to present a positive destiny of Israel over against the present failure (and rejection) of the Nation to accept Jesus as Messiah. To expect Paul to introduce such a negative picture of Israel’s destiny (in desecration) at this point (his climax to Israel’s restoration), is contrary to the apostle’s logical structure. Nevertheless, Bruce defends the position that it is the eschatological Antichrist that is portrayed here, cf. “Excursus,” pp. 179-188.
"I have come in my Father's Name, and you do not receive me; if another shall come in his own name, you will receive him"

The conviction that anti-christianism should be perfected through a man of messianic proportions is made by the pronoun διός, which distinguishes "another [of the same kind]." The opposing of εγω ("I") and διός ("another") here clarify the identification that the coming Desecrator will be an individual like Jesus, who apparently makes messianic claims, but different in that he acts autonomously, rather than in relation to God.

The individual nature of this Desecrator is further developed in our text by the two phrases, each containing an adjectival genitive (a Semitic idiom carried over into the Koine of the LXX and New Testament): δυσκολος της διομελης ("the man of lawlessness") and δολος της διπληλειας ("the son of destruction"). The first term (διομελης) apparently describes his nature as characterized by opposition to the divine order, specified in verse 4, while the second term (διπληλειας) refers to his destiny, i.e. destined for "destruction" or "perdition," described in verse 8. It may be significant that in verse 3 states this one is διπολελφθη ("revealed"). The verb by its emphatic position points to this as a signal event, but also indicates the supernatural character of the coming while setting this διπολελφς ("unveiling, revelation") in opposition to that of the Messiah's διπολελφς (called η παρουσία in verse 9), as a counterfeit manifestation. In this way this individual is identified as a rival messiah or Antichrist (the preposition διπάλ now having the double sense of "in place of" and "against"), cf. διπάλχριστος of I John 2:18 ("you have heard that Antichrist is coming"). Frank Hughes says: "Obviously the Man of Lawlessness ... is a quasi-

210 In Greek the concept of "another" is expressed by two related terms: ετερος ("another [of a different kind]") and διος ("another [of the same kind]"), cf.

divine figure, a kind of evil 'divine man', some intermediate figure between God and humanity."\(^\text{212}\)

James argues that \(\odot \, \delta\nu\rho\omega\pi\omicron\sigma\, \tau\acute{\i}\zeta\, \delta\nu\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma\) ("the man of lawlessness") is simply a rendering of \(\text{אַשְׁרָה} \\ בְּלָיָאֵל\) ("man of Belial"), pointing out that in the LXX both \(\delta\nu\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma\) (II Samuel [LXX II Kingdoms] 22:5 = Psalm 18:4 [LXX 17:5]) and \(\delta\pi\omicron\sigma\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\) (I Kings 21:13 [LXX III Kingdoms 20:13a]) appear as renderings of \(בְּלָיָאֵל\).\(^\text{213}\) The nature of \(\odot \, \delta\nu\rho\omega\pi\omicron\sigma\, \tau\acute{\i}\zeta\, \delta\nu\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma\) is further qualified by the term \(\odot \, \delta\nu\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma\) ("he who opposes"), verse 4, which is used by the LXX as a rendering of the noun \(\text{אָרָי} \) ("adversary"), (cf. III Kingdoms [English, I Kings] 11:25a, as is the verbal form \(\delta\nu\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\kappa\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\i}\varsigma\) ("to oppose") to render the Hebrew verb \(\text{אָרָי} \) ("oppose," "prosecute") in Zechariah 3:1. Elsewhere in Paul he uses this term to denote \(\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\varsigma\) ("Satan") as the supreme "adversary" (cf. I Timothy 5:14). However, here, the terms are separate, as verse 9 reveals in saying that the coming of this Antichrist is \(\kappa\alpha\tau\tau' \ \epsilon\nu\varphi\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\varsigma\) ("in accord with the activity of Satan").

The Antichrist is somehow "energized" by, or as in apocalyptic literature, the incarnation of, Satan. This "energizing" of the Antichrist has its analog in Revelation 13:2 where the Beast from the abyss receives "his power and his throne and great authority" from the great red dragon (a symbol of "Satan"). Since his authority to challenge the place of deity does not originate with God, it must draw its dynamic from "Satan," a fact clarified by the additional words of verse 9: \(\epsilon\nu \ \pi\alpha\delta\sigma\ \delta\nu\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\nu\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\omega\varsigma\) ("with all power and signs and false wonders"), again a counterfeit or rival to Messiah, since these

---


\(^{213}\) M. R. James, “Man of Sin and Antichrist,” *HDB* 3 (1920): 226.
three substantives are all used in this order of the works of Jesus to authenticate his messiahship (cf. Acts 2:22). The parallel to the Olivet Discourse is again here apparent since Jesus predicted there that “false prophets” and “false messiahs” would arise, before the advent of the true Messiah, showing “false signs and wonders” (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα) to “lead into deception” (ἀπολαύει), cf. Matthew 24:24; Mark 13:22.

Having seen the pseudo imitatio Christi in the use of these descriptive terms for the Antichrist, we are prepared to see his ultimate act of usurpation introduced in verse 4 by the use of the middle voice with its reflexive nuance to emphasize the autonomy of action: ἐπεραιρόμενος (“exalts himself”). The sphere of his self-elevation is επὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεόν ἡ σέβασμα (“over every so-called god or object of worship”), meaning that this one ranks his (de)sanctity greater than the sanctity of any previous messianic claimants, or even the legitimate sancta themselves.

The ultimate offense, however, is his self-elevation above the true God (implied by the use of λεγόμενον before θεόν) which is attempted through a desecration of the Temple. Here, “the Temple of God” (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ) cannot be metaphorical, even though some have supposed it to be the Church, and the “Antichrist” to be a counterfeit or apostate “Christian” movement in the present age. As this is a majority view among Christian commentators, let us present five objections to this interpretation:

1. In the few places where Paul used ναός to mean something other than the physical Holy Place within the Temple in Jerusalem, he always explained his special meaning so that his readers would understand his metaphorical usage (e.g. I Corinthians 3:16: “You are a temple of God;” 6:19: “Your body is a temple;” II Corinthians 6:16: “We are a temple;” Ephesians 2:19-21: “The household of God … grows into a holy

---

temple in the Lord”). Further, the general metaphorical appeals against compromise or union with defiling elements in the Church (universal and local) and the believer’s body (corporate and individual) in these texts, may be argued to be implicit warnings against the specific eschatological invasion of the literal Temple by the Antichrist, who embodies all of the lesser defilements.

(2) In II Thessalonians 2:4 ναὸς has the definite article, thus, “the Temple,” in contrast to Paul’s analogical usage where ναὸς is anarthrous, hence, “a temple.” Milligan states: “...the nature of the context, the use of such a local term as καθίσατε, and the twice-repeated def. art. (τῶν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ) all point to a literal reference in the present instance ...”

(3) In II Thessalonians 2:4, τῶν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is the direct object of καθίσατε (“to sit down”), a verb suggesting a definite locality, not an institution. Another verb for “enthronement” or “usurpation” would have been used to express the symbolic sense, had it, rather than the literal act of “sitting” been intended.

---

215 This is not the language of equivalence, nor of replacement, but of analogy, otherwise we have three temples replacing the Jewish Temple: a universal temple, a local temple, and an individual temple. If one is making this substitution because of a felt need to remove the old institution in favor of the new spiritual reality, why compound the old imagery?

216 An apparent exception to this grammatical pattern is I Corinthians 3:17, however, while “a temple” in verse 16 = the Church, the reference to “the Temple” in verse 17 must mean “the Temple [at Jerusalem]” in order for the argument to make sense. There is here an almost a fortiori argument: “Do you not know that you are a temple of God? If anyone destroys the [Jerusalem] Temple, God will destroy him. For the [Jerusalem] Temple is holy as you are [holy].” In other words, if the Jerusalem Temple is holy and violators will be punished (the greater), what do you think will happen if you violate the Church, which is a temple by analogy (the lesser)?

(4) II Thessalonians 2:4 reflects a dependence upon Daniel 9:27 (for the Temple desecration, but for the figure of the Antichrist in the “Abomination of Desolation,” probably also 11:31-36 and 12:11).\textsuperscript{218} The only “Temple” that could have been meant in Daniel 9:27 was the Jerusalem Temple. This would also be the case in Matthew 24 and Mark 13 which both depended on Daniel, but probably were influential in the development of Paul’s eschatology on this point.

(5) The interpretation of as the Jerusalem Temple, and of a literal seating of the Antichrist, was the universal interpretation of the ante-Nicene Church fathers (cf. e.g. Irenaeus, c. 185 C.E.): “But when this Antichrist shall have devastated all things in this world, he will reign for three years and six months, and sit in the temple at Jerusalem; and then the Lord will come from heaven in the clouds, in the glory of the Father, sending this man and those who follow him into the lake of fire; but bringing in for the righteous the times of the kingdom.” The symbolic or “spiritual” use of the Temple for the Church does not fully appear until the third-century C.E. with Origen, who was influenced by the allegorical interpretations of the Hellenistic idealist school of Philo.

The argument for a literal Temple is supported by the allusion here, and the direct citation from Daniel 9:27 in the Olivet Discourse, of the βῆλημα τῆς ἔρημωσεως (“Abomination of Desolation.”). It is clearly in Matthew and Mark an idolatrous object or defiling activity that takes place within the Temple: ἐστὸς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ (“standing in the Holy Place”), Matthew 24:15; ἐστηκότα διὸν οὐ δεῖ (“stand where it ought not to be”), Mark 13:14.\textsuperscript{219} Some commentators who admit that a literal Temple is in view, nevertheless argue that the activity of


\textsuperscript{219}Cf. David Wenham, The Rediscovery of Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse, Gospel Perspectives 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), p. 178, argues that in view of the synoptic references to “holy place,” and “where it ought not to be,” and the Danestic background, the Jerusalem Temple is the preferred location.
Antichrist, καθότι αὐνοεικύνετα ἐκεῖνοι ὅτι ἐστίν θεός (“seating himself, displaying himself as being God”) is also literal. This is taken in a metaphorical sense of “usurpation of the honor of the divine.” The difficulty with this view is two-fold:

(1) Cultic language used throughout, and the reference to the ναὸς, indicates a view of the Temple as the place where divine authority was authenticated. As we have argued, ναὸς most likely refers to the “Holy of Holies,” the most sacred area where the cherubim and the Shekinah, representing the divine Presence, displayed itself and legitimized the Temple as הַבְּרוֹאָת ("the house of YHWH"). Tatford proposes an interesting scenario based on this reference to the ναὸς: "Evidently the audacious rebel will blasphemously take his seat in the sanctum sanctorum itself."²²⁰ According to this explanation the "man of sin" will attempt to publicly parody or substitute himself for YHWH, which would necessarily entail an entrance into the Holy of Holies (unsealed) to display himself there in place of the Shekinah. In the days of the Tabernacle and the First Temple, the throne of YHWH was said to be שָׁבַע הָרוּפָם ("seated [above/between] the cherubim"), cf. Psalm 80:2 [English, verse 1]; 99:2 [English, verse 1].²²¹

It is difficult to understand how the Antichrist would effectively “usurp the place of deity” or “deceive” (and as Matthew 24:24 emphasizes, “even the very Elect [i.e., the Jewish Remnant]”), by simply assuming a title to himself, as did the Caesars with their παντοκράτωρ (= ἄνωθεν ἐξῆς), "All-Powerful, Omnipotent [One]" = ("Almighty"/"[Lord of]


²²¹Whether or not this implies that the Antichrist would need to seat himself on the actual Ark of the Covenant, if it reappeared according to the apocalyptic legends, cf. II Maccabees 2:6-8, is not certain, since even without the Ark, the Holy of Holies retained in its distinction as the place of the divine Presence in the Second Temple.
Hosts”), and κύριος (= יְהֹוָה). "lord" = ("YHWH/Lord, Master"). It also seems inconsistent with the structure of the verse to take the phrase τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ as literal, and then assume the whole clause εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθέσατο ἀποδεικνύοντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶν θεὸς to be figurative.²²²

(2) The parallel typical figures throughout the biblical period and the later Second Temple era all were desecrators that entered who violated the material Temple through physical contact. The Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the Temple, as did the later Roman generals Vespasian and Titus. Antiochus IV erected an “abomination” in the Sanctuary or near the altar, as did later Hadrian, and as Gaius (Caligula) attempted to do. Alexander the Great approached the Temple, and the Roman emperor Pompey entered both the Sanctuary and the Holy of Holies. A similar idea is seen in Isaiah 14:13-14, where the usurping figure (typical of Satan and/or Antichrist) aspires to enthrone himself in the heavenly Sanctuary in rivalry to the Most High. While this is metaphorical, it connotes the concept of divine attestation by enthronement in the recognized, i.e. legitimate, place of divine manifestation - the Holy of Holies. If the Antichrist is the antitype of all the previous Temple desecrators, then his actions would seemingly need to parallel theirs in order to adequately fulfill the correspondence.

It appears, therefore, that the invasion of the Holy Place by such an unholy person as ὁ νῦς ἡς ἀποκλείας ("the man of sin") is what identifies him as τὸ βῆλημ μα πάντος ἐρημώσεως. A midrash on Psalm 119:133 believed that it was impossible for שָאָר ("Satan") or the עֶבֶר הֵיכֶר ("Evil Inclination") to enter the בֵּית הַמִּסְכָּר ("Temple").²²³ If similar


²²³ מְדוֹרֶשׁ דִּבְרֵי 119:62.
thoughts of inviolability were connected with the Antichrist account, not only could the deception be understood, but also the explanation for it as the pivotal event of the seventieth week when finally revealed.

It is interesting that in later Halakhic literature there are the concepts of the מומר בלשון or spite apostate, who commits sin for no other cause than to manifest his rebellious spirit, and the sons of Belial, also called בני בליאל, who casts off the yoke of God and denied the kingdom of heaven by worshipping idols, abrogating the laws of Torah, removing the Covenant made with Israel, and speaking presumptuously or despisingly concerning God and His word. It is said of such an idol-worshipper that he is called "desolation, abomination, hateful, unclean, and iniquitous." These conceptions of an arrogant, idolatrous, blasphemer who violates the Covenant with Israel, compare favorably with the image of the Antichrist as envisioned by Daniel and embellished by Paul.

The destruction of the Antichrist presented in verse 8 which occurs at the eschaton τῷ ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ("[at] the appearance of his coming") concurs with Zechariah 12-14 and the apocalyptic battle scenes, which

---

224 Cf. דרומ הדר 11a.

225 Cf. Sifre 93a, b; Sandhedrin 111b

226 Cf. Sifre 31b, with references to Numbers 15:22.

227 T. Peah 16b; Sanhedrin 27c.

228 Ibid; Sifre 31b, 33a. These references have in view the Sinaitic Covenant, however, Sifre 31b §111 (to Numbers 15:22) and R. Hillel's commentary (cf. Friedmann, Beth Talmud, I, p. 334) argue it is the Abrahamic Covenant.

229 Cf. Sifre 31b (to Numbers 15:31); cf. Mishnah Avot 3.13, speak of the "uncovering of faces," by which is meant speaking presumptuously (cf. idiom "bare faced = shamefully"); Sifre 33a (to Numbers 15:30) and Sanhedrin 99b relate it to allegorizing the Torah (especially the Halakhah) with the intention of abolishing the law.

230 Cf. Sifre 104a, text and note 7; cf. Targum Onkelos on Deuteronomy 31:18.
also the Olivet Discourse describes. This, then, with the allusion to Daniel 9:27 via Matthew 24 and Mark 13, to the “Abomination of Desolation,” reveals the Pauline use of the desecration of the Temple as an eschatological motif.

**The Antichrist as the Antitype to Desecration Types**

In tracing the desecration motif we have discovered that the imagery of an eschatological Desecrator appeared to be in view in light of the succession of historical desecration figures seen in Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus IV, and Titus. Were we to include the Garden of Eden “Sanctuary” as a part of this literary trail, we would add the imagery of the Edenic deceiver, the serpent, to this list, since this figure was responsible for the first deception resulting in the first desecration and exile. Northrop Frye has argued that the apocalyptic world set in context reveals Israel surrounded by hostile nations which seek to dominate and destroy. Apocalyptic pictured this context as bearing all the marks of triumph except permanence. He further considered the literary order of types in the apocalyptic world to be composed of idealic imagery: God, Messiah, the Garden of Eden, Jerusalem, the Temple, et. al., which is opposed by demonic imagery - Satan, Antichrist, Waste Land, Babylon, Tower of Babel, et. al. This later category divides into two forms: parody-demonic, comprised of a group called στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (“followers of the rule of the world-system”), and individuals, such as the Antichrist, who represent the temporarily successful heathen nations, and manifest-demonic, representing the inevitable condition of negative conflict. This counterpart imagery can be depicted as follows:231

---

231Cf. Northrop Frye, *The Great Code*, pp. 166-167. I have modified Frye's tables where I felt the imagery could be more precisely identified.
### Categories of Counterpart Imagery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Manifest Demonic</th>
<th>Parody Demonic Group</th>
<th>Demonic Individual</th>
<th>Antichrist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual or Angelic</td>
<td>Seraphim Cherubim</td>
<td>Shekinah Spirit/wind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baal Dagon Molech, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradisal</td>
<td>Garden of Eden</td>
<td>Tree/Water of Life</td>
<td>Waste Land Sea</td>
<td>Heathen Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark of Beast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>Those Cast Out</td>
<td>He then Kingdoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharaoh Nebuchadnezzar Antiochus I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Flock</td>
<td>Shepherd, Sheep, Lamb</td>
<td>Dragons of Chaos: Leviathan</td>
<td>Beasts of Fertility or Prey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deified Animal (Serpent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable</td>
<td>Good Harvest</td>
<td>First Fruits</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>Vegetation gods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Astarte Tiamat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>Jerusalem (city)</td>
<td>Temple (stone)</td>
<td>Ruins (T. Mount)</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Tower of Babel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counterpart imagery traces motifs from the biblical beginning (the paradisal state) through the conflict between kingdoms of the divine and the demonic (Israel and the nations), expressed polemically in the Tanach and New Testament. Between the two categories of apocalyptic and demonic comes the figurative imagery of the Tanach, which for the New Testament form a typology that finds its antitype in the Last Days. Narrowing our focus to the divine/human counterparts of this scheme, we find that the quasi-divine human types of Israelite oppressors find their antitypical expression in the Antichrist as the ultimate counterpart of the divine/human (God/Messiah). This typical/antitypical relationship may be illustrated according to our selections as below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGICAL FIGURE</th>
<th>TYPOLOGICAL ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHARAOH</td>
<td>OPPOSED GOD (EX. 5:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPRESSED PEOPLE (EX. 1:11, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBUCHADNEZZAR</td>
<td>OPPOSED GOD (HAB. 1:6-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPRESSED PEOPLE (2 KGS. 24:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESECRATED TEMPLE (2 KGS. 24:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIOCHUS IV</td>
<td>OPPOSED GOD (DAN. 11:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPRESSED PEOPLE (DAN 11:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESECRATED TEMPLE (DAN 11:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION (DAN. 11:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITUS</td>
<td>OPPOSED GOD (DAN. 3:25a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPRESSED PEOPLE (DAN. 6:25c; LK.21:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESECRATED TEMPLE (DAN. 6:26f; LK.21:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABOMINATION DESOLATION (HADRIAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTITYPE</td>
<td>OPPOSES GOD (REV. 13:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPRESSES PEOPLE (DAN. 9:27; REV. 13:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESECRATES TEMPLE (2 THESS. 2:4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of the typology to the Antichrist antitype has been traced from the perspective of the Temple desecration motif. Notice in the diagram that development begins with the dual elements of opposition to the divine program manifested as opposition to God and oppression of God's People. Pharaoh sets the basic plot which will be progressively enlarged by a concentration of desecration against the Temple (indicated on the chart by the change from gray to black type).

Nebuchadnezzar cast the third element with his desecration of the Temple. His desecration was a removal of the Temple from Israel and of Israel from the Land. This act was more severe than that of Pharaoh’s persecution of Israel in his land, but not as severe as that under Antiochus which was persecution of Israel within its own Land. The reason for this is that the Babylonian exile offered the opportunity of return to Israel, but the Antiochean persecution offered only a succession of further persecution without escape.

The advance in desecration under Antiochus is the setting up of the “Abomination of Desolation,” the fourth and final element in the
typological/apocalyptic scheme. When Titus as a successor-oppressor to
Antiochus desecrates the Temple, he does not implement this fourth element,
however, since the Roman empire is "the people of the prince that shall come"
(Daniel 9:26), the later Roman emperor Hadrian may fulfill this as a type (though
this is extra-biblical).

Therefore, the eschatological Antichrist, envisioned by Daniel (8-12), Paul
(II Thessalonians 2), and John (Revelation 13) bears all the elements of prior
types to establish his antitypal identity. We now move to the final stage in the
development of our motif, which carries forward the Temple
Desecrator/Antichrist imagery into the apocalyptic realm, the Apocalypse.

**The Desecration/Restoration Motif in the Apocalypse**

We have selected the last book in the New Testament for our final study of
Temple desecration and restoration as an eschatological motif for several reasons:

1. *The Apocalypse presents the Temple as a central eschatological motif.* From
   John's first vision to his last the heavenly Throne-room/Temple is in view.
   In the Book of Revelation the entire history of Temple schemes are
   alluded to: Tabernacle, Tent, and Temple; all set within a context that
   purports to present the final reality concerning the divine design for the
   Sanctuary.

2. *The Apocalypse draws multiple parallels to Genesis, in terms of protology and
   eschatology.* What is presented in Genesis in a seminal form is presented
   in Revelation as a fully-formed and fulfilled motif. What was seen as the
   divine ideal concerning the Edenic Sanctuary in the first chapters of
   Genesis, will be viewed as a realized reality in the final chapters of
   Revelation.

3. *The Apocalypse reveals the final stage of the motif development.* As the both
   the latest of the New Testament compositions, the Revelation stands at the
   end of the New Testament development of the desecration/restoration
   motif and should exhibit any developmental changes in form or
   expectation from the original paradigm.
The Date of the Book of Revelation

The date of the Revelation is significant to our study because its interpretation of references to the Temple may be affected by its position on one or the other side of the 70 C.E. destruction. If the book is considered to have been written before the destruction of the Temple, its predictions concerning the Temple are generally thought to be in view of that event. Thus, all references to the Temple in the book are fulfilled ipso facto at the 70 C.E. date. In this case, there is no place for comparison with the futurist perspective of an ultimate desecration to the fulfillment of a restoration of Israel in terms of the biblical prophets or apocalyptic visionaries. Rather, these works are themselves reinterpreted according to the past-fulfillment (70 C.E.) scheme of these Christian commentators.\(^\text{232}\)

However, external and internal evidences lead to the conclusion that the book is to be dated well after the fall of Jerusalem, in which case the events it describes are future from the standpoint of the Temple’s destruction, and therefore are strictly eschatological in nature. The following summary evidences for a late date for the book:\(^\text{233}\)

(1) The external evidence for the date of Revelation comes primarily from the testimony of Irenaeus (120-202 C.E.), who was the disciple of the Apostolic Father Polycarp (70-155 C.E.), who was himself a disciple of the Apostle John, who is the traditional author of the Revelation. Irenaeus’ statement is as follows:

We will not, however, incur the risk of pronouncing positively as to the name of Antichrist; for if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in the present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld

\(^{232}\)For the arguments of such modern preterist interpreters cf. David Chilton, Days of Vengeance (Fort Worth, Texas: Domion Press, 1987).

the apocalyptic vision. For that was seen not a very long time since, but almost in
our day, towards the end of Domitian's reign.234

These comments of Irenaeus refer to a date of approximately 90-95 C.E. This testimony of Irenaeus may also be bolstered by the almost universally held chiliastic interpretation by the first-third-century ante-Nicean church fathers (e.g. Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Papias of Hierapolis, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Commodianus, Cyprian, Hippolytus, Nepos, Lactantius, Victorinus of Petru, Methodus, and Apollinaris of Laodicea). Their interpretation depended on a futurist perspective sustained by the Revelation.

(2) The internal evidence is of several kinds:

(a) a comparative investigation of motifs between the Johannine Apocalypse and Statius' Silvae, reveals that the former, while probably not modeled on the latter's adulatio emphasis of Domition, nevertheless contains sufficient circumstantial parallels exist to identify the polemics of the Apocalypse within the religio-political milieu of emperor worship around A.D. 95.235

(b) the use of the name "Babylon" for "Rome," which is a common nomen for the second destroyer of Jerusalem, patterned after that of the first, in Jewish literature. If it was adopted by the author of Revelation from Jewish tradition, it necessitates a date after 70 C.E.

(c) the condition of the seven churches described in the first four chapters of Revelation accord well with the Domition persecution.236

---


235 The first effort to investigate these parallels was that of Kenneth Scott, "Statius' Adulation of Domition," AJP 54 (1933): 247-259. The most recent is that of Deane James Woods, "Statius' Silvae and John's Apocalypse: Some Parallel and Contrastive Motifs" (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1990). Woods analyzes eleven motifs to validate that the literary motifs in the Apocalypse were common to those circulating in the Roman empire during the reign of Domition.

236 However, the assumption of chronological indicators after chapter four, when the literary style change from symbolic narrative to apocalyptic must be
We may conclude that there is adequate evidence to prefer the traditionally accepted date for the Apocalypse as circa A.D. 95, well after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. This will not eliminate the possibility that Temple texts in the Apocalypse might be theologically reminiscent of the pre-destruction glory, and thereby have reference to the Second Temple, rather than an eschatological Third Temple. However, the late date more readily argues for a future focus, realizing the divine restoration in terms identical with the prophetic texts upon which the book depends - Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah.

The Interpretation of the Apocalypse

Because of the variety of interpretations of the Apocalypse, it is necessary to briefly address the hermeneutical approaches that have produced these variations. On a simplified scale, basically two hermeneutical systems have competed over the interpretation of the book. These may be distinguished as a literal interpretation and a non-literal interpretation, although both systems identify and distinguish between normal and symbolic language, although to varying degrees of consistency based on their presuppositions. These interpretive systems may be generally classified as literalists and non-literalists, and may be further classified as: premillennialists and amillennialists, postmillennialists.237

The Literal Interpretation of the Apocalypse

During the first three hundred years of the Christian Church the premillennial interpretation, known then as Chiliasm,238 was considered the

---


238 So-called because the Greek word for "thousand" (i.e., the "thousand years" of Revelation 20) is χιλια. They were also referred to as "millenarians" after the Latin term for "thousand," millennia.
dominant view among the Church Fathers. For example, Irenaeus (c. 136-203 C.E.) gives testimony to this in his citation from a Fragment of Papias, one of the apostolic fathers:

Then creation, reborn and freed from bondage, will yield an abundance of food of all kinds from the heaven's dew and the fertility of the earth (Gen. 27:28), just as the elders recall. Those

---

239 Cf. Joel Gregory, "The Chiliastic Hermeneutic of Papias of Hierapolis and Justin Martyr Compared with Later Patristic Chilists (Ph.D. dissertation, Baylor University, May, 1983). This well-established historical view has recently been challenged by Charles Hill, Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in the Early Church (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), whose revisionist historical analysis of the first six hundred years of the Church argues that a non-Chilastic eschatology existed as recognized orthodoxy. Nevertheless, his own table summarizing his evidence indicates that the earliest patristic interpretation was "definitely Chiliastic" (his term). His evidence rather reveals a growing non and anti-Chiliasm as one moves forward in time. Others have argued from this evidence that the chiliastic interpretation lost ground as anti-Jewish polemics increased, and Greek philosophical thought became normative in the Christian hierarchy. Thus, a shift occurred from literalism (considered Jewish) to allegory (considered Christian), and a "spiritual" interpretation developed (via Clement and Origen), which was especially championed by Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Caesarea, who said that Chiliasm should "go worship with the Jews" (cf. Walter Kaiser, "Response 3: An Evangelical Response," in Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition, eds. C. A. Blaising and D. Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1992), pp. 360-376 (especially 361-363). In addition, from the time of Constantine, the political merger with Christianity had deemed Chiliasm inadequate for the social order, and its "christianizing" of the empire further polarized Jew and Christian. Chiliasm apparently began to revive after a return to literal interpretation with the Protestant Reformation (which had depended in large measure on Jewish exegetical methodology to counter the Roman Catholic mysticism and the doctrine of Papal infallibility) and Puritan scholasticism, which revived the Christian study of Mishnah and Talmud, cf. Pinchas Lapide, Hebrew in the Church (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989). For further discussion of chiliastic historical development cf. Le-Roy E. Froom, The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation. 4 vols (Washington D.C.: Review and Herald, 1950), and J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines. 5th revised ed. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978).
who saw John, the Lord's disciple [tell us] that they heard from him how the Lord taught and spoke about these times ... 240

The premillennial system 241 seeks to interpret the apocalyptic genre in a literal fashion while recognizing the symbolic imagery of visionary discourse. While it accepts a soteriological orientation, it argues that the scope of the divine purpose in redemptive history is too varied to reduce it to one category, i.e., the Church. Since the redemptive program in the Tanach was clearly in nationalistic terms, consistency of interpretation would require that eschatological and apocalyptic texts be treated with this as the normative perspective. In the interpretation of the Apocalypse, 242 it maintains that the presence of a literal succession of events implies an historical succession of events, 243 and that the imagery employed depends upon prior contextual usage in the Tanach (e.g., the Prophets), where literal historical events were understood. This agrees with the interpretive method employed by the Jewish writers of apocalyptic literature during the Second Temple period, "who understand the words of the prophets [concerning the End of Days and the Redemption] as alluding to their own


era.\textsuperscript{244} In this regard premillennialism is consonant with Jewish eschatology, which affirms that the “Messiah will appear in history and the messianic kingdom will appear within history.”\textsuperscript{245} Therefore, the constituent elements of the Kingdom in Jewish eschatology: the return from exile, the coming of Messiah, and the rebuilding of the Temple\textsuperscript{246} are also accepted by premillennialists as indispensable to Israel’s national prophetic program.

Premillennialists further argue for a consistency in grammatical historical interpretation, following the normal use of words in context, which allows for figurative use where the context dictates this usage. Therefore, they would interpret the Temple in Revelation according to its context as either an actual, earthly, tangible, edifice, or as the ναός, the literal existential heavenly archetype of the earthly Temple.

As an example of how premillennialists would interpret the Apocalypse, let us consider Revelation 21:3:

\begin{quote}
καὶ ἥκουσα φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ βρόντου λεγούσης, Ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετά τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ σχηματίσεις μετ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτὸι λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν ἔσται [αὐτῶν θέος]
\end{quote}

(“Behold, the tabernacle of God is among men, and He shall dwell among them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be among them [their God]”).


\textsuperscript{245}“The Eschatology of Judaism,” in Luther H. Harshbarger and John A. Mourant, Judaism and Christianity: Perspectives and Traditions (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968), p. 337.

\textsuperscript{246}Cf. Solomon Schechter, Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 98: “The idea of the kingdom is accordingly often so closely connected with the redemption of Israel from the exile, the advent of the Messiah, and the restoration of the Temple, as to be inseparable from it.”
Premillennialists would interpret this text literally as a fulfillment of the prophetic text from which it cites: Ezekiel 37:27: לֹ֣א אֲנָלָ֗הּ וַעֲגָרֵ֥לָהּ לָ֖עָם וְנַעֲרַ֑יִית "And My dwelling place also will be with them; and I will be their God, and they will be My People". Interpreted literally, this text would understand the New (celestial) Jerusalem as a real eschatological city, however, distinct from the terrestrial Jerusalem (since the New Jerusalem has no Temple), yet apparently replacing it in the eternal state (i.e., at the time of "the new heavens and earth." Revelation 21:1), as the abode of all the People of God (Revelation 21:3-8).

While this text in Ezekiel would refer to the eschatological Temple described later in Ezekiel 40-48, Revelation 21 is apparently describing the heavenly Temple, from which Ezekiel 40-48 drew their structure (cf. Revelation 21:11-21), which as the courts of YHWH and His hosts, is itself a Temple, not needing to contain a separate complex. This may in part explain why John reports he saw no Temple there, verse 22, (however, see comments below). But it is the unique language of Ezekiel 37:27 which was the basis of the selection of this text for application to the ultimate manifestation of YHWH among men in Revelation 21. In addition to the usual term מקדש ("sanctuary"), Ezekiel uses here and nowhere else the term מקדש ("dwelling place"). The association of these terms tied together all of YHWH's "sanctuaries" throughout time (including the eschatological Temple of Ezekiel 40-48), because all were in some way linked to the Shekinah, the Divine Immanence. Thus, the terminology pointed to the

247 John notes that this "holy city" was in heaven, but now has apparently descended to earth: καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ("descending out of heaven from God," verses 2, 10), thus, transferring the celestial to the terrestrial. This may incidentally be equated with the rabbinic notion of the Temple descending from heaven in fire. Cf. for a discussion of the premillennial view as contrasting the amillennial view on this topic: Alan A. McNickle, "The New Jerusalem in Amillennial Theology" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1984).

248 This is how the Targum understood this verse, translating מֶשֶׁכֶל in full: "I will make My Shekinah dwell among them." This language allowed John in the Fourth Gospel to speak of Jesus as the λόγος = דְּרֵחַ which
Divine ideal of ultimate dwelling, which in John's vision, best suited the final stage of Divine manifestation.

The Non-Literal Interpretation of the Apocalypse

The amillennial and postmillennial system is determined by a hermeneutical platform of soteriologically-structured spiritualization which governs the interpretation of scripture and history according to a program of redemption that culminates with the manifestation of God with the covenant community. Thus, any eschatological distinctions between Israel and the Church are eliminated, and the Jewish hope of restoration [both physical and spiritual] on the present earth is "raised" to that of resurrection [spiritual only] on the "new earth". In the case of the Apocalypse, what the premillennialist would interpret as future history (since the historical reality of the visions have not yet literally occurred), the amillennialist and postmillennialist would interpret as past (fulfilled allegorically in the Church as the historic covenant community). The presupposition in apocalyptic is that anything not corresponding to present normative experience must be considered as hyperbolic imagery.²⁴⁹ Therefore, the interpretation of the Temple in Revelation must be in purely symbolic terms, representing the community of the redeemed, and every detail of measurement and sancta must likewise be given a corresponding symbolic meaning.

Hence, under this system, Revelation 21:3 would be interpreted as the Church - either the Church on earth in its universal dominion (postmillennialists) or the Church in heaven (amillennialists). Accordingly, since John in Revelation 21 applies the language of Ezekiel 37 and 40-48 (cf. Revelation 21:9-27) to "a bride adorned for her husband" (verse 2), an expression assumed to apply only to the Christian community, it must mean that this was the intended meaning of the original text, and therefore the contexts of Ezekiel 37:27 and 40-48 were typological descriptions of the Church. This system, therefore, must interpret the nationalistic promises made to Israel as a subservient part of the covenantal format which was primarily soteriological in nature, and apply those promises spiritually (or soteriologically) to the Church as the true Elect of God. As can be seen from the interpretation of the Apocalypse in particular, Israel (in its national election) has been superceded by the Church (in its spiritual election) to inherit the covenantal blessings, which were ultimately spiritual.

The Desecration/Restoration Motif and the Structure of the Apocalypse

In this chapter we have previously demonstrated that the "seventieth week" (Daniel 9:27) of the "Seventy Weeks" Prophecy (Daniel 9:24-27) significantly informed the sequence and motif selection of the individual Synoptic accounts of the Olivet Discourse. We will find that this influence also holds true in a structural analysis of the Apocalypse in its judgment section (chapters 4-19). Daniel 9:27 may be seen to have in part shaped the genre, motifs, language, and most of the structure of the book. McClean's analysis of the book of Revelation250 again reveals that the structure of the judgment section contains linguistic and thematic parallels with the Synoptics that reflect an amplification of the Synoptic eschatological discourses. Chapter 6:1-11 (the first five seals) was found to be the midpoint in the seventieth week, and to correlate directly with the preliminary signs of the Synoptics. Further, Revelation 7-19 was demonstrated to be an expansion of the Synoptic gospels within the framework of Daniel 9:27. This is

particularly evident in John's incorporation of the three-and-a-half years division of the seventieth week, and the development of the Abomination of Desolation motif through the various beasts of chapters 12, 13, and 17. Finally, the third section (the Great Tribulation), of Revelation's six major sections, develops into four sub-sections (4:1-5:14; 6:1-17; 8:1-18:24; 19:1-21) shaped by the seal, trumpet, and bowl septet judgments. These septet judgments are structured according to the seventieth week:

251 The six sections of the book of Revelation according to McClean are: (1) Prologue (chap. 1); (2) Letters to the Seven Churches (chaps. 3-4); (3) God's Great Tribulation (chaps. 4-19); (4) Kingdom of God (chap. 20); (5) New Jerusalem (chaps. 21-22:5); (6) Epilogue (chap. 22:6-21).
Figure 15: Diagram of Revelation Judgment Section Correlated with Structural Divisions of the Seventieth Week of Daniel and the Olivet Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) The First half of the Week: (Daniel 9:27a): Desecration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Seal Judgments (Revelation 4:1-6:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synoptic Correlation: The Preliminary Signs (Matthew 24:4-14;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) The Second half of the Week: (Daniel 9:2b1): (Pivotal events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Trumpet Judgments (Revelation 7:1-13:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synoptic Correlation: The Abomination of Desolation (Matthew 24:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) The Final Days/Consummation: (Daniel 9:27b2): Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bowl Judgments (Revelation 14:1-19:21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of Daniel 9:27 as a paradigm for the structure of both the Olivet Discourse and the Apocalypse ties these apocalyptic discourses together, and argues that the unifying motif is that of desecration/restoration. In this regard it is significant that the subject of Temple desecration and the "Abomination of Desolation" in Daniel 9:27 finds further exposition in the judgment section (cf. Revelation 11:1-2; Revelation 13:4-18). Here we see that the pivotal events of the bowl judgments include the desecration of the earthly Temple (Revelation 11:1-2) and the announcement of judgment proceeding forth from the heavenly Temple (Revelation 11:19) and parallel the pivotal event of the Olivet Discourse, the
"Abomination of Desolation." This suggest that the Apocalypse represents the final Christian development of the eschatological desecration/restoration motif.

Having seen in chapter 5 the significance of Daniel 9 to eschatological desecration and restoration of the Temple, let us proceed to investigate these motifs within the context of the Apocalypse. We will first consider the references to the Temple in the Apocalypse and then examine the use of the desecration/restoration motif.

**The Desecration/Restoration Motif and the Temples of the Apocalypse**

The structure of the Apocalypse, as we have seen, in part has been patterned after Daniel's seventieth week, and therefore follows the use outlined there of desecration and restoration of the Temple. Our selective examination of the desecration motif will consider the Danielic figure of the Temple Desecrator as Antichrist by a comparison of the "Little Horn" of Daniel 7 with the "First 'Beast'" of Revelation 13. We will further consider the concept of the desecration of the Temple presented in Revelation 11:1-2.

Our examination of the restoration motif will follow the path of the various depictions of the Temple, and seek to discern their distinctives within the eschatological framework dictated by the seventieth week. Special attention will be given to the final use of the restoration motif in the Apocalypse, that of the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21-22.

**The Desecration of the Temple in the Apocalypse**

The earthly Temple is depicted in Revelation 11:1-2. This chapter has been called one of the most difficult and the most important in the entire Apocalypse. One reason for this difficulty are these opening verses which treat the subject of a Temple on earth that is not only a measurable (verse 1), but also desecrated for three and one-half years (verse 2). The literal earthly Temple identification is considered problematic because of the assumption that the use of

---

symbolism in Revelation requires that the meaning of terms such as Temple are also symbolic,\textsuperscript{253} and because, as Kiddle observes: "the literal Jerusalem had already been in ruins for over twenty years at the time John wrote, and everyone everywhere knew it. When told that the temple was to be measured, they sensed immediately that an allegorical sense was intended."\textsuperscript{254} Under this interpretation, "the Temple of God" here represents the Church. Arguments advanced in support of the symbolic interpretation run generally along theological, rather than exegetical lines. For example, this Temple is the Church because the literal Temple was abandoned by Christ and the Spirit transferred to the Church (hence the use of ναός, since this referred to the "Holy of Holies" and only this term is used symbolically of the Church).\textsuperscript{255} Furthermore, the Church has in previous chapters been symbolized by the twelve tribes, the seven golden lampstands, and priests, so it is not unlikely that it should here be symbolized by the Temple.

In addition, there is a further problem for the identification of an earthly Temple with regards to the question of the date. Historicians, who acknowledge the literal Jerusalem Temple is in view, and date the Apocalypse after 70 C.E., invariably assume that this is a pre-70 C.E. Temple tradition that has been

\textsuperscript{253} Cf. e.g., G. V. Caird, \textit{A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine}, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 131: "In a book of symbols such as Revelation the last thing that the temple and the holy city could refer to was the physical temple and the earthly Jerusalem. A literal meaning would be inconsistent with his symbolism elsewhere," Caird in order to maintain his idea of consistency, here makes the outer court = members of the Church who have compromised with the world, and the holy city = the world outside the Church (p. 132). However, there is no textual or hermeneutical control to justify this identification, and any such interpretation as this must therefore be arbitrary.


incorporated at this point. Conversely, preterists, who also see a literal Temple, use this text in support of a pre-70 C.E. date for the book, assuming the vision depicts the events surrounding the Roman destruction of the Second Temple.  

However, despite these problems, the symbolic view is unwarranted, and the futurist view is preferred, for the following reasons:

1. While some New Testament passages use the Temple as a metaphor for the spiritual composition of the Church and the Christian, all other references to the Temple in the New Testament, taken in their normal sense, refer to the literal Temple of the Jews (or its archetype in heaven).  

2. The noun describing the Temple is definite: "the Temple of God" (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ), i.e. the Jerusalem Temple, which is never used to symbolize Christians or the Church.  

3. The Temple here is described as the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, rather than as God’s dwelling place (which would lend itself more to a symbolic usage), and therefore, would not be a suitable representation of the Church which is predominantly Gentile.  

4. The θυσιαστήριον ("altar") has no corollary to the Church nor to the Church age, and therefore would make no sense as a symbol of anything Christian. On the other hand, it is a literal part of the Temple cult, and is supported by Daniel's references (9:27; 12:11) mentioning the sacrifice and oblation, which presupposes the existence of the Temple.

---

256 Cf. Chilton, op. cit.


(5) John speaks of the outer precinct being "trodden down by Gentiles" (verse 2), which would better suit an earthly Temple than a heavenly one.261

(6) John's use of the terms "altar," "outer court," "Gentiles," and "the Holy City," all indicate that the context is Jewish, not Christian.262

(7) The outer court and the entire City are trampled by the Gentiles, signaling that the Temple and the City must be something in contrast to the Gentiles, i.e. something Jewish.263

(8) John's interest in this book is wholly eschatological, and since predictions of the restoration of the Temple were expected, he is showing how earlier expectations of the End are to be fulfilled.264

(9) The reference to "forty-two months" is clearly a reference to Daniel's seventieth week (Daniel 9:27; 12:11), which is divided into two divisions of forty-two months (31/2 years) each. In addition, the context of the vision here is the end of the sixth trumpet judgment, which would corroborate this being the middle of the seventieth week.265

---


262 J. A. Seiss, The Apocalypse. 3 vols. (New York: Charles C. Cook, 1909), 2:159. This is the brazen altar of burnt offering in the outer court, rather than the golden altar of incense in the Holy Place, because the worshippers seem to be in proximity to it (and only priests could go into the Holy Place), and it may be observed that when an altar is spoken of in the text without further qualification it always means to indicate the brazen altar, cf. Beckwith, The Apocalypse of John, p. 597.

263 Ladd, op. cit.


(10) If the Temple here represents the Church, then who is represented by the worshippers in the Temple? It would be inconsistent to make the Temple the Church and then identify the Church as these worshippers.\textsuperscript{266} Since the worshippers are measured in addition to the Temple, they must be seen as distinct from it, or else John has been told to measure a group of people whose being is only a part of themselves.\textsuperscript{267} The distinction between the Temple and its worshippers is best explained as between the Jewish People as a whole, and a Remnant who are true to God and the cult.\textsuperscript{268}

(11) The measurement here of the Temple is like that in Ezekiel 42:2, which probably informs this passage. Since Ezekiel measured a literal earthly Temple, the Temple here should be understood in the same manner.\textsuperscript{269}

If we interpret this Temple in context we find that it and its altar are measurable, however, so also are those who worship in it. Therefore, this measurement is a “spiritual” measurement or evaluation.

The purpose for this measurement has been thought to be for the acquisition of information disclosed later in this section,\textsuperscript{270} or as an indication of judgment.\textsuperscript{271} However, as this measurement is spiritual, not literal, no dimensions


\textsuperscript{267}E. W. Bullinger, \textit{The Apocalypse} or “The Day of the Lord” (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, n.d.), 347.

\textsuperscript{268}Cf. Ladd, \textit{A Commentary on the Revelation}, p. 152.


\textsuperscript{270}This is the normal connotation of \(\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \varepsilon \omega\) and assuming that 11:1 continues the Johannine commission begun in 10:11 the obtaining of information is the proper sequel and expected function, cf. Henry Alford, "Revelation," \textit{The Greek New Testament}. 4 vols (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903), 4: 657.

\textsuperscript{271}Measurement can indicate such judgment (cf. II Samuel 8:2a; II Kings 21:13; Isaiah 34:11; Amos 7:7-9; Lamentations 2:8), cf. J. Massyngerberde Ford, \textit{Revelation}. AB (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1975), p. 176.
are recorded to be later disclosed. Rather, the command to measure the Temple, altar and the Remnant (Ἐγείρε καὶ μέτρησον τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ) must be seen in opposition to the prohibition against measuring the outer Gentile court (μὴ αὐτὴν μετρῆσῃ). In addition the qualification in the command to ἐκβάλε ἐξωθεν ("leave out") indicates exclusion in contrast to inclusion in the spiritual judgment. This implies, then, that the Temple, et. al. are considered "holy," and therefore in God's favor, while the outer court of the Gentiles is "profane," thereby incurring God's disfavor. Following this perspective Thomas has observed:

John's future revelations will distinguish between God's favor toward the Sanctuary, the altar, and the worshippers associated with them, and His disapproval of all that is Gentile in orientation because of their profanation of the holy city for half of the future seventieth week. The immediate outcome of this measurement is the information about the two witnesses whose orientation is toward the sanctuary and the altar and who consequently enjoy God's favor, and about the Gentile foes who will oppose them and eventually kill them in conjunction with their trampling of the holy city.\(^{272}\)

The fact that divine favor is displayed toward the proper functioning of the cultus does not likewise imply divine protection. Indeed, the Temple's court and the City of Jerusalem will be given over by divine command to the Gentiles for the last half of the seventieth week. This period coincides with the period of great tribulation set forth in the Olivet Discourse, which is characterized by Gentile domination with escalating persecution of the Jewish Remnant. Apparently these verses describe the pivotal period in the middle of the seventieth week in which the Temple is initially desecrated by the Gentiles prior to, but leading up to the trampling of Jerusalem (verse 2e). If we can supply the details of other prophetic texts touching upon this period, we can plot the course of desecration paralleling this text:

(1) The cessation of the daily sacrifices polluted the altar (Daniel 9:27; 12:11).\(^{273}\)

(2) The entrance of the Antichrist and/or his image in the Holy of Holies (vulgar), i.e. the “Abomination of Desolation” (II Thessalonians 2:4), and

(3) The inordinate and defiling worship commanded by the Antichrist (Revelation 13:4, 8).

This series of events may indicate a further reason for the exclusion of the Gentile court at the time of measurement. The first half of the seventieth week sees Jerusalem at peace, with faithful Jewish worshippers in the Temple and the sacrificial system uninterrupted (verse 1-2b), but the second half sees the trampling of Jerusalem (verse 2c). This accords with the treatment afforded the two witnesses (11:7-10), who have direct relation to the Temple and represent the Remnant. Consequently, their deaths may provide the opportunity for the Temple’s desecration (cf. 11:8-10), which leads to judgment of the nations (11:13, 18), continuing through the campaigns of Armageddon and concluding with the advent of Messiah and the battle for Jerusalem. Since the Gentile nation’s judgment is reserved for a later time, there would be no reason to include them in the process of spiritual evaluation, which primarily deals with Israel.

This desecration of the earthly Temple follows the traditional desecration/restoration motif in cursing and blessing, with Israel first in under Gentile oppression, and then experiencing reversal with the oppressing nations either destroyed or doing obeisance to YHWH.

The Temple Desecrator in the Apocalypse

In the Apocalypse we are presented with the most detailed account of the eschatological Desecrator, the Antichrist. In Revelation 13:1-10 the ascent of the Antichrist and his usurpation of divine prerogatives is described with allusions drawn from the career of the פֶּן הַאָרָה (“Little Horn”) of Daniel 7.\(^{274}\) A

\(^{273}\)In Daniel 12:11 the 1,290 days = 42 months based on a 360 lunar calendar.

comparison of these two images reveal that John identifies his figure τὸ ἄγγλιον ("the Beast") with the "Little Horn" of Daniel's account. The literary parallels between these two texts may be seen as follows:

Figure 16: Comparison of Daniel 7 and Revelation 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Little Horn&quot; (Daniel 7)</th>
<th>First 'Beast' (Revelation 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beast whose power absorbed into &quot;Little Horn&quot; has ten horns (vs. 7)</td>
<td>Beast has ten horns (vs. 1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rises from the sea (vs. 3)</td>
<td>Rises from the sea (vs. 1c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth speaks arrogant things (vs. 8)</td>
<td>Mouth speaks arrogant things (vs. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes war with the saints and prevails (vs. 25a)</td>
<td>Makes war with the saints and overcomes them (vs. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks great words against the Most High (vs. 25b)</td>
<td>Opens mouth in blasphemy against God (vs. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wears out the saints of the Most High (vs. 25c)</td>
<td>Woman on beast directing him is drunk with saint's blood (Rev. 17:6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The blended qualities of insolent blasphemy toward God and the seductive religious influence over men are seen above as common traits to both figures, thus linking once again the contexts of Daniel and the Apocalypse as eschatological. Since in Daniel 7 the "Little Horn" is readily identifiable with Antiochus IV Epiphanes, this Syrian oppressor bears his typical role as a prototype of the Antichrist.

The direct reference to the desecration of the Temple in this comes in 13:6 as an exegetical clause developing the Antichrist's blasphemy against God: ... βλασφημήσαι τὸ δώμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σκινήν αὐτοῦ, [καὶ] τοὺς ἐν τῷ
of "to blaspheme His Name and His Tabernacle, [and] that is those who dwell in heaven"). As our inclusion of the variants in the text indicate, there is a question as to how θυ σκυνήν αὐτοῦ ("His Tabernacle") is to be understood. If we take the majority reading with kal included (which has extensive versational support), we will read θυ σκυνήν αὐτοῦ as another of the objects of blasphemy: God's Name, God's Tabernacle, and [God's] heavenly dwellers. In this case it might have reference to the earthly Temple, if we can assume τὸ δῶμα αὐτοῦ is in apposition to θυ σκυνήν αὐτοῦ, and has reference to the Shekinah. However, the best manuscripts omit the kal,275 which would result in a reading (like that adopted by the UBS text) that sees τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκυνοῦντας in apposition to θυ σκυνήν αὐτοῦ as explaining this place name in terms of those occupying that place. In this case, the heavenly Temple is in view.

Whether we retain or omit the conjunction, the desecration of the Antichrist is leveled against the Temple as God's own, indicating its holy status. If the heavenly Temple is in view (probably the preferred reading), then the Antichrist is pictured attacking heaven as the source of the authority he is usurping on earth. The next step from blasphemy of the Name of God and the heavenly Temple, an act of supreme desecration itself (see chapter 3), would be the actual desecration of the earthly Temple of God, which is supplied by the Olivet Discourse and II Thessalonians 2:4.

The Heavenly Temple and the Desecration Motif

The heavenly Temple is also employed as the basis for imagery that forms the desecration motif of Revelation 15, namely, the plagues that will descend on the "wicked worldlings" (or "earth-dwellers"), after the covenant paradigm of

275E.g. P47, an early third-century manuscript, and earliest reading of this text, not only excludes the kal, but ends the verse with θυ σκυνήν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ("His Tabernacle in heaven"). Therefore, the internal criteria of preferring the more difficult reading, and that which best explains the other variants, results in the omission of the kal as the best reading.
Exodus 15 and 32 in which the Reed Sea punished those that persecuted God’s People. In verses 6-8 the Temple serves as the setting of judgment from which emerge angels bearing golden bowls of wrath representing earthly plagues. The movement continues from the Temple to the earth, with the glory of God filling the Temple as a cloud that obscures the heavenly Sanctuary from beholding the defilement produced by the plagues. An additional example of the desecration of the heavenly Temple may be found in Revelation 13:6 if we accept the majority text reading (see discussion above).

The Restoration Motif and the Temples of the Apocalypse

We have concluded in previous investigation that the Temple was the axis around which the hope for Jewish restoration turned. If a return to the Land was anticipated, it was expected to be complete only with the rebuilding and consecration of the Temple. If a messianic age was imminent, it was to be inaugurated with Messiah’s rebuilding of an ultimate inviolable Temple, complemented by a restoration of the hearts of both Jews and Gentiles to prevent future desecration. With the onslaught of Roman persecutions that the early Jewish-Christian community experienced, represented by John’s exile to the isle of Patmos, we can understand the apocalyptic nature of the Apocalypse. Set within a Jewish milieu, we can also understand that predictions of the Temple’s survival until the end of time were expected, and thus would form a necessary part of this apocalypse. Indeed, the Temple (υαυδέ) makes more appearances in the Revelation than in any other single book in the New Testament and in the Synoptic Gospels combined. Despite the inclination of interpreters to completely symbolize the book, the important consideration must be to consider each occurrence of Temple in context to determine its specific reference as “heavenly Temple (Tabernacle/Tent of Meeting),” “earthly Temple,” or “new Temple.”

It has been suggested that there are no references to the “eschatological” or “Restoration Temple,” which at first seems surprising, given the entire focus of

---

apocalyptic writers on this Temple. However, the focus of the Revelation is Christian, and beyond this, it has a view to the ultimate summation of history in Christ. Therefore, one would expect a greater emphasis on the heavenly Temple and the heavenly Jerusalem, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. 9:23-24; 12:22-24), and on the earthly Temple prior to the coming of Christ, as it recapitulates and culminates the eschatological scenario presented by Jesus in the Olivet Discourse. However, some commentators allow for the eschatological Temple to be placed chronologically within Revelation 20:1-9, the period interpreted by these commentators as the messianic era of Jewish anticipation, the thousand-year “Millennium.”

The references to θρόνων, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς (“thrones, and they that sat on them”), verse 4a, to ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (“reigned with Messiah”), verses 4c, 6c, and to becoming λευκάς τοῦ θεοῦ (“priests of God”), verse 6b, all are typical apocalyptic features found in the Gospel’s and Jewish apocalyptic literature concerning the reign of Messiah and of the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel. The apocalyptic overthrow (with fire from heaven) of nations opposed to Messiah (here characterized as "Gog and Magog"), with the attack centered on Jerusalem, called here τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡγαμημόνην (“the beloved city”) is also a familiar theme of Jewish apocalyptic literature. It would seem, then, that although the eschatological Temple is not explicitly mentioned, it is implicitly present by virtue of its association with these events as presented in other apocalyptic texts.

One use of Temple in Revelation 3:12 is obviously metaphorical, as the comparison of a living being to a non-living structure would require. The verse says: ὁ νικῶν ποιήσει αὐτούς στῦλον ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἐτέρῳ (“He who overcomes, I will make him a pillar in the Temple of my God, and he will not go out from it anymore ...”). The pillars in the Temple were architecturally designed to serve as supports for the Temple facade in time of frequent earthquakes. It is true that the pillar metaphor is used elsewhere in the New Testament (Galatians 2:9: I Timothy 3:15), however, these uses do not mention the Temple, and so perhaps only here is there a clear example of this as a
Temple metaphor. Coupled with the idea of cultic stability, is the promise of remaining within the Temple, something no priest, not even the High Priest was permitted to do for extended duration, however, it was the height of eschatological hope (cf. Psalm 23:6; 92:12-15). We will first consider the references to the heavenly Temple, which comprise the majority of uses.

*The Heavenly Temple*

The "heavenly Temple" is explicitly pictured in Revelation 7:15; 11:19; 14:15, 17; and 15:5, 6, 8. Implicit references to this heavenly Temple may also be seen in Revelation 4:3; and 6:16. Here the הָבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ, the archetypal Temple and pattern for all earthly and eschatological Temples is revealed. In Revelation 7:15 as 15:5, 6 not only is the Temple present, but also the Tabernacle, since the heavenly pattern was the same for both. Its inclusion is also fundamental to the restoration motif, since as Craig Koester has observed, "some NT authors also associated the tabernacle with hopes for a restoration and unity in Israel. According to Acts the growth of the Jewish Christian community marked the restoration of David's tent, and in Revelation the church of the new age appears as the tabernacle-city."\(^{277}\)

The language here of the Tabernacle being "upon them" is drawn from Ezekiel 37:27, a restoration context, in which the eschatological Temple is constructed, and YHWH's Presence dwells once again in harmony with His People. In Revelation 15:5 the author combines all of the earthly sanctuaries into

\(^{277}\)John's vision of the heavenly Temple, and especially his use of the phrase: ὁ ναός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ("the Temple of God which is in heaven"), Revelation 11:19, reveals that he follows in the tradition of the הָבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ, shared in the New Testament epistles with Hebrews 8:4-5, and consonant with the concept developed in the Tanach. A similar development of the tradition also appears in early Judaism; cf. for rabbinic references Str-B, pp. 702-704.

one as typifying the ideal heavenly model: “After these things I looked, and the Temple of the Tabernacle of Testimony in heaven was opened ...” From the other uses of the heavenly Temple in Revelation we learn that the heavenly Temple houses an altar (6:9; 8:3; 5; 9:13; 14:18; 16:7), God’s throne (16:17), and the heavenly Ark of the Covenant (11:19). In addition, Webb would see the veil which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies present in those texts which depict an "opening" to the heavenly throne-room/Temple through which angelic beings or John himself passes immediately into the Divine Presence (cf. Revelation 4:1-3; 6:14-17; 15:5; 16:1, 17).²⁷⁹

Significantly, the heavenly Temple also is used with a restoration motif in chapter 15:1-4, which celebrates the victory of God’s judgment (after the Red Sea deliverance, Exodus 15) in subduing the Gentile nations and bringing them to worship before Him, one of the goals of the restoration itself, a fact indicated by the citation in verse 4c from Isaiah 66:23: יָבֹא כָּל בּוֹשֶׁךָ לִבְשָׁנָה לַעֲבֹר נֹשֶׁאָה יְהוָה ... (“... all the nations will come and worship before You’’). If the New Jerusalem in fact contains a part of the heavenly Temple, then the references in Revelation 21:24, 26 to the glory and honor of the nations being brought into it may also fulfill this restoration mandate.

**The Earthly Temple**

We have seen that the Temple of Revelation 11:1-2 is best viewed as a literal future earthly Temple. The restoration of this earthly Temple will apparently will be prior to the mid-point of the seventieth week, since at that point the “Abomination of Desolation” will have taken place in its Holy Place (cf. Daniel 9:27; Matthew 13:15; Mark 13:14; II Thessalonians 2:4). Accordingly, this interpretation envisions a rebuilding of a [Third] Temple and the reinstitution of the cultus at a time prior to the messianic era, since these events are associated with the advent of the Messiah and the restoration of national Israel. If, however, this Temple is built before this period, then those who build it must believe that

they are in the messianic era, and that the Messiah has truly arrived. This is in accordance with the prediction of false messiahs who make their appearance during the first half of the seventh week (cf. Matthew 24:5, 11; Mark 13:5-6), and of Daniel's record of a covenant (of peace) signed between Israel and the נני (Antichrist), which may allow for such a rebuilding and attribute to the נני messianic status (cf. Zechariah 6:12-13), and more (cf. Revelation 13:4, 8). It will be this Temple which the Gentiles trample in their last desecration of the Holy City (Zechariah 12:2; 14:2; Revelation 11:2), before the restoration under the true Messiah at the climax of this seventh week.

The Millennial (Ezekiel's) Temple

Following the chronological pattern established in the Olivet Discourse and the Apocalypse, after the Parousia the Messiah will build the Millennial Temple of Ezekiel's vision. Commentators have conjectured that the significantly larger dimensions of this Temple will require topographical changes in Jerusalem's Temple Mount, and that this may be the reason for the similar statements of topographical alterations attendant to YHWH's advent in Zechariah 14:4, 10:

"...and his feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives, which is in front of Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives will be split in its middle from east to west by a very large valley, so that half of the mountain will move toward the north and the other half toward the south. ... All the land will be changed into a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem; but Jerusalem will rise and remain on its site ...".

The Apocalypse does not explicitly treat the subject of the Millennial Temple, but reserves its application of the ideal representation of the Temple to the New Jerusalem (chapters 21-22), which borrows from Ezekiel 40-48 for its description. Some premillennialist interpret Revelation 21:9-27 as occurring during the Millennium, based largely on the presentation in verses 24, 26 that the
Gentile nations will bring their glory into the New Jerusalem, which these interpreters hold may be suspended over the earth at this time. However, the parenthetical statement in verse 25 (cf. 22:5) that "there shall be no night there," may better suit the eternal state which follows the creation of the new heavens and earth. However, in Revelation 20, which is considered the classic text on the Millennium, the Temple may be implied in verse 4:

Kai ἐλθον θρόνους, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, καὶ κρύμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς; καὶ Χριστὸς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν μετ’ αὐτοῦ τῇ χλίμα ἐπη.

("And I saw thrones and they that sat upon them, and judgment was given to them ... and they reigned with Christ for a thousand years").

If the idea here of θρόνους is derived from the royal thrones of Daniel 7:9, 10, 22, where a divinely judicial process is in view, then there is a combination of ruling and judging intended. According to Matthew 19:28, this period of the παλιγγενεσία would be characterized by the Messianic rule. In addition, the occupancy of these thrones occurs at the same as that of Satan's binding (20:1-3). Thus, the picture is of a period of unthreatened holiness during which Israel enjoys a theocratic government. It is impossible that such a government as a continuation of Israel's national program could exist without a Temple. The conditions described here in Revelation 20 parallel those described in Ezekiel 40-48 during which the Millennial Temple exist (cf. Ezekiel 43:7; 44:3, 24; 45:8-10), thus, the reader would have been expected to fill in the details even though direct references were not provided.

The New Temple

With the "New Temple" we have something apparently new to the apocalyptic scene. Revelation 21-22 pictures a period after a new heavens and a new earth have been created (cf. Isaiah 65:17; 66:22; II Peter 3:13) and a new state of existence is begun. That a re-creation, rather than a renovation is in view
appears evident from the language employed (cf. 21:1, 4-5, 23, 25; 22:3, 5). 280 While it has been argued that a chronological recapitulation to the Millennial Temple has occurred with verses 9-27 (based especially on verses 24-26), such cannot be successfully maintained in light of the chronological sequence of 19:11-22:6. 281 Here the restoration motif terminology of return to the covenant is rehearsed, however, it is a return again to Eden, for the curse has been removed and God is, after the restored Paradise motif, dwelling once again in His Garden Sanctuary.

It is also significant, as Mealy has observed, that in the Isaianic context from which this re-creation language borrows, the theme of the restoration of oppressed Jerusalem is immediately associated with the theme of re-creation. 282 The New Jerusalem will be superior to the old Jerusalem (even in the

280 The language of re-creation is expressed as: ἀπῆλθαν ("passed away"), 21:1b, cf. ἔφυγεν ("fled away"), 20:11; οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν (a new heaven and a new earth"); 21:1a (N.B. here new replaces old rather than old being renovated); ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ("[there] is no [longer any] sea"), 21:1c (thus the removal of the archetypal connotations of evil personified by the sea); ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ("[there] shall be no [longer any] death"), 21:4; νῦν γάρ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεί ("[there] shall be no night there"), 21:25; 22:5; πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἐτί ("[there] shall no [longer] be [any] curse"), 22:3. These last three phrases, all which are suggestive of evil and the old order, reflect that this new order is entirely pervasive (cf. 21:5: καὶ ἐποίημι πάντα, "I am making all things new").


282 J. Webb Mealy, op. cit., p. 192. Webb would see this as evidence that the re-creation attends the Parousia, however, is not necessary to see this re-creation as attendant, but proceeding as a result, from the new order initiated at the eschaton. The Parousia rather sets in motion an irreversible sequence of events culminating in the new heavens and new earth.
Millennium), because it will remove Jerusalem from the possibility of the threat of future desecration.

After the fashion of Ezekiel’s visionary eschatological Temple, the city of New Jerusalem is described with the Shekinah glory present (verse 11a; cf. Ezekiel 43:2) and jeweled adornment and inscribed gates (verses 11b-21; cf. Ezekiel 43:31-34). What is at first startling to those accustomed to the imagery of the Temple as the center of blessing and the symbol of the divine Presence, is the statement of Revelation 21:22 concerning the New Jerusalem: ναὸν οἶκ εἰδον εῦ αὑτῷ (“And I saw no Temple in it…”).

Some commentators see here the passing away of “symbol for reality,” and “the breaking away of the author from dependence upon Ezekiel.”283 While it is proper to observe the differences between the description of the New Jerusalem and Ezekiel’s Temple, this difference is not an exchange of symbol for reality, since Ezekiel’s Temple was not symbolic, but an earthly Restoration Temple. One must further take exception with the contention that the model of Ezekiel’s eschatological Temple has been discarded, since for almost the whole of the chapter the author has been building his description from allusions to Ezekiel, and completes his description in verses 24-27 with both the worship of the nations being brought to the New Jerusalem (verses 24-26) and cultic exclusions to maintain absolute ritual purity (verse 27), after Zechariah 14:16-21 (a previous allusion to Zechariah 14:7 was in verse 25). It is this use of Ezekielian language that continues the cultic connection on the new earth, and helps identify this city as a "Temple-city.”284


284 It should also be noted (as we argue below) that if the Temple-city is the heavenly Temple’s דֶּשֶׁם descended to a restored earth, then the language displays the continuity between the Edenic Sanctuary and Ezekiel’s Temple, both of which were patterned after the heavenly archetype and represented idealic realizations. Thus, the Millennial Temple (Ezekiel’s) realized the earthly ideal, which was lost at Eden, and unrealized by either the First nor Second Temple, and the New Temple, represents the ultimate realization in an uncursed (new Eden) world.
If, then, these verses register the ultimate fulfillment of the ideal Temple, it must be asked why it is stated that there is “no Temple?” The answer is that there is a Temple, but it is more than any Temple envisioned by earlier restoration motifs. All former Temples were the construction or reconstruction of an earthly structure, cultically restricted (even to the righteous), and containing the Shekinah in its innermost division. This New Temple is exceptional in that it has none of these former limitations, and goes beyond them as the archetype exceeds the model. These unique features are depicted as:

1. An absence of cultic restrictions for the righteous. In 21:7 the δ ὑπεκών ("overcomer") is the individual (in opposition to the group, cf. Revelation 2:3) who will inherit or partake of eternal life (cf. verses 4, 6) and especially the covenental status of ἡ ἁγια σύνοιτο reflected in the phrase: εσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσται μοι υἱός ("I will be his God and he will be My son," cf. verse 3 for the group). What is particularly exceptional is the degree of this access: καὶ ἰδονταί τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ("and they shall see His face"). 22:4. This clearly indicates a new access without cultic restrictions, in light of Exodus 33:20: Λέγετε, ἡ θανάσια, καὶ θανάσια η λίμνη τῆς θάνατος τῆς σκότους, καὶ η καρδία ποΤ ἢ ("You cannot see My face, for no man can see Me and live"). The text explains that the reason this is possible is because the New Jerusalem cannot be defiled from within by cultic pollution since the curse is past (22:3), nor from without, since all possible desecrators have been confined in the “Lake of Fire” (21:8, 27). Thus, as Ladd has pointed out: "In the eternal state God will dwell among His people in a direct unmediated communion."285

2. A transference from heaven to earth. In 21:2, 10 (cf. 3:12) the New Jerusalem is described as: καταβάλλοντας ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ("... descending out of heaven from God ..."). The present participle indicates that the city was in the process of descent, thereby characterizing it as a

---

"descending-from-heaven" kind of city. This is further emphasized by the prepositions ἐκ, indicating origin (heaven), and ἀπό, indicating the originator (God).

This city is not an earthly construction, but a transferred structure from heaven. From the parallels between the description of this city and the Garden of Eden and Ezekiel's Temple, we may conjecture a common source, namely the archetypal heavenly Temple, which John has previously depicted in his heavenly throne visions. Thus, we may have here a transference of the heavenly Temple to the new earth to constitute a new Temple where the divine ideal of YHWH among His creation, lost at Eden (cf. Genesis 3:8) can be realized.

(3) A constitution as the Sanctuary par excellence. In the previous descriptions of the descending city, it is stated that this city is τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν ("the holy city"), verse 2, and ἔχονσαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ ("having the glory of God"), verse 11a. These phrases indicate respectively the supernal holiness of the New Jerusalem and the presence of the Shekinah.

This is reinforced by the announcement in 21:3:

'?I'doû ë skhô toû theou metâ tôn adrôpwn, kai skhôse meâ autwv, kai autoi laoi autou esontai, kai autôs ë theos meâ autwv estai autwv theos"

("Behold, the Tabernacle of God is among men, and He shall dwell among them, and they shall be His people and [God Himself] shall be among them").

This skhô toû theou ("Tabernacle of God") is the heavenly Tabernacle which has previously appeared (cf. Revelation 7:15; 13:6; 15:5) and has in view the Holy of Holies, as indicated by both the ë skhô and the verb skhôse. What we believe this implies is that the Holy of Holies in the heavenly Temple/Tabernacle has been separated from its courts and now constitutes the New Jerusalem. The intensive

---

---

286As seen above, the purified condition of the peoples would not require outer courts which formerly served to provide separation or gradations of holiness.
phrase ἀυτὸς ὁ θεὸς ("God Himself") emphasizes the Presence of YHWH without mediation or representation, i.e., the cultus, whose performance within the courts and Holy Place are no longer required.

This supposition may be supported by 21:16 which reveals the dimensions of the city as: ... τετράγωνος κείται, καὶ τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς ὀσοὺ [καὶ] τὸ πλάτος... ("... laid out as a square, and its length is as great as the width ...") Here is a city said to be fifteen hundred miles in measurement, yet with all measurements equal. Since the Holy of Holies in the earthly Temples was built according to this design (cf. I Kings 6:19-20), the concept presented here may be that the entire city is a Temple, or rather, an immense "Holy of Holies." The original design of the Tabernacle was to allow YHWH to dwell among His People (Exodus 25:8). This was also stated as the goal of the Restoration Temple (Ezekiel 37:27; Zechariah 2:10; 8:8).

Here then is the Sanctuary par excellence, epitomizing the realization of a Temple's most ideal function, the communion of God and man. Within this Temple is what has always constituted a Temple a holy place - the true Temple, YHWH Himself. So 21:22 explains: ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ ἀριθμὸν ("...for the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb, are its Temple"). Thus, God's Presence (Shekinah) in the midst of the New Jerusalem = Holy of Holies, constitutes it a true and ultimate Temple.

287 The predicate adjective τετράγωνος ("foursquare"), describing the city, is from τέτρα (Acolic for τέσσαρες) "four" and γώνιος (a cognate of γωνία) "corner." This term was also used with reference to cube-shaped building stones, cf. BAGD, p. 821, and indicates here a quadrilateral quadrangle or tetragonal structure.

288 Some have suggested this mimics the city planning of Near Eastern cities such as Babylon, which according to Herodotus was laid out as a square with each side 120 stadia in length, and Ninevah, which Diodorus Siculus described in a similar fashion. However, the adjective ἔσσαν indicates the shape of a perfect cube, which from the Jewish perspective, would have had reference to the Holy of Holies, as described in I Kings 6:19-20.
This ultimate communion between the human and the divine was likely also envisioned as the goal of the restoration motif in the ל Nimbus ("World to Come"). Flusser contends that this reflects a Jewish concept, and aduces evidence from a Jewish midrash on Isaiah 60:19 fused with a midrash on Psalm 132:17 which presents an almost identical parallel to this text (Revelation 21:22-23). These parallel elements may be illustrated as follows:

Figure 17: Comparison of Revelation 21:22-23 and Midrash on Psalm 132:17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revelation 21:22</th>
<th>The Midrash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 22: &quot;And I saw no Temple in the city&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;In the world to come there will be no need of the light of the Temple&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 23 &quot;The glory of God has illuminated&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;God will be the everlasting light of Jerusalem&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;and its lamp is the Lamb&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Messiah is compared to a lamp&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, then, is the final use of the restoration motif in the New Testament, designed to picture, in continuity with the Tanach and the rest of the New Testament, in a restoration without reversal, absolute in holiness, and with a Temple without cultic limitations. Thus, the author of the Apocalypse ends his vision of the End with a conclusion much like the prophet Ezekiel did his, with

---

289 Flusser, denying the possibility of dependence by the midrash upon the Apocalypse concludes: "the idea that [scholars] have assumed that no corporeal temple will exist in the eschatological Jerusalem must be Christian in origin, because they imagine it to be unthinkable in Jewish Messianic expectations [is]... wrong,"David Flusser, “No Temple in the City,” Judaism and the Origens of Christianity (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1988), p. 465.

290bid, p. 459.
the eternal epithet: “the name of the city from that day shall be, יהוה (“YHWH is there”).
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research has been to re-examine the attitude of the New Testament documents towards the cultic institution of national Israel, the Jerusalem Temple. Rather than tackling the question from the traditional approach of systematic and ecclesiastical history, we have sought to follow the example of comparative literary genre studies, and particularly those which have sought to trace a theme or motif throughout a given corpus or collection of related genre. We selected a Temple motif with a demonstrable re-occurring pattern interwoven throughout the historical and literary drama.

Our procedure has been to trace this literary motif within a select but extended corpus in order to examine its theological continuity or discontinuity as imagery connected with the Temple tradition. Since previous study had focused on either the motif of desecration or restoration within the prophetic and/or apocalyptic genres, or had studied the theme of the Temple as a separate motif or in combination within the larger Jerusalem (whether historical or eschatological) tradition, it was our approach to consider the subject of the Temple under the dual motif, with its positive and negative schema, of desecration and restoration. In our preliminary studies we found this motif to be inseparable, insofar as the context in which the motif was originally developed employed the negative (desecration) to project a promise of the positive (restoration). Since restoration was always an event future to the act of desecration, this motif was most commonly found within eschatological and apocalyptic genres. Our procedure then was to restrict this
research to the use of the desecration and restoration of the Temple as an eschatological motif.

The reason for this direction was entailed by our secondary purpose to evaluate a predominate interpretation in Christian theology termed replacement theology. This interpretation in its various forms holds that the Jewish Temple was irrevocably replaced by the Church, which is the New [spiritual] Temple, just as the nation of Israel was superseded and replaced by the Christian community, the New Israel. At odds with this perspective was traditional Judaism which held that the Tanach had offered national Israel the hope of restoration, complete with a functioning Temple and cult. This hope was cast in an eschatological and apocalyptic mold, which the New Testament adopted for its own purposes. It was reasoned that if a continuity was found to exist, or not to exist, in the use of an eschatological Temple motif, then it could be decided whether the terminus of fulfillment occurred in the first-century with the Church, or awaited a future fulfillment in terms of the Jewish-prophetic construct.

Our range of research was to encompass the entire Tanach, however, with only representative book studies where material was replete or redundant, and where there was presented the best possible field of available textual examples for our survey. Further, our examination was to extend to the apocalyptic literature of the apocrypha, the pseudepigrapha, and the Qumran literature, and then to the New Testament literature, where our study would involve an investigation of the uses by the New Testament authors of the dual motif through inter-textual citations and allusions to the contexts of Tanach and the apocalyptic literature.

Throughout the process of tracing the motif, where textual propositions could be drawn, we attempted to interact with our theological question of replacement theology. While no separate section was developed to interface these conclusions, our arguments have taken place where they are most proper, within the context of exegetical discussion.
CONCLUSIONS ON THE DESECRATION/RESTORATION MOTIF

Our conclusions from the study of the motif can be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) The divine ideal from creation was for the Creator to dwell with (יָבֵל = σκηνών) the creature in harmony, and to commune together without fear of reprisal or failure. Failing this, the Temple (יָבֵל = σκηνή) was given as a means to restore what was lost, i.e., the Divine Presence to the realm of man. To maintain this restored relationship, covenant became the requisite and binding force, but it was the Temple that symbolized success or failure in terms of the Nation's adherence to the covenant.

(2) The Temple on earth was patterned after an ideal Temple, a heavenly archetype (יְבֵית הָאָדָם) in the cosmos to which the earthly representative was continually compared. The Jerusalem Temple served Israel as a unifying center for the Nation, as a symbol of political independence, and as a regulating influence for social and cultic concerns. Above all, however, it remained the place where YHWH's Name dwelt (via the Shekinah), symbolizing the Presence of God with His People, and to which all prayers were to be directed for the success of the Nation as well as the individual. In times of desecration (whether from the Nation or the nations), the reality of an eschatological Temple, closer to the divine idea, was expected as the ultimate fulfillment of restoration.

(3) The motifs of desecration and restoration are cultic in nature, and therefore must be understood in the cultic sphere of purity and impurity. Desanctification resulted from desecration, which accompanied by defilement, rendered the Temple as a common object, bereft of the Divine Presence and violable by foreigners, who extended the desecration to a universal scale so that the divine Name itself became profaned. Restoration was seen as reversal, that resulted in return, rebuilding, and renewal, both of the Land, the Temple, and the People.

(4) Eschatology is the expectation of the promise of restoration, but also in terms of desecration, where the divine ideal is surrendered.
Apocalyptic is divine intervention, both to effect restoration, but also to reverse desecration mediated through earthly and celestial evil powers, in order to end the threat of profanation, and resolve theodicy. The cycle of reversal must continue until it reaches its prescribed end—the Day of the Lord, the eschaton, the Last Days, when at last a resolution of the divine order will occur. The Temple will be at the center of the ultimate restoration, since it symbolized the Divine Presence throughout history.

(5) Within the motifs of desecration and restoration exist a dormant figure of earthly origin that grew to eschatological proportions. First symbolized by the Pharaoh, and then by every oppressor of the Nation, this figure developed until in Daniel it became crystallized as the “Abomination of Desolation.” The apocalyptic literature carried the imagery farther with its concept of Belial and the “son of Belial,” and built upon the post-exilic promises and the post-exilic problems of the Nation to construct a complex eschatology which set a Messiah against an Antimessiah (or Antichrist), especially in our focus as Temple Restorer versus Temple Desecrator.

(6) The final stage of development of the motif, so far as our research permitted, was that of the New Testament, in which the Temple appears both as an object of reverence, and as the necessary object of judgment—not in order to desecrate, but in order to restore. The Second Temple had not attained to the divine ideal. In this light, Jesus was seen as one who performed the task of Temple Restorer or Builder (Zechariah 6:12) through both public demonstration, after the pattern of the prophets (especially Jeremiah), and in private discourse (the Olivet Discourse), at which occasions his actions and words were set against the eschatological restoration hope of the Prophets. His disciples who followed him, and especially Paul, likewise revered the Temple, but realized that it would pass away in its present form, yet nevertheless employed its model of sanctity for the Church. He likewise predicted an eschatological desecration of the Temple built upon the “Abomination of Desolation”
theme (II Thessalonians 2), within the context of the advent of Messiah, thus implying the future reversal of desecration in restoration.

Finally, the Apocalypse envisioned the restoration in terms of a New Temple, both after the pattern of the former, but exactly fulfilling the divine ideal (Revelation 21-22). The Revelation, structured in at least its judgment section by Daniel 9:27 (which was previously seen to have informed the structure of the Olivet Discourse), depicted both an earthly Temple predicted for desecration (Revelation 11:1-2), and a heavenly Temple that was often the revelatory stage for divine intervention. Furthermore, it was seen that the Apocalypse used the eschatological Temple motif in an attempt to restore a harmony with the Tanach by paralleling the book of Genesis in the form of proleptic protology with the form of ideally realized eschatology.

**CONCLUSIONS ON REPLACEMENT THEOLOGY**

One of our purposes in this study was to challenge the theological interpretation that views the Temple as a part of the old covenant, now replaced and abrogated by the new covenant community, the Church. Our intention was to demonstrate that if the expectation of restoration was a necessary and inseparable corollary of desecration, and if this expectation was consistent throughout the various literary compositions - Tanach, Apocalyptic Literature, and the New Testament - then one could not employ the traditional "Temple texts" in the synoptic Gospels, Acts, the Pauline corpus, and the Johannine Apocalypse, as evidence that an irrevocable destruction was expected to occur in 70 C.E.

If the Temple was respected as a sacred institution in early Jewish Christianity, as reflected in the New Testament, then one could not adduce passages from polemical situations to argue that Christians had rejected the Temple as the spiritual center, and now interpreted the Church as the new Temple and themselves (Jew and Gentile) as the new Israel. Our demonstration of the desecration/restoration motif reveals that it was viewed as part of the divine program for the ages, and as such represented an enduring hope embraced by
both by first-century Judaism and early Jewish and Gentile Christianity. As a result, we can draw the following theological and practical conclusions concerning the interpretation of supercessionism or replacement theology:

(1) The Temple is both a historical institution, divinely given to Israel as a focal point of God's Presence and promise of restoration as a nation and a spiritual community, and a symbol of the People of God, which is greater than the Church. The Temple is beyond time because its purpose is ultimately to unite Jew and Gentile in the worship of God. The prophets envisioned this when on earth the restored Temple, built by the common labors of Jew and Gentile, would become the house of prayer for all nations. Paul envisioned this when he spoke of the Church, made up of both Jews and Gentiles, as a temple, unified and indwelt by God's holy Presence.

(2) Jesus came not to destroy the Temple nor to end a rebellious race, the Jews, but came as a Jew to live an observant Jewish life, and to offer the promise of the hope of the consolation of Israel that was tendered by the Prophets. To interpret Jesus outside of this context is to do violence to the text and to history, and to sow the seeds of anti-Semitism that destroys the hope of unity the imagery of the Temple portrayed.

(3) The New Testament affirms the eschatological promise of salvation and national and cultic restoration to Israel as a demonstration of God's covenant faithfulness and power to reverse desecration and bring sanctification. We believe the statement of Markus Barth is true: "The future of the church lies in the salvation of Israel."¹

(4) While the Church does not replace Israel, Israel will replace the Church, as they fulfill their historic destiny to bring the knowledge of the glory of God to all the earth. The Church, however, remains with restored Israel as the People of God, and together enjoys the Messianic Kingdom and the eternal state.

Our impression has been throughout the research and study that the Temple as a motif, and especially an eschatological motif, has not received adequate attention, despite the abundance of literature that has been generated in this endeavor. While we have summarized our points, we have not as yet given our conclusion the sense of literary cohesion that has been felt throughout from every arena: the structural, semantic, and theological. Too, we feel that while New Testament scholars have recently made encouraging attempts to bridge the gap that has long separated them from making full use of Jewish studies and of open dialogue with Jewish scholars, especially those engaged in New Testament research, a reassessment of theological dogma in light of genuine eschatological continuity is warranted. The early Jewish and Gentile Christian Community, insofar as they followed the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, shared a like precious faith with the Jewish Community in the coming of the Messiah to restore the hearts of the Jewish Remnant to God and to establish his Righteous Kingdom on earth. While other polemical concerns later divided this ground of agreement, the Christian scriptures attest a unity in expectation with the Jewish Prophets and are best read and understood in this original Jewish milieu. A return to an exegetical approach to the biblical text, with a literal historical grammatical hermeneutic, may go far to re-establishing a long awaited dialogue between Jews

---

2 Most noteworthy are the Princeton Symposia jointly hosted by the American Interfaith Institute and the Center of Continuing Education at Princeton Theological Seminary. The purpose of the symposia, chaired by James Charlesworth, is to study issues common to both Judaism and Christianity in an arena of scholarship, in order to clarify why the origins of Christianity were misunderstood and to re-examine the Christian use of the Bible to foster anti-Semitism. Recent symposia have been on "Judaism and Christian Origins," and "The Bible and Anti-Semitism." For publication of the former, cf. James Charlesworth, editor. The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); cf. also, Pinchas Lapide, Israelis, Jews, and Jesus. Transl. P. Heinegg (New York: Doubleday, 1979), Eugene Fisher, Faith Without Prejudice: Rebuilding Christian Attitudes Towards Judaism, Revised and Expanded edition, (New York: Crossroad and American Interfaith Institute, 1993), and the popular work designed to demonstrate to the public that Jesus was a defender, not a denigrator, of Judaism, L. C. Yaseen, The Jesus Connection: To Triumph over Anti-Semitism (New York, 1985).
and Christians on the eschatological hope. In our opinion, one of the greatest obstacles to such dialogue continues to be the stigma of replacement theology.

The reward of this study has been the recognition of a motif that transcends literary genres and informs the eschatological hopes of both Judaism and Christianity. In an age in which the Temple is but a relic of the past, it is a further reward to see what it was meant to be, and since the promises made through the ancient prophets still go unfulfilled, what one day it may yet be seen to be.
APPENDIX

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE TEMPLE

THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE THROUGH TIME INCLUDING PRE-SANCTUARY LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL PREPARATIONS AND HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF JEWISH ESCHATOLOGICAL RESTORATION INTERPRETATION AS REFLECTED IN POST 70 C.E.-DESTRUCTION AND MODERN ATTEMPTS TO REBUILD THE TEMPLE

PRE-TEMPLE PERIOD

2000 B.C.E. Abraham and Isaac offer a ram on Mount Moriah (Gen. 22:1-19)
1400 B.C.E. Moses describes service to be performed at the future central Sanctuary (Temple); Deut. 12:5-21;15:19-20
996 B.C.E. David makes Jerusalem his capital and moves the Ark to a site adjacent to Temple Mount (II Sam. 5:6-12; 6:1-17; I Chron. 11:4-9; 15:1-16:38)
993 B.C.E. David desires to build the Temple; Solomon designated as builder (II Sam. 7:1-13; I Chron. 17:1-14)
990 B.C.E. David purchases threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite as site for the First Temple (II Sam. 24:18-25; I Chron. 21:18-26)
960 B.C.E. David makes material preparations for the First Temple and charges Solomon to build it (I Chron. 22)

FIRST TEMPLE PERIOD

950 B.C.E. Solomon builds the First Temple (I Kgs. 5-8)
910 B.C.E. Temple treasures taken by Egyptian Pharaoh Shishak (I Kgs. 14:25-28; II Chron. 12:1-11)
835 B.C.E. Jehoash (Joash), King of Judah, and Jehoiada effect repairs to damaged parts of Temple (II Kgs. 12:5-14; II Chron. 24:12-14)
826 B.C.E. Jehoash (Joash), King of Israel attacks Judah, breaks down the walls of Jerusalem, and plunders the Temple removing the Temple treasury to Samaria (II Kgs. 14:13-14)
720 B.C.E. Ahaz closes Temple, empties Temple treasury, breaks up Temple furnishings and vessels to pay tribute to the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser, and defiles Temple with a pagan Syrian altar (II Kgs. 16:8-18; II Chron. 28:21, 24)

715 B.C.E. Hezekiah opens Temple doors, cleanses Temple, returns Temple vessels, restores ritual and Passover, and builds storehouses for Temple contributions (II Chron. 29:3-19; 30:1-27; 31:11-12)

711 B.C.E. Hezekiah is forced to give Temple treasures and strip gold off Temple doors to pay tribute to the Assyrian king Sennacherib (II Kgs. 18:15-16)

622 B.C.E. Josiah repairs Temple; Hilkiah the priest discovers book of the law hidden in Temple that brings spiritual revival (II Kgs. 22:3-23:3; II Chron. 34:8-35:19)

605 B.C.E. Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar pillages the Temple, taking articles and depositing them in the Babylonian temple (II Chron. 36:7)

597 B.C.E. King Nebuchadnezzar returns and further plunders the treasures of the Temple (II Kgs. 24:13; II Chron. 36:7)

586 B.C.E. King Nebuchadnezzar invades Jerusalem a third time and destroys the Temple

SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

573 B.C.E. Ezekiel in Babylonian exile has vision of Millennial Temple (Ezek. 40-48)

539 B.C.E. Babylonian king Belshazzar desecrates Temple vessels at a pagan feast (Dan. 5:1-4)

538 B.C.E. Daniel in exile in Babylon receives vision of defiling of the future Third Tribulation Temple by Antichrist placement of an image of himself in the Holy Place (Dan. 9:24-27); Daniel also receives vision of defiling of future Second Temple (Zerubbabel's) by Antiochus Euphranthes' placement of a statue of Zeus in the Holy Place (Dan. 11:31)

515 B.C.E. Zerubbabel, descendant of David, rebuilds First Temple (hence, a "Second" Temple) and Persian king Darius returns Temple vessels taken by Nebuchadnezzar (Ezra 6:3-15)

332 B.C.E. Alexander the Great conquers Jerusalem, but spares Temple

169-167 B.C.E. Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) pillages Temple; soldiers of Antiochus defile Temple; sacrifices stopped and pagan rituals instituted in Temple
164 B.C.E. Temple cleansed and re-dedicated by Judah Maccabee (Hanukkah) after successful revolt against Seleucids (I Maccabees 4)

67 B.C.E. Arisobulus besieges Jerusalem and substitutes pig for sheep in attempt to end Temple sacrifices (which were stopped on the 17th of Tammuz). The result of this fratricidal war between Aristobulus and his brother Hyrcanus led to the intervention of Rome and the end of Jewish independence.

63 B.C.E. Roman emperor Pompey conquers Jerusalem and enters Holy of Holies

20-19 B.C.E. Herod the Great begins work to rebuild and extend Temple = Second Temple; work continues on Temple until c. C.E. 64 (Matt. 24:1; Mk. 13:1; Lk. 21:5; Jn. 2:20)

c. 4 B.C.E. Jesus dedicated in Herod’s Temple; recognized there as Messiah by Simeon and Anna the prophetess (Lk. 2:22-38)

c. 8 C.E. Jesus makes pilgrimage to Temple at Passover and remains there three days to talk with Jewish teachers (Lk. 2:41-51)

c. 26 C.E. Jesus at the commencement of His ministry is tempted by Satan by being taken to the pinnacle of the Temple (Matt. 4:5; Lk. 4:9), and drives moneychangers from outer courts of Temple (Jn. 2:13-17)

c. 29 C.E. Jesus comes to Temple courts at Hanukkah (Jn. 10:22-23); enters Temple Mount through Eastern Gate (Matt. 21:1-11; Lk. 19:37-44); casts out moneychangers a second time (Matt. 21:12-13; Lk. 19:45-46); teaches and heals daily in Temple (Matt. 21:14, 37; Lk. 19:47); predicts destruction of Second Temple (Matt. 23:37-38; 24:2; Mk. 13:2; Lk. 21:6, 20-24) and defiling of Third (Tribulation) Temple (Matt. 24:15; Mk. 13:14); crucified on mountains of Moriah (adjacent to Temple Mount) Matt. 27:33; Holy of Holies is torn (Matt. 27:51); Peter preaches in court of the Gentiles in Temple at Shavuot (Pentecost) Acts 2; Peter heals lame man at the Nicanor Gate leading from Court of Gentiles to Court of Women in Temple (Acts 3:1-11)

40 C.E. Roman emperor Caligula fails in his attempt to defile Temple by erecting a statue of himself

56 C.E. Paul goes to Temple with men completing Nazarite vow and is wrongly accused of defiling the Temple by taking a Gentile there (Acts 21:26-28)

70 C.E. Roman General Titus destroys Second (Herodian) Temple
POST-TEMPLE PERIOD

132-135 C.E. Roman emperor Hadrian renegs on promise to rebuild Temple for Jews and sparks Bar Kokhba rebellion; possible rebuilding of Second Temple by Bar Kokhba; Hadrian retakes Jerusalem, destroys Bar Kokhba Temple, and desecrates Temple Mount by erecting pagan temples

135 C.E. Tinnnes (Turnus) Rufus, Roman governor of Judea plows up the site of the Temple Mount on the Ninth of Av (Tisha B'Av) to signify the utter destruction of the Jewish city and signal the birth of Jerusalem as the Roman colony Aelia Capitolina

326 C.E. Byzantine emperor Constantine builds Church of Holy Sepulchre to overlook Temple ruins as example of Christianity as new spiritual center

363 C.E. Pagan emperor Julian (the Apostate) in the days of Hillel III, allows Jews to begin rebuilding the Temple to counter Byzantine Christianity; effort fails when earthquake destroys building materials stored in Solomon’s Stables

443 C.E. Hopes that empress Eudoxia would permit a rebuilding of Temple prompts letter calling for Jewish return and messianic revival

614 C.E. Jewish support of Persian conquest of Jerusalem leads to favored status of Jews and hopes for rebuilding Temple

637-640 C.E. Muslims conquer Jerusalem and Caliph Omar Ibn-Chatub re-discovers on Temple Mount the site of Temple (Foundation Stone), clears area and permits Jews to build Yeshiva there buried in centuries of debris

691 C.E. Moslem Caliph Abd al-Malik completes Dome of the Rock on Temple Mount

715 C.E. Al Aqsa Mosque is completed over Jewish/Christian remains at southern end of Temple Mount

1000 C.E. Rabbi Avraham Berachia described in his writings the existence of a Temple Mount Yeshiva and synagogue

1099-1118 C.E. Crusaders take Jerusalem and transform Moslem Dome of the Rock into Christian church and Al Aqsa Mosque into headquarters of Knights Templar

1165 C.E. The Rambam visits Jerusalem and prays on the Temple Mount

1187 C.E. Saladin recaptures Jerusalem for Moslems

1287 C.E. The Meiri writes that he heard that the custom was for Jews to enter the Temple Mount

1476 C.E. Jews enter Al-Aqsa mosque for a hearing about the Rambam synagogue on the Temple Mount
1537 C.E. Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent embellishes Dome of the Rock and builds perimeter walls around Old City

1854 C.E. Crimean War (Turkey, France, England, Russia) fought to resolve jurisdiction of Jerusalem's Holy places

1855 C.E. Duke of Brabant becomes first non-Muslim to tour Dome of the Rock since 1187 expulsion of the Crusaders

1867-70 C.E. Palestine Exploration Fund conducts first underground exploration of the Temple Mount

1873-74 C.E. Discovery of Temple Inscription forbidding Gentile entrance

1891 C.E. Report on clearance of Eastern Gate by Ottoman authorities

1917 C.E. Jerusalem is conquered by British; continual struggles between Arabs and Jews over access and control of Western Wall of Temple Mount.

ISRAELI PERIOD

1948 C.E. Israeli independence granted May 14, 1948 but no access to Western Wall or Temple Mount; both Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque damaged by bombs in War of Independence

1951 C.E. King Abdullah of Transjordan is assassinated in the Temple area; succeeded by nephew Hussein of Hashemite dynasty


1961-1967 C.E. British archaeologist Dame Kathleen Kenyon conducts first excavations at Southwest corner of Temple Mount

June 7, 1967 Israel during Six-Day War liberates Temple Mount on third day of fighting; hopes of rebuilding Temple revive, but are dampened when Defense Minister Moshe Dayan orders Israeli flag removed from atop the Dome of the Rock

June 8-9, 1967 Shortly after capture of Temple Mount, IDF Chief Chaplin Rabbi Shlomo Goren and team carefully measure the dimensions of the Temple Compound based on available archaeological remains compared with measurements recorded in Josephus, Mishnah tractates Middot and Shekalim, Maimonides, and Sa'adiah Gaon (cf. Shlomo Goren, י"ע י"ע (Tel-Aviv, 1992).

June 17, 1967 Moshe Dayan meets with leaders of Supreme Moslem Council in Al Aqsa Mosque and returns Temple Mount, especially site of the Temple, to sovereign control of the Moslem Wakf as a gesture of peace; agrees that Jews can have access to Mount, but cannot conduct prayers or religious activities

June 28, 1967 Israeli government officials meet with Moslem and Christian authorities and place administration of Jerusalem's Holy sites under control of respective religious leaders
August 1-8, 1967  Israeli Police are asked to regularly enforce public order at Temple Mount and other religious sites in Jerusalem after reports of improper visitor conduct; Ministry of Religious Affairs commits to given oversight of Holy places.

August 15, 1967  Rabbi Shlomo Goren leads group, including army chaplins, to pray on Temple Mount. Based on his measurements taken on the Mount in June, he contends that he knows where the Holy of Holies is located and that rabbinic ban against entering the Temple Mount is no longer applicable.

August 22, 1967  Chief Rabbinate seeks to enforce religious ban on entrance to Temple Mount by posting signs at ramp leading to Temple Compound.

February 29, 1968  Israeli archaeologists Benjamin Mazar and Meir Ben-Dov begin extensive excavations south and southwest of the Temple Mount 100 years after first British excavation. Significant finds relating to the Temple include the original entrance to the Temple Mount through the Huldah Gates and Temple priest's tunnels.

July 15, 1968  Moslem Court of Appeals rejects one hundred million dollar offer by American Masonic Temple Order to build their "Temple of Solomon" on the Mount.

December 19, 1968  Prayers are offered on Temple Mount at Hanukkah by nationalistic Jewish group.

April 15, 1969  Temple Mount Faithful file legal action against Police Minister Shlomo Hillel to allow Jewish prayer services on Temple Mount; Israeli State Attorney upholds police enforcement of government prohibition of prayer on basis of national security and political concerns.

August 23, 1969  Australian "Christian" cultist, Denis Michael Rohan, sets fire to the Al Aqsa Mosque; Arab demonstrators, and later Moslem legal representatives, accuse Israel of deliberately setting the blaze in order to rebuild the Temple.

August 27, 1969  Wakf closes Temple Mount to non-Muslims for two months.

September 9, 1970  Israeli High Court decides not to adjudicate on Temple Mount prayer case and allows government restriction to remain.

March 11, 1971  Gershon Salomon of Temple Mount Faithful leads group of students to pray on Temple Mount; results in minor disruption.

August 8, 1973  Knesset member Binyamin Halevi and Rabbi Louis Rabinowitz pray on Temple Mount in protest of government ban.

January 30, 1976  Lower Court (Magistrate) acquits of Betar youths arrested for holding prayer service on Mount effects ruling that Jews are permitted to pray on Temple Mount; Police Minister Shlomo Hillel rejects court ruling.
February 9-23, 1976 Arab East Jerusalem schools protest the Lower Court ruling resulting in over 100 arrests; Arab shops close in strike, riots in West Bank; court ruling is appealed (Feb. 11)

March 4, 1976 UN Secretary Kurt Waldheim pledges to introduce Islamic contentions against Israel's interference with Moslem Holy places

March 8, 1976 Gershon Salomon and Rabbi Rabinowitz attempt to lead group to Temple Mount but are turned back by police

March 11, 1976 Moslem councils in Ramallah, El Bireh and Nablus protest police action against Arabs that demonstrated against the Lower Court ruling permitting Jewish prayers on the Mount

March 17, 1976 Lower Court ruling is overturned by District Court but upholds the historical and legal right of Jews to pray on the Temple Mount if the Ministry of Religious Affairs can regulate such activity to maintain public order

August 14, 1977 Gershon Salomon leads thirty members of El Har Hashem ("To the Temple Mount of God") in an attempt to conduct a TishaB'Av service on the Temple Mount, but is turned away by police

March 25, 1979 Rumors that Meir Kahane and Yeshiva students would hold prayer service on Temple Mount provokes a general strike among West Bank Arabs; 2,000 Arab youths brandishing stones and staves riot at Temple Mount and are dispersed by Israeli police

August 3, 1979 Several Jewish nationalist groups are prevented from holding prayer service on Temple Mount

August 6, 1980 Israeli High Court considers appeal to revoke ban on prayer on Temple Mount based on recent law guaranteeing freedom of access to religious sites

August 10, 1980 Ultra-right activist group, Gush Emunim ("Bloc of the Faithful") with 300 supporters attempt to force entrance to the Temple Mount and are dispersed by police

August 28-30, 1981 Chief Rabbi Shlomo Goren and workers of the Ministry of Religious Affairs trace a leaking cistern to discover one of the original entrances to the Temple (Warren's Gate); Announcement of discovery brings crowd of curious Israelis; Arab riot, police arrests Israelis on site, and Rabbi Goren closes dig; Yigael Yadin condemns the dig as quasi-archaeological; Arabs seal the cistern, thus preventing entrance to the tunnel. Goren debates issue on Israeli radio.

September 2-4, 1981 Yeshivah students, under orders from Rabbi Getz, break down Arab wall-seal; Getz claims that the treasures of the Temple, including the Ark of the Covenant are hidden within a lower chamber accessed by the tunnel; Arabs clash with Jewish students and police intervene; gate entrance is sealed due to rioting Wakf protests (Sept. 3); Supreme Moslem Council orders general strike of all Arab schools and shops
in East Jerusalem (Sept. 4) to protest excavation under Temple Mount

**September 10, 1981** Wakf seals tunnel from Moslem side to prevent future Israeli entrance

**September 15, 1981** Gershon Salomon and the Temple Mount Faithful attempt another prayer service on the Mount, but are again stopped by police

**April 11, 1982** Alan Goodman, an American immigrant into the Israeli army, opens fire on the Temple Mount "to liberate the spot holy to the Jews". Though ruled mentally unstable by the Israeli courts, and later sentenced to life imprisonment, the incident set off week-long Arab riots in Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza, and drew international criticism against Israel

**April 25, 1982** Kach Party member, Yoél Learner, attempts to sabotage a mosque on the Temple Mount. He is arrested and later sentenced to two and one half years in prison

**December 9, 1982** Geula Cohen, a member of Israel's Knesset, raises the charge that Moslem Arabs have caches of ammunition sequestered on the Temple Mount

**March 10, 1983** Rabbi Israel Ariel and a group of more than forty followers, planning to pray on the Temple Mount (via the Solomon's Stables, adjacent to the Al Aqsa Mosque), after four youths connected with Yamit Yeshiva are found breaking into the area. Weapons and diagrams of the Temple Mount are recovered in a police search, and numerous arrests are made

**April 1983** The Jerusalem Post prints an "Open Letter to the Prime Minister and the People of Israel," drafted by an "evangelical Christian" group, condemning the arrests of the Temple Mount activists of March 10th

**May 11, 1983** Israel's High Court reverses a police refusal to grant a license for prayer at the entrance to the Temple Mount to members of the Temple Mount Faithful

**May 22, 1983** Physicist Lambert Dolphin of SRI International in California and his team attempt to use scientific equipment within the Western Wall tunnel area to clarify the Temple's location. Israeli police stop the project as a result of pressure from Moslem officials

**September 17, 1983** Rabbi Shlomo Goren and IDF Chief of Staff Moshe Levy conduct a prayer service within the Western Wall tunnel beneath the Temple Mount

**January 27, 1984** Temple activists are arrested for attempting to "attack" the Temple Mount

**January 3, 1985** It is revealed that a secret airlift of 3,000 Ethiopian Jews to Israel was successfully accomplished the previous month. Temple activist groups interpret it as sign of the nearness of the Messiah and the rebuilding of the Temple
January 8, 1986 Several members of the Knesset led by Geula Cohen, seek to hold a prayer service in the Temple area. The incident provokes a riot and an altercation with Arabs on the Mount

February, 1989 The Temple Institute opens a visitor's center for the exhibition of their Temple artifacts on the second floor of a building in the Jewish Quarter

October 16, 1989 Gershon Salomon, Yehoshua Cohendressed in the priestly garments, and members of the Temple Mount Faithful attempt to lay a cornerstone for the Third Temple at the entrance to the Temple Mount during the Feast of Tabernacles. A protest at an Arab school earlier in the day led police to rescind previous permission to conduct the ceremony.


October, 1989 Israel's Ministry of Religious Affairs sponsors the First Conference on Temple Research at Shlomo (The Great Synagogue).

October 8, 1990 Pre-announced plans by the Temple Mount Faithful to repeat their previous year's ceremony and attempt to lay a cornerstone for the Third Temple, provoke a riot on the Temple Mount. At the Western Wall where more than 20,000 Jews are assembled for Feast of Tabernacle services, 3,000 Moslem Palestinian Arabs pelt the crowd with stones from above. The result of the mêlée with Israeli police left 17 Arabs dead and brought condemnation from the U.N., including the United States. Iraq's Saddam Hussein uses incident to call for Jihad against Israel.

July- August, 1991 Gershon Salomon and members of the Temple Mount Faithful come to the U.S. for an extended lecture tour, including a television appearance on Pat Robertson's 700 Club and numerous other radio, T.V. and public meetings.

September 24, 1991 The Temple Mount Faithful conduct their third attempt to lay a cornerstone and to pray on the Temple Mount. Met by opposition from harredim who feared a repetition of the 1990 Arab riot, and official restraint, the attempt to lay the cornerstone was aborted.

October 31, 1991 At the Middle East Peace Conerence in Madrid, Spain, Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk Al-Shara accuses Israel of attempting to blow up the Al Aqsa Mosque and proclaims that there will be no free access to the religious sites on the Temple Mount unless Israel returns all of East Jerusalem to the Arabs.

November 1992 Rabbi Nachman Kahane, rabbi of the Young Israel Synagogue and director of the Institute for Talmudic Commentaries, announces plans to organize a Jewish
"Fundamentalist" Society which has as one of its objectives to rebuild the Third Temple

**February 10, 1992** Members of the Ateret Cohanim settle in the Arab village of Silwan, ancient site of David's City and announce plans to build more than 200 homes for Jews adjacent to the Temple Mount. Purpose is to establish Jewish presence for day when Temple is rebuilt.

**May 8, 1992** Rabbi Dr. Marvin Antelman of the Weizmann Institute announces that a sample of more than 900 pounds of substance discovered at Qumran excavations conducted by Vendyl Jones is ancient Temple incense (פומר הלרדה). Excavator believes that it will be significant for future rebuilding of the Temple and lead to other discoveries of Temple treasures.

**March 1992** The Biblical Archaeology Review publishes report by Leen Ritmeyer, chief architect of the Temple Mount excavations arguing that First and Second Temples were on site of present Dome of the Rock.

**November 1993** Lubavitcher organization Habad announces that Hasidic Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson is believed to be the Messiah, and journal Wellsprings reports in interview with Rabbi Friedman and that as Messiah his first work will be to return to Jerusalem and build the Third Temple. Signs appear in Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv area bearing Schneerson's picture with the words: "Welcome King Messiah."

**May 1993** Yeshivat Har-Habayit opens with 20 students meeting regularly on Temple Mount and rented facility in Jewish Quarter for dormitory and education.

**May 19, 1993** The "Covenant of Jerusalem" is signed in Jerusalem by 70 Jewish leaders on the 25th Anniversary of Jerusalem's unification. Throughout the document is the affirmation that the Third Temple will stand in the future on the Temple Mount.

**June 1993** Temple Institute finalizes discussions with American rancher to have qualified "Red Heifers" (Numbers 19) transported to Israel to begin breeding

**August 28, 1993** Temple Institute's director Rabbi Yisrael Ariel argues in Jerusalem Post that Third Temple will be "man-made" and not heaven-sent.

**September 13, 1993** "Declaration of Principles" signed between Israeli Prime Minister Yitzjak Rabin and PLO leader Yasser Arafat in Washington, D.C.; Arafat announces with Jordanian King Hussein that Jerusalem, and especially the Temple Mount, will be goal of further negotiations.

**November 1993** Excavators seek legal permission to renew dig at Cave IV site in Qumran based on ground-penetrating radar survey
conducted by Tel-Aviv University. Site is claimed to be the *Wadi Ha-Kippa* and that the survey revealed the possibility of recovering Temple treasures as indicated by the Copper Scroll.

December 1993

Rabbi Chaim Richman, Director of Public Relations at the Temple Institute, publishes *The Odyssey of the Temple* chronicling ancient and modern history of the Temple.
Figure 18: Daniel's "Seventy Weeks' Prophecy"

Daniel's "Seventy Weeks' Prophecy" (Daniel 9:24-27) according to Apocalyptic Premillennialism

- Messiah's Anointing (C.E. - 445 B.C.E.)
- Return of the Exiles (C.E. = 537 B.C.E.)
- First Temple (C.E. = 520 B.C.E.)
- Seventy Weeks (C.E. = 516 B.C.E.)
- Second Temple (C.E. = 516 B.C.E.)
- Third Temple (C.E. = 516 B.C.E.)
- Rebuilding of Jerusalem completed (C.E. = 516 B.C.E.)
- Messiah the Prince cut off (end of 690 years) (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- "Seventy Weeks" Prophecy completed (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- Time of Daniel's "seventieth week" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- "Seventy-weeks" Prophecy completed (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- Complete destruction (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- Antichrist wars, stops regular sacrifices, desecrates Temple, "Abomination of Desolation" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- "Prince to come" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- Rebuilding of the Temple may be result (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- "People of Prince to come (Romans) destroy City and Sanctuary" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- "Messiah the Prince cut off, but not for himself" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
- Decree of Artaxerxes for Jews to "restore and rebuild Jerusalem" (C.E. = 430 B.C.E.)
The Temple in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature

The Eschatology of the Temple Employing the Desecration/Restoration Motif

First Temple
(Solomon's)
Shekinah present
(1 Kings 5-8)

Second Temple
(Zerubbabel's & Herod's)
Roman eagle present
(Ezra 3:7-6:18; Mat. 24:1-2;
Mark 13:1-2; Luke 21:5-6)

Desecration

Messiah's
Coming
(According to the
New Testament)

Jewish Diaspora (right)
Age of the Church

"Third" Temple

Eschatological
Temple
Shekinah present

(2 Thess. 2:4;
Rev 11:1-2)

(1000 Years)

(Divine Ideal)

(1,000 Years)

Historical Restoration
not Divine Ideal

Temple in Ruins
Dome of the Rock
dominates site

Desecration

Abomination of Desecration
present

Gentiles inclusion (Rom. 9:11)

Preterist Period
of the Postponement of
Israel's Messianic Age
according to the
Apocalyptic Interpretation
(Rom 11:23-24)

B.C.E.

191

Battle of Gog & Magog
(Ezek. 38-39)

Third Temple
Built
(by Antichrist)

Third Temple
Descended
(Re: 20:10; Rev 11:5-20)

New Temple
(Rev. 21-22)

Millennium (Messianic Age)
(Teach: Isa. 2:2-4; 11:29-30;
Zech. 14:19-21)

B.C.E.

586

Battle of
Zerubbabel's

B.C.E.

520

Battle of
Herod's

B.C.E.

191

First Temple
Built
(by Babylonians)

Second Temple
Built
(by Romans)

Second Temple
Destroyed
(by Romans)

First Temple
Destroyed
(63 BC)
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